#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 264

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 264, a bill to expand access to community mental health centers and improve the quality of mental health care for all Americans.

S. 360

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. Bennet) was added as a cosponsor of S. 360, a bill to amend the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993 to expand the authorization of the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, and the Interior to provide service opportunities for young Americans; help restore the nation's natural, cultural, historic, archaeological, recreational and scenic resources; train a new generation of public land managers and enthusiasts; and promote the value of public service.

S. 411

At the request of Mr. Rockefeller, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. Johnson) was added as a cosponsor of S. 411, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 411, supra.

S. 522

At the request of Mr. Durbin, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Murphy) was added as a cosponsor of S. 522, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to award grants to establish, or expand upon, master's degree or doctoral degree programs in orthotics and prosthetics, and for other purposes.

S. 526

At the request of Mr. Baucus, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 526, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the special rule for contributions of qualified conservation contributions, and for other purposes.

S. 557

At the request of Mrs. Hagan, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 557, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to medication therapy management under part D of the Medicare program.

S. 569

At the request of Mr. Brown, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. King) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare.

C 605

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 607, a bill to improve the provisions relating to the privacy of electronic communications.

S. 734

At the request of Mr. Nelson, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 734, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation.

S. 783

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 783, a bill to amend the Helium Act to improve helium stewardship, and for other purposes.

S. 888

At the request of Mr. Johanns, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 888, a bill to provide end user exemptions from certain provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

S. 909

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. McCaskill) was added as a cosponsor of S. 909, a bill to amend the Federal Direct Loan Program under the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for student loan affordability, and for other purposes.

S. 1064

At the request of Mr. Brown, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. King) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1064, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for treatment of clinical psychologists as physicians for purposes of furnishing clinical psychologist services under the Medicare program.

S. 1123

At the request of Mr. Johanns, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1123, a bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to curb waste, fraud, and abuse in the Medicare and Medicaid programs.

S 1171

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1171, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to allow a veterinarian to transport and dispense controlled substances in the usual course of veterinary practice outside of the registered location.

S. 1174

At the request of Mr. Blumenthal, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Toomey) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1174, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 65th Infantry Regiment, known as the Borinqueneers.

S. 1211

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1211, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to prohibit the use of the phrases GI Bill and Post-9/11 GI Bill to give a false impression of approval or endorsement by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

S. 1238

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1238, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the current reduced interest rate for undergraduate Federal Direct Stafford Loans for 1 year, to modify required distribution rules for pension plans, and for other purposes.

S. 1274

At the request of Mr. Chiesa, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1274, a bill to extend assistance to certain private nonprofit facilities following a disaster, and for other purposes.

S. 1276

At the request of Mr. Nelson, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1276, a bill to increase oversight of the Revolving Fund of the Office of Personnel Management, strengthen the authority to terminate or debar employees and contractors involved in misconduct affecting the integrity of security clearance background investigations, enhance transparency regarding the criteria utilized by Federal departments and agencies to determine when a security clearance is required, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 157

At the request of Ms. Klobuchar, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Hoeven) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 157, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that telephone service must be improved in rural areas of the United States and that no entity may unreasonably discriminate against telephone users in those areas.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. McCain, Ms. Cantwell, and Mr. King):

S. 1282. A bill to reduce risks to the financial system by limiting banks' ability to engage in certain risky activities and limiting conflicts of interest, to reinstate certain Glass-Steagall Act protections that were repealed by the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. McCAIN. I am pleased to join my colleagues, Senator Warren of Massachusetts, Senator Cantwell of Washington, and Senator King of Maine, and also recognize the hard work of my friend from Ohio who has been heavily involved in this issue in the past.

This legislation is bipartisan. The 21st Century Glass-Steagall Act, which will restore the much needed wall between investment and commercial banking to lessen risk, restore confidence in our banking system, and better protect the American taxpayer. The original 1933 Glass-Steagall Act was put in place to respond to the financial crash of 1929.

Similar to the 21st Century Glass-Steagall Act that we are introducing today, it put up a wall between commercial and investment banking with the idea of separating riskier investment banking from the core banking functions such as checking and savings accounts that Americans need in their everyday life.

