

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, this year, we celebrate the 70th anniversary of D-Day and the brave Americans of our Armed Forces who served our country with great courage and patriotism. Today I stand before you to honor their heroic sacrifice.

As a fighter pilot in World War II, my father flew 63 missions in a P-47 Thunderbolt. He provided air cover while my father-in-law stormed the beaches of Normandy on D-Day. In a dogfight during the Battle of the Bulge, my father was shot down by the Germans. He spent the next 6 months in a German POW camp behind enemy lines until being liberated by Allied forces on D-Day.

But it was through my father's stories that I came to understand the courage, resilience, and sacrifice of veterans and military families all across our great Nation. And this is the reason that I am deeply committed to easing the transition for veterans back to civilian life, expanding their job opportunities, strengthening their health care benefits, and improving mental health services for the dedicated men and women who have worn the uniform of the United States.

D-Day is a reminder of the great sacrifice borne by our servicemen and -women and their families.

□ 0915

HONORING JEANNE MANFORD

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a real American hero—Queen's own Jeanne Manford. In 1972, Jeanne's openly gay son, Morty Manford, was beaten during a gay rights protest. That year, Jeanne marched with Morty in one of New York's earliest Pride parades.

She carried a now-famous sign that read, "Parents of Gays Unite in Support for Our Children."

The phrase sparked Jeanne to found the organization Parents, Family and Friends of Lesbians and Gays, now known as PFLAG. Our Queens chapter was cofounded by Jeanne and Councilman Danny Dromm, who founded the Queens Pride Parade.

Today, I introduce a resolution honoring Jeanne, and this Sunday, I will march in the Queens Pride Parade, remembering that my neighbor, Jeanne Manford, opened doors that led to progress we have seen these last few decades. I will march with the pride of knowing I live in a nation where history moves us toward accepting all people as equals, regardless of race, religion, sexual orientation or gender identity. Thank you, Jeanne.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4745, TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4681, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 2014 AND 2015; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 604 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 604

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4745) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. (a) At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4681) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2014 and 2015 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this resolution and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule.

(b) In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute

consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-45. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived.

(c) No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and amendments en bloc described in subsection (f).

(d) Each amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(e) All points of order against amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in subsection (f) are waived.

(f) It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this subsection shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(g) At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. On any legislative day during the period from June 2, 2014, through June 6, 2014—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 4. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 3 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 5. The Committee on Appropriations may, at any time before 5 p.m. on Wednesday, June 4, 2014, file privileged reports to accompany measures making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015.

SEC. 6. House Resolution 567 is amended by adding the following:

"SEC. 7. TRAVEL.

"Clauses 8(a), (b), and (c) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to the Select Committee."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days with which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be with you here today. It seems as if only a few hours ago we were all here together—because it was only a few hours ago.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution before us today provides a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 4681, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2014 and 2015, and it makes in order a number of amendments for consideration. In addition, this combined resolution provides for an open rule for the consideration of H.R. 4745, the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2015.

This resolution provides for 1 hour of general debate on each of these bills equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the appropriate committees of jurisdiction.

The intention of the Rules Committee was to provide ample opportunity to debate issues related to our intelligence community. The intelligence community has done very good bipartisan work on this bill, which is being brought forward under regular order. And while the committee was able to work with some Members to modify their amendments so they would comply with House rules and be made in order, some amendments were still subject to a point of order or were already debated and voted on last week during the USA FREEDOM Act. Some amendments were simply not possible to debate on the floor in open session due to the national security implications.

The net result is that this rule makes in order a total of 11 amendments to the intelligence bill, four Republican, six Democrat, and one bipartisan amendment. So the process is inclusive, the rule is fair, and will provide a wide ranging debate on a topic of interest to all Americans.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for Utah for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, once again, we are considering a rule that combines two bills together under one single rule. That rule provides an open rule for the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill, or T-HUD, and a structured rule for the Fiscal Years 2014 and 2015 Intelligence Authorization Act.

