

Government Affairs Committee voted unanimously to pass the Senate version of this act, so upon our passage, we will very shortly be in an opportunity to begin making these kinds of changes, and I look forward to that. I look forward to this kind of legislation in the future.

I urge all Members to vote positively on this fundamental reform, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking Chairman ISSA and Ranking Member CUMMINGS for working with the university community to address a number of their concerns with specific provisions of H.R. 2061. I understand that the universities are still seeking some improvements to the legislation in order to ensure a transparent, fair, and effective process for improving the collection of data on federal funding, including of research grants to universities. I hope that the Chairman and Ranking Member will continue to work with the universities as this bill moves forward.

What concerns me most about this legislation is the sudden inclusion of major portions of H.R. 313 in this otherwise unrelated bill. I expressed my concerns about H.R. 313 when it was under consideration earlier this year, and these concerns remain in place today. I think we can all agree that federal agencies need to be wise and judicious in their use of travel funds, and that highly publicized past abuses, while very much the exception, were a wake-up call for us to exercise stricter oversight of taxpayer dollars. The Administration itself, through the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), has also sought to curb these abuses by instituting new travel caps and new reporting requirements on all agency travel and I applaud them for taking this seriously.

However, the scientific community, which includes tens of thousands of federal scientists and engineers at agencies such as the Department of Energy and NASA, depend on face-to-face interaction through conferences and workshops to foster innovation and launch new scientific directions. The scientific community, therefore, is rightfully concerned about the unintended consequences of travel restrictions stifling innovation and stunting economic growth by preventing federal scientists from participating fully in scientific exchanges with their fellow scientists and engineers from across the country and the world.

Once again, I want to thank Chairman ISSA for taking into consideration some of the concerns expressed by the agencies and the scientific community regarding the travel restrictions in H.R. 313 that have now been incorporated into H.R. 2061. However, this legislation still requires significant improvement. While OMB requires all agencies to publicly report on conference expenses in excess of \$100,000, H.R. 2061 would require even more detailed reporting for an agency sending even a single employee to a conference for which the conference's total cost—which may or may not be borne by taxpayer dollars—exceeds \$10,000. In other words, while the intent may have been otherwise, the language as written would not create any reasonable threshold for agency reporting. Are we really going to pay agency staff to post an explanation of how the participation of an employee advanced the mission of the agency for every \$30 roundtrip train ticket to a large meeting or workshop? It

seems to me that in any given fiscal year, the cost of the additional bureaucratic resources necessary to meet this requirement will exceed the actual expenses incurred.

I also remain concerned about what I see as arbitrary limits on the number of agency employees who may participate in large, international, scientific conferences and on the total amount an agency may spend not just next year, but through fiscal year 2018. I hope that, if this bill should continue to move forward, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will work with our colleagues in the other body to continue to perfect this bill. As the Ranking Member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, I stand by to assist in whatever way I can to ensure that we do not implement new regulations with unintended negative consequences for the progress of U.S. health, science, and innovation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2061, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1715

CLARIFICATION OF DETERMINATION OF COMPENSATION OF CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3343) to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to clarify the rules regarding the determination of the compensation of the Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3343

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

SECTION 1. CLARIFICATION OF DETERMINATION OF COMPENSATION OF CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

(a) DETERMINATION OF COMPENSATION.—Section 424(b)(2)(E) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (sec. 1-204.24(b)(2)(E), D.C. Official Code) is amended to read as follows:

“(E) PAY.—The Chief Financial Officer shall be paid at a rate such that the total amount of compensation paid during any calendar year does not exceed an amount equal to the limit on total pay which is applicable during the year under section 5307 of title 5, United States Code, to an employee described in section 5307(d) of such title.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to pay periods beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

California (Mr. ISSA) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, a capable chief financial officer is paramount to the physical health and integrity and defensiveness of any organization that he or she oversees. The District of Columbia is no exception. Just the opposite. The Federal city is perhaps the most important place for people to look at a microcosm of whether or not the Federal Government can be fiscally responsible.

In the 1990s, when the District of Columbia was bankrupt, Congress, at its discretion and the direction of this committee, stepped in with sweeping legislation to help the city's sinking financial ship. Included in these reforms was the establishment of an independent chief financial officer to oversee the city's finances. Since the creation of this position, Congress has come to rely upon the D.C. CFO to give an objective, unvarnished picture of the city's finances. The D.C. CFO is our best window into the financial status of the Federal city.

The bill before us today spends no Federal dollars. It simply allows the District to use its own locally generated funds to pay its CFO as much as a member of the Federal Government's Senior Executive Service can receive in total compensation. Now, I know that the men and women here on the floor understand the Senior Executive Service. But for those who may not, we have, throughout the government, hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of positions that are very senior that make, in fact, at times more than Members of Congress. These are specialists. These are highly trained career professionals that, in fact, make up to but not more than the Vice President.

Back in the 1990s when we created this position, we established an amount that seemed reasonable at the time. Today, establishing a more flexible amount, one that can change over time as the Senior Executive Service changes, makes more sense. Ultimately, there are CFOs throughout government—some of them controlling less responsibility and smaller amounts of funds and certainly, in many cases, less significant and complex relationships than that of a city of over 500,000 with countless different departments, including, obviously, the

education of children, the security of the Federal city, and the like. For that reason, it seems only fitting that we link it to a salary that can be at least as great as a senior Federal service.

Now, ultimately, we are not mandating a salary. We are only allowing the city to recruit someone who is created by an act of Congress to serve this body as a window into our oversight of the Federal city. This legislation was supported unanimously by the Oversight and Government Reform Committee last month, and I urge all Members to support this important technical change to the charter for the city of the District of Columbia.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the remarks of the chairman.