Commercial banks traditionally use their customer's deposit for the purpose of Main Street loans within their communities. They did not engage in high-risk ventures. Investment banks, however, managed money for those who could afford to take bigger risks in order to get a bigger return and who bore their own losses. Unfortunately, core provisions of the Glass-Steagall Act were repealed in 1999, shattering the wall dividing commercial banks and investment banks. Since that time, we have seen a culture of greed and excessive risk-taking take root in the banking world, where common sense and caution with other people's money no longer matters.

When these two worlds collided, the investment bank culture prevailed, cutting off the credit lifeblood of Main Street firms, demanding greater returns that were achievable only through high leverage and huge risk-taking, which ultimately left the tax-payer with the fallout.

Leading up to the 2008 financial crisis, the mantra of "bigger is better" took over, and sadly it still remains. The path forward focused on short-term gains rather than long-term planning. Banks became overleveraged in their haste to keep in the race. The more they lent, the more they made.

Aggressive mortgages were underwritten for unqualified individuals who became homeowners saddled with loans they could not afford. Banks turned right around and bought portfolios of these shaky loans. I know the 2008 financial crisis did not happen solely because the wall of Glass-Steagall was knocked down. But I strongly believe the repeal of these core provisions played a significant role in changing the banking system in negative ways that contributed greatly to the 2008 financial crisis

I believe this culture of risky behavior is still in play. For example, the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, on which I serve as ranking member, held a hearing in March of this year to discuss the findings of the subcommittee investigation report entitled, "JPMorgan Chase Whale Trades: A Case History of Derivatives Risks and Abuses."

The hearing and the findings of the investigation described how traders at

JPMorgan Chase made risky bets using excess deposits that were partially insured by the Federal Government. If they wanted to make these bets on deposits and money that was not insured by the Federal Government, the Senator from Massachusetts and I would not be here today.

They used federally insured deposits, putting the taxpayers on the hook for their risky and ultimately failed investments. I say again, the Dodd-Frank bill, the whole purpose of it, as sold to this Congress and to the American people, was to ensure that no investment company or investment financial enterprise would ever be too big to fail again.

Is there anybody who believes these institutions such as I just talked about, JPMorgan Chase and others, are not too big to fail? Of course they are still too big to fail. The investigation revealed startling failures and shed light on a complex and volatile world of synthetic credit derivatives.

In a matter of months, JPMorgan Chase was able to vastly increase its exposure to risk while dodging oversight by Federal regulators. The trades ultimately cost the bank a staggering \$6.2 billion in loss. This case represents another shameful demonstration of a bank engaged in wildly risky behavior. The London Whale incident matters to the Federal Government and the American taxpayer because the traders at JPMorgan Chase were making risky bets using excess deposits, a portion of which were federally insured.

These excess deposits should have been used to provide loans for Main Street businesses. Instead, JPMorgan Chase used the money to bet on catastrophic risk. The 21st Century Glass-Steagall Act will return banking back to the basics by separating traditional banks that offer savings and checking accounts and are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation from riskier financial institutions that offer other services such as investment banking, insurance, swaps dealing and hedge fund and private equity activities.

I believe big Wall Street institutions should be free to engage in transactions with significant risk but not with federally insured deposits. The bill also addresses depository institutions' use of products that did not exist when Glass-Steagall was originally passed, such as structured and synthetic financial products, including complete derivatives and synthesis.

complex derivatives and swaps.
Finally, the bill provides financial

rinally, the bill provides inhancial institutions with a 5-year transition period to separate their activities. Many prominent individuals in the banking world support returning to a modern day Glass-Steagall banking system, including FDIC Vice Chairman Thomas Hoenig. Last year in his opinion piece in the Wall Street Journal, entitled "No More Welfare For Banks. The FDIC and the taxpayer are the underwriters of too much private risk taking," he lays out his plan to

strengthen the U.S. financial system by simplifying its structure and making its institutions more accountable for their mistakes, which he calls Glass-Steagall for today. He ends his piece by stating:

Capitalism will always have crises and the recent crisis had many contributing factors. However, the direct and indirect expansion of the safety net to cover an ever-increasing number of complex and risky activities made this crisis significantly worse. We have yet to correct the error. It is time we did.

I could not agree more. Almost 3 years ago, Congress passed Dodd-Frank with the intent to overhaul our Nation's financial system. I did not vote for Dodd-Frank because it did little if anything to tackle the tough problems facing our financial sector.

