

rise in strong support of H.R. 4323, the "Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act of 2014," which reauthorizes three grant programs to address DNA backlogs and provide DNA training and technical assistance on local, state, and federal levels.

It is essential that these programs be reauthorized so that the backlog of unprocessed rape kits can be reduced and then eliminated and perpetrators of sexual assault crimes can be prosecuted and convicted.

There is an ever-present need to continue robust funding for programs such as the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grant Program in order to make sure victims do not fall through the cracks of the system.

Women who have been raped have a right to expect police to thoroughly investigate the case and prosecute the offenders; however, many rape kits across the country are never even tested, and the perpetrators never face justice.

Mr. Speaker, the number of backlogged DNA samples was in excess of 100,000 nationwide as recently as January 2010.

H.R. 4323 reauthorizes for four years (until the end of fiscal year 2019) the following programs:

1. "Debbie Smith Reauthorization" (\$151 million/fiscal year): grants for state and local DNA crime laboratories to address DNA backlogs and enhance their capacity.

2. DNA training and technical assistance (\$12.5 million/fiscal year): directed to law enforcement, courts, forensic scientists, and corrections.

3. DNA training and technical assistance (\$30 million/fiscal year): directed to sexual assault nurse examiner ("SANE") programs.

In my congressional district, these grant programs have resulted in forensic laboratories being hired to clear much of the Houston Police Department's backlog of untested DNA benefit from this type of legislation.

Just within the past year, decades-old rape kits that sat untested in Houston have identified at least one-third of potential offenders in cases where there was sufficient DNA, according to the Houston Police Department.

In my district more than 6,600 rape kits have been cleared as of August 2013 because of the funding made possible by the grant programs that H.R. 4323 will reauthorize. This record of success highlights the importance and continuing need to provide adequate funding so law enforcement agencies can conduct necessary DNA testing and training.

Mr. Speaker, the DNA Initiative is an invaluable tool for law enforcement today, and it will continue to be a legislative priority of mine. That is why I am pleased to co-sponsor H.R. 4323 and urge my colleagues to join me in voting to approve this critically important legislation.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to encourage my colleagues to support the reauthorization of the Debbie Smith Act. I thank my colleague from Virginia for his support.

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

I recognize the many people who have worked very hard to bring us to the reauthorization today of this important legislation.

I particularly want to thank Congresswoman MALONEY for her leadership from the original legislation to today. Congresswoman KAREN BASS of California unfortunately could not be with us for this debate this evening, but she has played a role as the lead cosponsor of this legislation. I thank the ranking member of the full committee and the ranking member of the Crime Subcommittee, Mr. CONYERS and Mr. SCOTT, for their hard work on this as well.

I certainly thank the chairman of the Crime Subcommittee, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, for his contribution, as well as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for his work in this area on this and other legislation affecting crimes against women.

Mr. Speaker, this is important legislation that will help avoid many, many future victims. I really thank Debbie Smith and Natasha Alexenko for being with us when we talked about this issue this afternoon. I want to thank them for their courage in speaking out about it. They are not only helping to have a better understanding on the part of the public of the nature of this problem, but they are actually helping to fight crime.

This Congress will be helping to fight crime when we get these perpetrators of these horrific events much, much more quickly than these multiyear delays that we have heard about tonight. We need to get them quickly. We need to prosecute the guilty. We need to exonerate the innocent and put the guilty ones in prison, where they cannot perpetrate more of these crimes. Some of them are out on the streets for additional years perpetrating multitudinous crimes. This is a serious problem. It will save the taxpayers money by reducing the amount of crime that is perpetrated in our society.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4323.

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.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1820

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro

tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at 6 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.

BUDGET AND ACCOUNTING TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 1872 will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. DeLauro moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1872, as reported, to the Committee on the Budget with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

TITLE IV—EQUAL PAY AND PROTECTING SMALL BUSINESSES AND CONSUMERS

SEC. 401. EQUAL PAY FOR WOMEN AND PROTECTING SMALL BUSINESSES AND CONSUMERS FROM HIGHER LOAN COSTS.