T-HUD is an appropriate acronym, Mr. Speaker, because that is how we can describe this House's action on the bill last year. The Appropriations Committee tried to come up with a bill that funds our Transportation, Housing and Urban Development programs, but it was so woefully inadequate that it never made it to the House floor.

Although the T-HUD bill may be \$1.2 billion above last year's enacted levels, due to a reduction in offsets caused by a decline in Federal Housing Administration receipts, the program level in this bill is actually \$1.8 billion below last year's level.

On the transportation side, this bill provides no funding for high-speed rail, and it cuts \$200 million from Amtrak's capital funding. And if that weren't bad enough, I want to highlight one particularly egregious rider in the T-HUD bill, a rider that would exempt Wisconsin, Mississippi, and Idaho from Federal truck weight limits on their interstate.

Mr. Speaker, there have been no reviews by highway safety experts or cost-benefit analysis on the effect of increased size and weight limits on these roads and bridges, yet the majority decided to go forward with these extraneous riders anyway.

I would remind my colleagues that in the last surface transportation reauthorization bill, Congressman LOU BARLETTA offered an amendment that required DOT to conduct a comprehensive study on the impact of increasing truck size and weight on road safety and infrastructure costs. It passed with strong bipartisan support, and the Department of Transportation is currently in the process of completing the study, which should be finished by the fall of this year.

Mr. BARLETTA sent a letter to the Rules Committee before last night's meeting requesting that a point of order against this rider be made available. I support Mr. BARLETTA's request, and I wish the Rules Committee would not have protected this provision. We should not be raising truck size and weights in a State-by-State patchwork approach before DOT even has a chance to finish its study, especially when the highway trust fund is expected to run out of money this summer and our roads and our bridges are already in horrible disrepair.

I will insert letters from AAA, the Owner-Operator Independent Drivers Association, law enforcement officers, first responders, and road safety groups all opposing this rider.

AMERICAN

AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, May 20, 2014.

Hon. HAROLD ROGERS,

Chair, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. NITA LOWEY,

Ranking Member, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROGERS AND RANKING MEMBER LOWEY: AAA opposes Section 125 of the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development (THUD) Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 2015 that would increase the current federal truck size and weight limits. This section carves out special interest exemptions from federal truck size and weight regulations for Idaho, Mississippi and Wisconsin. We urge you to remove Section 125 from the bill.

Study after study has shown that increasing truck size or weight increases wear and tear on roads and dramatically impacts bridges. At a time when the federal Highway Trust Fund and many state budgets across the country are nearly tapped out, we cannot afford to allow bigger trucks to run up the cost of maintaining infrastructure.

We also are concerned with the safety impact of allowing heavier trucks on the nation's roadways. According to NHTSA, fatalities in crashes involving large trucks increased four percent from 3,781 in 2011 to 3,921 in 2012. Of these fatalities in 2012, 73 percent were occupants of other vehicles, 10 percent were non-occupants, and 18 percent were occupants of large trucks.

Congress has recognized the importance of a stronger national freight program and work is underway to establish a robust national freight strategy. Considering changes to truck size and weight limits outside the context of this national discussion, and the two-year truck size and weight study required by MAP-21, is premature.

Thank you for consideration of AAA's views on this important safety issue.

Sincerely,

AVERY ASH,
Director, Federal Relations.

OWNER-OPERATOR
INDEPENDENT DRIVERS ASSOCIATION,
May 20, 2014.

Hon. HAROLD ROGERS,

Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. NITA M. LOWEY,

Ranking Member, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROGERS AND RANKING MEMBER LOWEY: On behalf of our nation's small business trucking professionals, the Owner-Operator Independent Drivers Association (OOIDA) writes in opposition to language in the FY2015 Transportation and Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Bill that allows trucks weighing up to 129,000 pounds on Interstate Highways in Idaho.