What Dodd-Frank did, though, was create thousands of pages of new and complicated rules. Is there any Member of this body who believes that Dodd-Frank has resulted in the end of too big to fail? The 21st Century Glass-Steagall Act may not end too big to fail on its own, but it moves the large financial institutions in the right direction, making them smaller and safer

This bill would rebuild the wall between commercial and investment banking that was successful for over 60 years and reduced risk for the American taxpayer.

I ask unanimous consent that the Thomas Hoenig article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[FROM THE WALL STREET JOURNAL, June 10, 2012]

NO MORE WELFARE FOR BANKS

THE FDIC AND THE TAXPAYER ARE THE UNDER-WRITERS OF TOO MUCH PRIVATE RISK TAKING. (By Thomas Hoenig)

I have a proposal to strengthen the U.S. financial system by simplifying its structure and making its institutions more accountable for their mistakes. Put simply, my proposal would help prevent another 2008-style crisis by prohibiting banking organizations from conducting broker-dealer or other trading activities and by reforming money-market funds and the market for short-term collateralized loans (repurchase agreements, or repos). In other words, Glass-Steagall for today.

Those opposed to taking these actions generally focus on two themes. First, they say that if Glass-Steagall—enacted in 1933 to separate commercial and investment banking—had been in place, the crisis still would have occurred. Second, they argue that requiring the separation of commercial banking and broker-dealer activities is inconsistent with a free-market economy and puts U.S. financial firms at a global competitive disadvantage. Both assertions are wrong.

Advocates of the first argument say the crisis was not precipitated by trading activities within banking organizations but by excessive mortgage lending by commercial banks and by the failures of independent broker-dealers, such as Lehman Brothers and Bear Stearns.

This assertion ignores that the largest bank holding companies and broker-dealers were engaged in high-risk activities supported by explicit and implied government

guarantees. Access to insured deposits or money-market funds and repos fueled the activities of both groups, making them susceptible to the freezing of markets and assetprice declines.

Before 1999, U.S. banking law kept banks,

which are protected by a public safety net (e.g., deposit insurance), separate from broker-dealer activities, including trading and market making. However, in 1999 the law changed to permit bank holding companies to expand their activities to trading and other business lines. Similarly, broker-dealers like Bear Stearns, Lehman Brothers, Goldman Sachs and other "shadow banks" were able to use money-market funds and repos to assume a role similar to that of banks, funding long-term asset purchases with the equivalent of very short-term deposits. All were able to expand the size and complexity of their balance sheets.

While these changes took place, it also became evident that large, complex institutions were considered too important to the economy to be allowed to fail. A safety net was extended beyond commercial banks to bank holding companies and broker-dealers. In the end, nobody-not managements, the market or regulators-could adequately assess and control the risks of these firms. When they foundered, banking organizations and broker-dealers inflicted enormous damage on the economy, and both received government bailouts.

To illustrate my point, consider that if you or I want to speculate on the market, we must risk our own wealth. If we think the price of an asset is going to decline, we might sell it "short," expecting to profit by buying it back more cheaply later and pocketing the difference. But if the price increases, we either invest more of our own money to cover the difference or we lose the original investment.

In contrast, a bank can readily cover its position using insured deposits or by borrowing from the Federal Reserve. Large nonbank institutions can access money-market funds or other credit because the market believes they will be bailed out. Both types of companies can even double down in an effort to stay in the game long enough to win the bet, which supersizes losses when the bet doesn't pay off. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) fund and the taxpayer are the underwriters of this private risk-taking.

This leads to the second criticism of my proposal-that breaking up the banks is inconsistent with free markets and our need to be competitive globally. The opposite is true. My proposal seeks to return to capitalism by confining the government's guarantee to that for which it was intended-to protect the payments system and related activities inside commercial banking. It ends the extension of the safety net's subsidy to trading, market-making and hedge-fund activities. This change will invigorate commercial banking and the broker-dealer market by encouraging more equitable and responsible competition within markets. It reduces the welfare nature of our current financial system, making it more self-reliant and more internationally competitive.

Capitalism will always have crises and the recent crisis had many contributing factors. However, the direct and indirect expansion of the safety net to cover an ever-increasing number of complex and risky activities made this crisis significantly worse. We have yet to correct the error. It is time we did.