(a) EQUAL PAY FOR WOMEN.—This Act shall not take effect until the female-to-male earnings ratio of full-time, year-round workers is at least 100 percent, as reported by the Bureau of the Census pursuant to the data collected from any Current Population Survey Annual Social and Economic Supplement.

(b) PROTECTING SMALL BUSINESSES AND CONSUMERS.—This Act shall not apply to any loan for a small business, student, agriculture, or for veterans' housing if such Act increases the cost of such loan and credit programs for small businesses and consumers due to the elimination or reduction of Federal support.

Ms. DELAURO (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, this is a final amendment to the bill. It will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

This amendment works to end pay discrimination against women, and it helps to ensure a very simple principle, one I hope that everyone in this body agrees with: men, women, same job, same pay, because it is true in this body.

Tomorrow is the dubious milestone of Equal Pay Day, the day a women's earnings catch up to what a man made last year. We are now over 3 full months into 2014. Women should not have to work an extra quarter of a year to be paid what they are due.

My amendment would postpone the effective date of the bill under consideration until Congress has worked to close this pay gap. It also ensures that this act does not increase the cost of loan and credit programs for small businesses, students, farmers, and veterans as a result of an elimination or reduction of Federal support.

Paycheck discrimination is not a partisan issue. It affects every woman. It affects every family in America. Nearly 60 years ago, a Republican President, Dwight Eisenhower, told the Congress that "legislation to apply the principle of equal pay for equal work without discrimination because of sex is a matter of simple justice."

Over 50 years ago, Congress came together in a bipartisan fashion to pass the Equal Pay Act and end what President Kennedy called "the serious and endemic problem of unequal wages."

In 2014, women are still making 77 cents on average for every dollar made by a man. This wage gap is only closing at a rate of less than one-half a cent a year. That means we still have 40 more years before women will get paid what they deserve for the same work.

Families cannot afford to wait that long. They should not have to. That is why we just saw the Republican-controlled Senate in New Hampshire pass a paycheck fairness bill unanimously because this is an issue of simple fairness—same job, same pay—that affects everyone.

Women are half the workforce in America today, two-thirds of the primary cobreadwinners in American families. The poverty rate among women is as high as it has been in 17 years. Women have less retirement security, less protection on their pension, and more reliance on Social Security, but they receive lower payments because of this continuing wage gap.

As a result, two-thirds of seniors living in poverty today in the United States of America are women. These disproportionate financial pressures that women are facing are very much a product of this wage gap.

According to the National Partnership for Women and Families, women lose \$11,000 in income every year as a result of pay discrimination. This pay gap has not budged in a decade. For women of color, it is even worse. African American women make only 62 cents as compared to the average White male; Hispanic women, only 54 cents.

The pay gap holds true across occupations and education levels. This is not just a problem for women. Less pay for women means less income. That affects an entire family. Two-income households are already struggling.

This is not a partisan issue. Unequal pay affects families all across our

country. What are they trying to do? Pay their bills, achieve the American Dream, and they are getting less take-home pay for their hard work.

We have heard it from AnnMarie DuChon in Massachusetts. She found out years into her job that the university she worked for was paying men more for the same work.

Terri Kelly in Tennessee only discovered she was making less than she deserved because her husband held the exact same job, and she saw his paycheck.

ReShonda Young of Iowa discovered that her own father was paying women less when she went to work in the family business. This is real.

Both Republicans and Democrats agree that people doing the same job should receive the same pay. This amendment reaffirms our commitment to this basic principle.

It also says that we are not going to force small businesses and consumers, who are working hard, playing by the rules, and trying to make a better future for themselves, to pay more because of their skill.

Mr. Speaker, we made an enormous difference for women and families when we passed the Affordable Care Act in March 2010. We said to insurance companies: you cannot charge women more than men.

That is the law of the land today. It is real, it is being implemented, and it is happening right now. Now, we should build on that.

Let us make sure that employers cannot pay women less for the same job. This makes all the difference in their lives and the lives of their families. I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, a number of questions come to my mind after just hearing the sponsor of the motion. They don't necessarily go in this order.