Not only is the expansion of existing weight limits on these roads outside of the highway reauthorization process, but this provision comes as the Department of Transportation is conducting a Congressionally-mandated study on truck size and weight provisions nationally. This study should be allowed to continue without Congress passing legislation, such as the Idaho provision, which would put heavier trucks on Interstate Highway System miles where they currently are not permitted.

Current federal Interstate System weight limits were put in place to halt an "arms race" between states attempting to garner favor with major shippers as a way to attract business. Today's generally uniform limits focus attention on the national nature of our

Interstate System. The Idaho provision, a state-wide allowance of trucks on currently designated Interstate Highway miles above the existing Interstate weight cap, would be a step backwards from this sensible approach.

While proponents of this provision argue that Idaho is at a disadvantage compared to neighboring states with higher weight limits on Interstate highways, it is critical to remember that those states operated these heavier-weight vehicles on their Interstate system prior to the passage of federal legislation in 1991 that froze maximum weights on longer-combination vehicles. Idaho's state government could have enacted legislation prior to the 1991 freeze setting an Interstate weight allowance equal to its neighboring states, but it did not. Additionally, neighboring states also have strict permitting requirements for these heavier weight loads, requirements that are absent from the provision included in the THUD bill.

While Idaho conducted a pilot study regarding use of heavier weight trucks, it is important to note that none of those trucks in the study operated on Idaho Interstate System roads. Federal studies that have examined operations of heavier vehicles on Interstate System roads, including the initial work completed for the on-going MAP-21 truck size and weight study, show significant infrastructure and safety concerns with bigger and heavier trucks. These are facts that OOIDA members and other small business truckers know full well given that the highway is their workplace.

Further, while proponents of bigger and heavier trucks argue that the entire trucking industry is supportive of a weight increase, the overwhelming majority of drivers and motor carriers do not see a benefit from increasing truck size and weights. Heavier weights may lead to cost savings for shippers and receivers; however, for the small business truckers that make up more than 90 percent of the trucking industry, heavier trucks only mean higher fuel, repair, and equipment costs.

Bearing in mind that that MAP-21 study has yet to be completed, we urge the Appropriations Committee to remove this language from the FY2015 Transportation Appropriations Bill. Should you have any questions, please contact Ryan Bowley in our Washington Office.

Sincerely,

TODD SPENCER,
Executive Vice President.

NATIONAL TROOPERS COALITION,
NAEMT, AND NATIONAL SHERIFFS'
ASSOCIATION.

May 29, 2014.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, We are writing on behalf of the nation's law enforcement officers and first responders to express our opposition to any truck size or weight increases. We understand that proposals to allow heavier trucks and thaw the freeze on longer combination vehicles are being considered as part of annual appropriations legislation. We urge you to reject these proposals.

Bigger trucks would add new dangers to our roads. Allowing heavier or longer trucks would threaten the safety of motorists as well as law enforcement officers and first responders because heavier and longer trucks would be more difficult to control, take longer to stop, and increase crash severity. Studies conducted by the U.S. Department of Transportation have found that trucks with multiple trailers and trucks that are heavier are associated with higher crash rates. (2000 US DOT Comprehensive Truck Size and Weight Study; 2013 US DOT "Desk Scan")

Bigger trucks also would impose a huge economic cost in terms of further damage to

our already deteriorating highway infrastructure, the additional strain to our aging and deficient bridges and the costs associated with cleaning up crashes. These are additional costs that would be borne by all levels of government and ultimately by the taxpayers.

The current proposals to allow bigger trucks have not been the subject of congressional hearings. We question the appropriateness of making changes such as these that affect public safety in a funding bill without full and open public debate.

Representing law enforcement and first responders across the country, we are united in opposing bigger trucks. Not only do these trucks endanger the traveling public, but they also put at risk law enforcement officers and first responders. Please oppose any provisions that would increase the size or weight of trucks.