Mr. McCAIN. I would like to thank the Senator from Massachusetts, whom I will freely admit has a great deal more knowledge, background, and expertise on this issue than I do. I appre-

ciate her leadership. When the Senator sought to join us in the Senate, she committed to the people of Massachusetts and this country that she would be committed to certain significant reforms to ensure that we never again have the kind of crisis that devastated my State.

Still today, nearly half the homes in my State are underwater, which means they are worth less than their mortgage payments, while Wall Street has been doing well for years. That bailout is one of the more unfair aspects that I have seen in American history. We cannot revisit or fix history, but we sure can make sure we have made every effort to make sure these large financial institutions do not gamble with taxpayers' money.

I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. It is a pleasure to join her in this effort as her junior partner.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN, Mr. President, I rise in support of the senior Senator from Arizona and to support the 21st Century Glass-Steagall Act. I am honored to join Senators McCain, Cantwell, and KING in introducing this bill. I particularly commend Senator McCain for his hard work and his long-time dedication on this issue.

Senator McCain is a real leader in the Senate. While we do not agree on every issue, he is a fighter who stands for what he believes. Senator McCain has worked hard to shed light on the too-big-to-fail problem. He has been thinking about how to bring back elements of Glass-Steagall for years. I am proud to join with him to speak about the 21st Century Glass-Steagall Act. I am glad to be his partner in this endeavor.

Washington is a partisan place. This Congress has its share of partisan bills. But we have all joined together today because we want a safe future for our kids and for our grandkids. We know that 5 years ago Wall Streets's highrisk bets nearly brought our economy to its knees, disrupting the lives and livelihoods of hard-working Americans.

We know the economic downturn did not affect just Democrats or just Republicans or just Independents, it affected everyone.

Over the past 5 years we have made some real progress in dialing back the risk of future crises. But despite the progress that has been made, the biggest banks continue to threaten the economy. The four biggest banks are now 30 percent larger than they were just 5 years ago. They have continued to engage in dangerous high-risk practices that could once again put our economy at risk.

The big banks were not always allowed to take on big risk while enjoying the benefits of both explicit and implicit taxpayer guarantees. Four years after the 1929 crash, Congress passed the Banking Act, or the Glass-

Steagall Act as it is known, which is best known for separating the risky activities of investment banks from the core depository functions such as savings accounts and checking accounts that consumers rely on every day.

For years, Glass-Steagall played a central role in keeping our country safe. Traditional banking stayed separate from high-risk Wall Street banking. But big banks wanted the higher profits they could get from taking on more risk. Investors wanted access to the insured deposits of traditional banks. So Wall Street investors combined with the big banks to try to weaken and repeal Glass-Steagall. Starting in the 1980s, regulators at the Federal Reserve and the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency responded. reinterpreting longstanding terms in ways that slowly broke down the wall between investment banking and depository banking. Finally, after 12 attempts to repeal, Congress eliminated the core provisions of Glass-Steagall in 1999.

The 21st Century Glass-Steagall Act will reestablish the wall between commercial and investment banking, make our financial system more stable and more secure, and protect American families.

Like its 1933 predecessor, the 21st Century Glass-Steagall Act will separate traditional banks that offer checking and savings accounts and are insured by the FDIC from the riskier financial services. It will return banking-basic banking-to the basics.

The 21st Century Glass-Steagall Act also puts in place some important improvements over the original Glass-Steagall. It reverses the interpretations the regulators used to weaken the original Glass-Steagall. Our bill also recognizes that financial markets have become more complicated since the 1930s, and it separates depository institutions from products that did not exist when Glass-Steagall was originally passed, such as structured and synthetic financial products, including complex derivatives and swaps.

The idea behind the bill is simple: Banking should be boring. Anyone who wants to take big risks should go to Wall Street, and they should stay away from the basic banking system.