One is: Why does she want to hide from the American public the actual facts of what they are doing to the American public, as far as spending the taxpayers' money?

The second question that comes to mind is: Why, when the opportunity was given to the other side of the aisle to work with us, to amend the bill or change the bill on those areas that they disagree with on its merits, why did they instead come with this proposal, this motion on the floor totally extraneous to the underlying message and purpose of the bill?

□ 1830

Mr. Speaker, many times we come to the floor and people say that the bill before us is a commonsense piece of legislation. Well, I am going to say it again because this is a commonsense piece of legislation. The underlying

bill, maybe we should have had a different name to it. Maybe if we simply called the bill what it is, the "Knowing What You Are Spending Bill," then the other side of the aisle would have agreed with us, wrapped their arms around the bill and us and said let's move forward, because who can disagree with actually know what you are spending?

That is all this bill does. It doesn't eliminate any programs; it doesn't cut any programs; and it doesn't diminish any programs. All it does is allow Congress and the American public to understand what we are spending and what the costs are to the various programs that both sides of the aisle support.

The proponent just now of the motion didn't get into the weeds at all. But let me just, for those just coming to the floor, remind them of what the major provisions of the underlying bill do. There are a number of them. I will give you three highlights.

First and foremost, it brings Federal budgeting in line with what the private sector has already been doing for a long time. It requires the executive branch and Congress to use something called fair value accounting when estimating the cost of Federal credit programs. What does that mean? Again, it just means that, when we spend American taxpayers' dollars, we have to let the taxpayers know how much it is actually costing.

This is not just my idea. This is what the private sector has been doing. This is even what the nonpartisan CBO, Congressional Budget Office, says we should be doing as well.

The second point is it brings Fannie and Freddie on budget. Why do we do that? To recognize the enormous and potential budgetary impact that these housing-related enterprises can and have had on our government. I don't think I have to remind either side of the aisle that they have cost upwards to \$187 billion in taxpayer dollars to get it done, and we want to make sure it is on the budget so we can see it clearly.

Thirdly and lastly, this bill would require agencies to make public the budgetary justification for the materials prepared in support of their programs. What is that saying? It just means that, if you have an agency out there that wants to spend your tax dollars, they have to have the justification for it.

I think those are three honest and fair proposals that the American public has a right to know. We can continue to help the poor; we can continue to have ag programs; we can continue to have energy programs; and we can continue to have programs that facilitate housing in this country. But as we do on those programs that we both agree on, let's make sure that we are being honest with the American public and telling them and knowing what it actually costs.

For that reason, I recommend a "no" on this motion to recommit that would

eliminate that possibility for transparency, accountability, and openness, and a “yes” on the final passage of the legislation.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 179, nays 217, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 165]

YEAS—179

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

NAYS—217

Griffith (VA)	Petri
Grimm	Pittenger
Guthrie	Pitts
Hall	Poe (TX)
Harper	Pompeo
Hartzler	Posey
Hastings (WA)	Price (GA)
Heck (NV)	Reed
Hensarling	Reichert
Herrera Beutler	Renacci
Holding	Ribble
Hudson	Rice (SC)
Huelskamp	Rigell
Huizenga (MI)	Roby
Hultgren	Roe (TN)
Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Hurt	Rogers (KY)
Issa	Rogers (MI)
Jenkins	Rohrabacher
Johnson (OH)	Rokita
Johnson, Sam	Rooney
Jolly	Ros-Lehtinen
Jones	Roskam
Jordan	Ross
Joyce	Rothfus
Kelly (PA)	Royce
King (IA)	Runyan
King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Kingston	Salmon
Kinzingler (IL)	Sanford
Kline	Scalise
Labrador	Schweikert
LaMalfa	Scott, Austin
Lamborn	Sensenbrenner
Lance	Sessions
Lankford	Shimkus
Latham	Shuster
Latta	Simpson
LoBiondo	Smith (MO)
Long	Smith (NE)
Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Luetkemeyer	Smith (TX)
Lummis	Southerland
Marchant	Stivers
Marino	Stockman
Massie	Stutzman
McCarthy (CA)	Terry
McCaul	Thompson (PA)
McClintock	Thornberry
McHenry	Tiberi
McKeon	Tipton
McKinley	Turner
McMorris	Upton
Rodgers	Valadao
Meadows	Wagner
Meehan	Walberg
Messer	Walden
Mica	Walorski
Miller (FL)	Weber (TX)
Miller (MI)	Webster (FL)
Mullin	Wenstrup
Mulvaney	Whitfield
Murphy (PA)	Williams
Neugebauer	Wilson (SC)
Noem	Wittman
Nugent	Wolf
Nunes	Womack
Nunnelee	Woodall
Olson	Yoder
Palazzo	Yoho
Paulsen	Young (AK)
Pearce	Young (IN)
Perry	