Thank you,

MAT HODAPP,
Chairman, National Troopers Coalition.

DON LUNDY, BS,
NREMT-P,
President, National Association of Emergency Management Technicians.

AARON D. KENNARD,
Executive Director, National Sheriffs' Association.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this rule, as I noted earlier, also covers debate on H.R. 4681, the Fiscal Years 2014 and 2015 Intelligence Authorization Act.

The intelligence authorization bill is one of the many important pieces of legislation that comes before the House every year—or nearly every year. Last year, for fiscal year 2014, the bill was marked up in committee, but the majority never seemed to be able to find the time to bring it to the House floor, which is why today we are dealing with a 2-year authorization for both the current fiscal year, FY 2014, and the coming fiscal year, FY 2015.

Now, a great deal has happened since the fiscal year 2013 intelligence bill was approved in December of 2012—everything from Edward Snowden to the sequester, from extreme weather events to drone strikes that also killed innocent civilians, from new technologies and cyber sabotage to protecting our human assets on the ground in dangerous regions. While the underlying bill attempts to deal with these and other issues in a bipartisan manner, some of the choices it makes weaken rather than strengthen our ability to accurately assess potential and real threats to our security.

One particularly troubling example is the bill's failure to strengthen the intelligence community's ability to analyze and assess how climate change affects our national security. Over a decade ago, the National Intelligence Estimate—or NIE—noted with grave concern how extreme weather and environmental changes were adversely affecting global food security, as well as increased refugee and IDP populations due to droughts, floods, and other extreme weather events.

□ 0930

The NIE described how such events contribute or can even drive social and political instability, which might threaten our national security interests. Given the acceleration of extreme weather and climate change over the last decade or so, I would think that we would want to encourage our intelligence agencies to analyze the national security implications of climate change, whether that is how storm surges and rising sea levels and temperatures might affect our Navy, or how competition over resources might affect the opening of the Arctic or water wars in the Middle East and northern Africa—but no.

Instead, this bill continues the Republican foolishness of pretending that climate change does not exist. Some of my Republican colleagues would rather stick their heads in the sand. That is not the way to run a government, Mr. Speaker.

Over 30 amendments were submitted to the Rules Committee for consideration, and I wish that all of them were made in order under this rule. It doesn't take long to debate 30-something amendments. I believe that the House is fully capable of handling such a debate.

After all, we should be pretty rested after a 5½-day break at the beginning of this week and a 9-day recess starting tomorrow. Surely, we could use the 2½ days when we are in Washington to actually debate the intelligence bill.

Several of these amendments dealt with highly controversial aspects of drone strikes, many of which have killed or wounded innocent civilians. I was glad to see that the U.S. did not carry out any drone strikes for the past month in Pakistan, where our use of drones has contributed to tensions between our two nations.

Our colleague and a member of the Intelligence Committee, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), submitted an amendment to ban so-called signature strikes against unknown targets.

Her amendment modestly calls for the U.S. Government to know, with near-certainty, that at least one individual who is a known target will be present before the strike is launched. I am outraged that her amendment was not made in order under this rule.

Other amendments, including bipartisan amendments, dealt with increasing the transparency of decision-making and reporting from drone strikes; others would have simply banned their use.

The U.S. is increasingly dependent on the use of unmanned weaponized aerial vehicles to deliver deadly force against individuals and groups residing or operating in other countries.

As we wind down the war in Afghanistan, we need to take a hard look at how we should pursue the so-called global war on terror, especially the use of drone strikes and operations outside the boundaries of international law enforcement.

I regret that all of the amendments brought before the Rules Committee dealing with drone strikes were not made in order, as each dealt with a different facet of the policy and each deserved to be debated by this House.

I would also like to say a word about the McCollum amendment, which was also denied by the Rules Committee. Our intelligence agencies should never ever use humanitarian work or workers as a cover for covert operations or a means to gather intelligence.