I wish to be clear—the 21st Century Glass-Steagall Act will not by itself end too big to fail and implicit government subsidies, but it will make financial institutions smaller, safer, and move us in the right direction. By separating depository institutions from riskier activities, large financial institutions will shrink in size and won't be able to rely on Federal depository insurance as a safety net for their highrisk activities. It will stop the game these banks have played for too long. Heads, the big banks win and take all the profits and, tails, the taxpayer gets stuck with all the losses.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation to reduce the risk in the financial system and to

dial back the likelihood of future cri-

Exactly 70 years ago the halls of the Senate filled with excitement and history when it passed the original Glass-Steagall. The financial industry at that time experienced some big immediate changes, but despite all kinds of claims to the contrary, Wall Street survived and the sky did not fall. In fact, the American people enjoyed a half century of financial stability and a strong, growing middle class. The regular financial crises that had occurred over and over before Glass-Steagall faded away, and our economy became stronger and more stable.

Few in Congress have been around long enough to have lived through the Great Depression that led to the first Glass-Steagall, but we were all around during the 2008 financial crisis. It has been 5 years since then, but our economy still has not fully recovered, and the downturn has had an impact everywhere—on our families, businesses, retirees, workers, schoolchildren, and college students. We need a banking system that serves the best interests of the American people, not just the few at the top. The 21st Century Glass-Steagall Act is an important step in the right direction. I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. Whitehouse, and Mr. Franken):

S. 1286. A bill to encourage the adoption and use of certified electronic health record technology by safety net providers and clinics; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Medicaid Information Technology to Enhance Community Health Act of 2013, or the MITECH Act. I am proud to be joined by my colleagues Senator Franken and Senator Whitehouse in introducing this important piece of legislation which would help clinics and health care providers serving our Nation's most vulnerable citizens qualify for incentives to adopt meaningful use electronic health records for their patients.

In recent years, Congress has recognized the benefits of implementing electronic health records in our health care system. Countless experts have determined that electronic health records and other forms of health information technology improve health care quality, reduce medical errors, and lower overall medical costs. We have made unprecedented investments in electronic health records and have seen the benefits of these investments. Since its implementation, these programs have helped hundreds of thousands of providers and hospitals nationwide establish and effectively use electronic health records. However, eligibility requirements for these incentives payments have prevented some low-income providers from receiving them.

While electronic health records are a vital part of any quality health prac-

tice, they are in some ways even more important for clinics that serve low income, uninsured, and underinsured populations. These patients often seek services from any number of settings rather than returning to a set primary care provider. When the clinics that serve a particular population are able to establish and maintain electronic health records for their patients, it is far more likely that a patient's record will be available to their health care providers even if the patient is seeing a different provider in a different clinic. This allows an individual's health care providers to have access to a complete medical history, improving their ability to form a diagnosis, preventing unnecessary duplication of tests, and reducing costs for the patients and government. This measure also will allow safety net clinics to better communicate with patients about necessary screenings and help to make sure patients are taking medications as prescribed and not "doctor shopping" for inappropriate medication.

The Health Information Technology for Economic and Clinical Health, HITECH, Act created financial incentives called "meaningful use" incentives for both Medicare and Medicaid providers to adopt and meaningfully use implement and support electronic health records. While the current program has helped thousands of providers, practices, and hospitals nationwide, many safety net providers and clinics have not been able to benefit from the incentives. Given that Medicaid eligibility levels are so low in many states, it is difficult for many safety net providers to meet the 30 percent Medicaid patient threshold required to participate in the Medicaid electronic health records incentive program even though their patients are predominately low-income.

Congress addressed this problem only for practitioners working in Federally-qualified health centers and rural health centers by creating a 30 percent "needy" threshold in the HITECH Act for those providers. Unfortunately, the law failed to provide similar support for other providers serving low-income individuals.

The MITECH Act of 2013 seeks to eliminate these barriers, which prevent many safety net providers from qualifying for Medicaid electronic health record incentive payments. The bill will improve access to incentives for safety net providers that were left out of the HITECH Act's efforts. Additionally, the MITECH Act requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop a methodology to allow these safety net clinics to be eligible for payments as an entity, similar to the current process that exists for hospitals.

Access to Medicaid electronic health records incentives will allow safety net clinics to better communicate with patients about necessary screenings, help ensure compliance with prescription drugs, reduce unnecessary duplication

of tests and will strengthen the safety net which provides essential care to so many Americans.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill. In doing so, we will offer vital support to safety net providers.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. Coons, and Mr. Whitehouse):

S. 1291. A bill to strengthen families' engagement in the education of their children; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I introduce the Family Engagement in Education Act with my colleagues Senator Coons and Senator WHITEHOUSE. I thank Representative THOMPSON for introducing the House companion of this bipartisan bill.