NOT VOTING—35

Barr	Gohmert	Pastor (AZ)
Bass	Griffin (AR)	Payne
Black	Gutiérrez	Pelosi
Brown (FL)	Hanna	Perlmutter
Buchanan	Harris	Richmond
Campbell	Keating	Schock
Cárdenas	Larson (CT)	Schwartz
Carter	McAllister	Stewart
DeFazio	Meeks	Visclosky
Denham	Miller, Gary	Wasserman
Fletcher	Moran	Schultz
Gingrey (GA)	Neal	Westmoreland

□ 1857

Mr. FARENTHOLD changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. GRIJALVA, DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. GABBARD changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 230, noes 165, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 166]

AYES—230

Aderholt	Granger	Nugent
Amash	Graves (GA)	Nunes
Amodei	Graves (MO)	Nunnelee
Bachmann	Grayson	Olson
Bachus	Griffith (VA)	Owens
Barber	Grimm	Palazzo
Barletta	Guthrie	Paulsen
Barrow (GA)	Hall	Pearce
Barton	Harper	Perry
Benishiek	Hartzler	Peters (CA)
Bentivolio	Hastings (WA)	Petri
Bilirakis	Heck (NV)	Pittenger
Bishop (UT)	Hensarling	Pitts
Blackburn	Herrera Beutler	Poe (TX)
Boustany	Holding	Pompeo
Brady (TX)	Hudson	Posey
Bridenstine	Huelskamp	Price (GA)
Brooks (AL)	Huizenga (MI)	Quigley
Brooks (IN)	Hultgren	Reed
Brown (GA)	Hunter	Reichert
Bucshon	Hurt	Renacci
Burgess	Issa	Ribble
Byrne	Jenkins	Rice (SC)
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Rigell
Cantor	Johnson, Sam	Roby
Capo	Jones	Roe (TN)
Cassidy	Jordan	Rogers (AL)
Chabot	Joyce	Rogers (KY)
Chaffetz	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (MI)
Coble	King (IA)	Rohrabacher
Coffman	King (NY)	Rokita
Cole	Kingston	Rooney
Collins (GA)	Kinzingler (IL)	Ros-Lehtinen
Collins (NY)	Kline	Roskam
Conaway	Labrador	Ross
Cook	LaMalfa	Rothfus
Cooper	Lamborn	Royce
Costa	Lance	Runyan
Cotton	Lankford	Ryan (WI)
Cramer	Latham	Salmon
Crawford	Latta	Sanford
Crenshaw	Lipinski	Scalise
Cuellar	LoBiondo	Schrader
Culberson	Long	Schweikert
Daines	Lucas	Scott, Austin
Davis, Rodney	Luetkemeyer	Sensenbrenner
Dent	Lummis	Sessions
DeSantis	Maffei	Shimkus
DesJarlais	Marchant	Shuster
Duffy	Marino	Simpson
Duncan (SC)	Massie	Sinema
Duncan (TN)	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (MO)
Ellmers	McCaul	Smith (NE)
Farenthold	McClintock	Smith (NJ)
Fitzpatrick	McHenry	Smith (TX)
Fleischmann	McIntyre	Southerland
Fleming	McKeon	Stivers
Flores	McKinley	Stockman
Forbes	McMorris	Stutzman
Fortenberry	Rodgers	Terry
Fox	Meadows	Thompson (PA)
Franks (AZ)	Meehan	Thornberry
Frelinghuysen	Messer	Tiberi
Galleo	Mica	Tipton
Gardner	Miller (FL)	Turner
Garrett	Miller (MI)	Upton
Gerlach	Mullin	Valadao
Gibbs	Mulvaney	Wagner
Gibson	Murphy (FL)	Walberg
Goodlatte	Murphy (PA)	Walden
Gosar	Neugebauer	Walorski
Gowdy	Noem	Weber (TX)
		Webster (FL)

Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)

Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall

Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—165

Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brownley (CA)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Green, Al

Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebsock
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Nadler
Napolitano

Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pelosi
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Walz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—36

Barr
Bass
Black
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Campbell
Cárdenas
Carney
Carter
DeFazio
Denham
Diaz-Balart
Fincher

Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Griffin (AR)
Gutiérrez
Hanna
Harris
Keating
Larson (CT)
McAllister
Meeks
Miller, Gary
Moran
Neal

Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Richmond
Schock
Schwartz
Stewart
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Westmoreland

□ 1904

Mr. ELLISON changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR HOLOCAUST DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE CEREMONY

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 90, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WILLIAMS). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 90

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR HOLOCAUST DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE CEREMONY.

Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used on April 30, 2014, for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust. Physical preparations for the conduct of the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. CON. RES. 94

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington, Mr. DENNY HECK, be removed as a cosponsor from H. Con. Res. 94.

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

There was no objection.

SHANNON MELENDI'S DEATH STINGS, 20 YEARS LATER

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share some words written by Anne Vasquez about the tragic loss of a teen from my Miami high school:

Shannon Melendi and I became fast friends. Tears still sting my eyes when I think of the final chapters of Shannon's short life.

At 19, a sophomore at Emory, she disappeared on a Saturday afternoon lunch break from her job at a softball field in suburban Atlanta.

The year was 1994. It would be another painful 12 years before the suspect confessed. Shannon's body was never found. No funeral, no official moment to mourn. The last 20 years have unfolded in surreal fashion.

A smart 19-year-old with quick wit, the president of her high school senior class, an aspiring lawyer, a champion debater, the daughter of present and caring parents—it can happen to anyone, anywhere.

Indeed.

Thank you, Anne. Shannon, we'll always remember you.

A THREAT TO LIBERTY IN UKRAINE

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, a threat to liberty anywhere is a threat to liberty everywhere.

Freedom's bell rings now for nations around our world to choose between the fledgling democracy of Ukraine or the dictatorship of Russia.

As the Russian bear eats its way through Ukraine's easternmost regions with abandon, the scene seems almost surreal as the world waits while Putin's pushes his illegal aggregation further.

The questions for freedom loving nations are:

Who defines freedom's edge for Ukraine? Surely, not Russia. Where does the edge of defiance stop? And who will push the bear back in its cage?

Aggressor Putin says he will send Russian peacekeeping forces to the nation he has just invaded illegally. That would be a line for "Saturday Night Live" if it were not so real.

When the Budapest Accords were signed in 1994 and Ukraine voluntarily gave up the third-largest cache of nuclear weapons on Earth, it was left defenseless, but was promised by our government, the United Kingdom, and Russia to respect the independence, sovereignty, and existing borders of Ukraine.

So let me ask our government, the United Kingdom, and Russia: Do words mean anything, or were they merely artful conveniences at the time?

Now, let me ask NATO nations: Where is the edge of liberty you will defend?

THE CAMEL STATUE

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the United States State Department is on an art spending spree.

First, it spent \$1 million for a granite statue at the London Embassy. It is modern art. It looks like a stack of bricks.

Now it has spent \$400,000 for a statue of a camel that will be sent to the Embassy in Pakistan. Is this really necessary? I mean, a camel?

This is an example of spending somebody else's money. This ought to be embarrassing to the State Department.

Mr. Speaker, there is more.

This is the same State Department that the inspector general has recently said has lost or misplaced \$6 billion. The State Department cannot account for this money. Where, oh, where has the taxpayer money gone? If any business lost \$6 billion its shareholders would be mad and want answers. But the government gives no answers, and what money it has it wastes on camel statues.