I rise in support of this important legislation, with special appreciation to Majority Leader ERIC CANTOR and particularly to Chairman ISSA and Ranking Member CUMMINGS for quickly marking up this bill so that it could come to the floor expeditiously, as the District is in the throes of hiring a new CFO. I will have more to say on their indispensable support presently.

The District of Columbia's independent chief financial officer is a unique office in the United States created by Congress. The city cannot obligate or expend funds without the CFO's approval, and the CFO can only be terminated for cause.

Today's bill, which contains a formula developed by Chairman ISSA, is an important example of the chairman's continuing commitment to assist the city in improving and safeguarding its vital operations.

When the current CFO announced his retirement earlier this year, the Mayor formed a CFO search committee, led by Alice Rivlin, the former head of the D.C. Financial Control Board, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Congressional Budget Office, and former Mayor Anthony Williams.

The search committee determined that the allowable compensation that is in the bill is necessary for the recruitment and retention of a CFO, but the District government does not have the authority under the Home Rule Act to alter the CFO's compensation. This bill would amend the Home Rule Act to permit the D.C. government to pay its CFO an amount that may not exceed the pay of members of the Senior Executive Service in agencies with an Office of Personnel Management-certified appraisal system.

Currently, the Home Rule Act sets the CFO's pay at the basic pay for level I of the executive schedule. The bill's compensation standard, as with the term of an interim CFO under the D.C. Chief Financial Officer Vacancy Act, which we got enacted earlier this year, was established by Chairman ISSA and is supported by the city. I am particularly grateful to the chairman and also to Majority Leader CANTOR for their continued partnership on legislation to

improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the District of Columbia government.

As with today's bill, their assistance was indispensable last month as the Congress, with bipartisan help from the Senate, agreed for the first time to remove the threat of a D.C. government shutdown by permitting the city to spend its local funds, its own locally raised taxpayer funds, for the entire fiscal year 2014.

While Federal agencies' spending authority expires on January 15, the CR that Congress approved matches the city's responsibility to raise local funds with its right to, therefore, spend these funds, consistent with budget autonomy for the District, which Majority Leader CANTOR, Chairman ISSA, and Ranking Member CUMMINGS have all supported.

Again, I want to offer not only my own but also the gratitude of the city. The District has chosen a CFO; but, unfortunately, that matter is still pending because it has to lay over here in the Congress. The city is faced with the issue of two sovereigns that must approve a piece of legislation. Whenever I have had anything approaching that kind of emergency, the chairman has gone out of his way to see to it that we proceeded and that the city was not inconvenienced or, dare I say, embarrassed. I very much appreciate the way in which he expedited this bill and got it on a markup—and there have not been a lot of markups—but he made sure this got on the most recent markup. I particularly appreciate his innovation in devising a formula that would, in fact, be approved as I believe and hope it will today by this House.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, to my colleague from the District of Columbia, Eleanor, thank you. Thank you for the work you do for the District. It is our committee's jurisdiction to oversee the Federal city, and it is an honor; but it wouldn't be possible if not for the engagement of Delegate NORTON, if it wasn't for the cooperation we have had with the Mayor and members of the council and with the outgoing CFO.

So we don't often get an opportunity on the House floor to talk about, candidly, the fact that we are hosted by a city here. We have jurisdiction over it; but, ultimately, the day-to-day operation is not a burden to Congress but, rather, a benefit to Congress that we have by having this unique relationship.

So as I urge all Members to vote for this important change, I want to thank the majority leader and all those who have brought this bill in a timely fashion to the floor so that we could make a decision and go to hiring a new CFO so we would never be without a person to oversee the finances and to report to Congress in a timely fashion so that we

can have confidence that the people who so kindly host us, in fact, will remain fiscally responsible and solvent throughout anything that may come their way.

So, again, to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), I thank her. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3343.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION AND EXPANSION OF ADMINISTRATIVE PENALTY AUTHORITY OF FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION THROUGH 2018

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3487) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act to extend through 2018 the authority of the Federal Election Commission to impose civil money penalties on the basis of a schedule of penalties established and published by the Commission, to expand such authority to certain other violations, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3487

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

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF ADMINISTRATIVE PENALTY AUTHORITY OF FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION THROUGH 2018.

Section 309(a)(4)(C)(iv) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 437g(a)(4)(C)(iv)) is amended by striking "December 31, 2013" and inserting "December 31, 2018".

SEC. 2. EXPANSION OF ADMINISTRATIVE PENALTY AUTHORITY OF FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION.

(a) APPLICATION TO QUALIFIED DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.—Section 309(a)(4)(C)(i) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 437g(a)(4)(C)(i)) is amended by striking "any requirement of section 304(a) of the Act (2 U.S.C. 434(a))" and inserting "a qualified disclosure requirement".

(b) SCHEDULE OF PENALTIES FOR EACH VIOLATION.—Section 309(a)(4)(C)(i)(II) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 437g(a)(4)(C)(i)(II)) is amended by inserting ", for violations of each qualified disclosure requirement," before "under a schedule of penalties".

(c) DEFINITION OF QUALIFIED DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENT.—Section 309(a)(4)(C) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 437g(a)(4)(C)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating clause (iv), as amended by section 1, as clause (v); and

(2) by inserting after clause (iii) the following new clause:

"(iv) In this subparagraph, the term 'qualified disclosure requirement' means any requirement of—