Our legislation will strengthen family engagement in education at the local, state, and national levels. It will empower parents by increasing school district resources dedicated to family engagement activities from one percent to 2 percent of the district's Title I allocation. It will also improve the quality of family engagement practices at the school level by requiring school districts to develop and implement standards-based policies and practices for family-school partnerships. It will build State and local capacity for effective family engagement in education by setting aside at least 0.3 percent of the State Title I allocation for statewide family engagement in education activities, such as establishing statewide family engagement centers to continue and enhance the work that had been supported through the Parent Information Resource Centers. For states with Title I-A allocations above \$60 million, the State Educational agency will make grants to at least one local family engagement in education center to provide innovative programming and services, such as leadership training and family literacy, to local families and to remove barriers to family engagement, and to support Statelevel activities in the highest need areas of the State. Finally, at the national level, our legislation will require the Secretary of Education the convene practitioners, researchers, and other experts in the field of family engagement in education to develop recommended metrics for measuring the quality and outcomes of family engagement in a child's education.

Research demonstrates that family engagement in a child's education increases student achievement, improves attendance, and reduces dropout rates. A study by Anne Seitsinger and Steven Brand at the University of Rhode Island's Center for School Improvement and Educational Policy found that students whose parents support their education through learning activities at home and discuss the importance of education perform better in school. Yet too often, family engagement is not built into our school improvement efforts in a systematic way. The Family Engagement in Education Act will promote meaningful family engagement

policies and programs at the national, state, and local levels to ensure that all students are on track to be career and college-ready.

This legislation builds on my successful efforts in the last reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ESEA, the 2001 No Child Left Behind Act, to incorporate provisions throughout the law to strengthen and boost parental involvement. It is also in line with the administration's blueprint for the ESEA reauthorization, which calls for doubling the amount that school districts are required to set aside for parental involvement and encouraging states to use some of their Title I funding to support local family engagement centers in education.

Developed with the National Family, School, and Community Engagement Working Group, which includes organizations such as National PTA, United Way Worldwide, Harvard Family Research Project, and National Council of La Raza, and endorsed by hundreds of local, state, and national organizations, this legislation represents the broad consensus that we must do a better job of engaging families in all aspects of their children's education.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the Family Engagement in Education Act, and to work for its inclusion in the forthcoming debate to reauthorize and renew the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

#### NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet in open session on Tuesday, July 16, 2013, at 2:30 p.m. in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled "Pooled Retirement Plans: Closing the Retirement Plan Coverage Gap for Small Businesses."

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact Sarah Cupp of the committee staff on (202) 224-5441.

### $\begin{array}{c} \text{COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL} \\ \text{RESOURCES} \end{array}$

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The hearing will be held on Thursday, July 18, 2013, at 9:30 a.m., in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on the current state of clean energy finance in the United States and opportunities to facilitate greater investment in domestic clean energy technology development and deployment.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record may do so by sending it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510-6150, or by e-mail to danielle deraney@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Kevin Rennert at (202) 224–7826 or Danielle Deraney at (202) 224–1219.

### $\begin{array}{c} \text{COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL} \\ \text{RESOURCES} \end{array}$

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The hearing will be held on Tuesday, July 23, 2013, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of this hearing is to consider S. 1273, the FAIR Act of 2013.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record may do so by sending it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510-6150, or by e-mail to

en Goldschmidt@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Todd Wooten at (202) 224–3907 or Lauren Goldschmidt at (202) 224–5488.

## AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 11, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 11, 2013, at 11 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled "Mitigating Systemic Risk Through Wall Street Reforms."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 11, 2013, at 9:30 a.m., in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent

that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 11, 2013, at 10 a.m., to hold a hearing entitled, "Assessing the Transition in Afghanistan."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 11, 2013, at 2:15 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 11, 2013, at 11 a.m., in SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct an executive business meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 11, 2013. at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my intern, Chris Riegg, be granted privileges of the floor for the balance of the day.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

# KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON SPOUSAL IRA

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2289 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title. The legislative clerk read as follows: A bill (H.R. 2289) to rename section 219(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 as the Kay Bailey Hutchison Spousal IRA.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 2289) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.