Whether we are talking about a vaccination campaign to protect children from polio or the delivery of food to desperate refugees, leave such plots and machinations to the movies. Keep them out of U.S. policy and covert operations.

They endanger all humanitarian workers and place obstacles in the way of carrying out urgent and essential global health and humanitarian work in places where too many dangers already exist.

Mr. Speaker, before I reserve my time, I also want to point out that this rule contains a provision which makes a change in the procedures for the special Select Committee on Benghazi, which was established by the House just a few weeks ago. The new provision allows the chairman of the new select committee to authorize foreign travel as part of the investigation.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has already conducted seven investigations of the Benghazi matter—seven. Many of us have argued that an additional eighth inquiry is not necessary, but since the House insists on proceeding, we would like to make sure that some of the partisan abuses that marked the previous inquiries will not be repeated by the new select committee, particularly with regard to foreign travel.

Mr. CUMMINGS has often protested the partisan abuses of foreign travel at the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and I insert in the RECORD a letter from Mr. CUMMINGS to Mr. ISSA, asking him to delay a Republican-only delegation to Libya, so that Democrats could join the delegation as well.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,

Washington, DC, September 20, 2013.

Hon. DARRELL E. ISSA,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to request that you immediately postpone your upcoming delegation to Libya and several other countries until you come into compliance with your own Committee directives, stop your partisan efforts to deliberately exclude Democrats from this trip, and provide adequate notice to allow Democratic Members to join this delegation at a later date.

On April 6, 2011, upon becoming Chairman of the Committee, you issued a memorandum to all Committee Members entitled "Rules for Committee-Authorized Foreign Travel." According to that memorandum, "All delegations must be bipartisan."

Earlier today, however, I obtained a copy of an itinerary for a trip you apparently

have been planning to Libya and several other countries next week, presumably as part of the Committee's ongoing investigation into the attack in Benghazi in 2012. The only congressional travelers on this itinerary are you and your Republican staffer. No Democratic Members are listed on the itinerary, and you have not contacted me or my staff about this trip. According to this itinerary, you are planning to leave this Sunday, which means Democratic participation at this late date is impossible.

Your 2011 memo also says that the "purpose must be very specific for each country." Yet, your itinerary states only that the Libya portion of the trip is "TBD," although it may include a "visit" to the embassy and a "working lunch." Your itinerary does not identify a single U.S. government official, Libyan official, or other individual the Committee plans to interview or speak with during this delegation.

Your 2011 memo also says that the only exception to conducting bipartisan international delegations is "in rare circumstances and at the sole discretion of the Chairman." However, you have not identified any such circumstances in this case that would justify excluding Democratic Members. Moreover, I have obtained other documents showing that you have been planning this delegation for more than a week, so there are no exigencies that would have prohibited you from consulting with Democrats.

Although you claim that your investigation of the Benghazi attacks is bipartisan, your efforts to secretly plan an official trip to Libya—and then deliberately exclude Democrats from joining—is part of an unfortunate pattern of partisanship that undermines the credibility of this investigation.

Last October, Rep. Jason Chaffetz undertook exactly the same partisan maneuver when he traveled to Libya—at your direction—and excluded Democratic Members from that trip. At that time, my staff obtained a last-minute copy of his itinerary that listed the Committee activity in Libya as "TBD" and failed to identify any officials to be interviewed. We now know that Rep. Chaffetz met personally with General Carter Ham, the Commander of AFRICOM, as well as Gregory Hicks, the Deputy Chief of Mission, who was then called before the Committee to testify.

The problem with these actions is that they effectively deny Democratic Members the ability to effectively investigate this incident. Since your secret delegation appears to violate your own directive to the Committee, I request that you postpone it until such time as Democratic Members are given an adequate opportunity to join.

Sincerely,

ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS,
Ranking Member.

Mr. MCGOVERN. In October of 2012, Oversight Committee Republicans went on a delegation to Libya, but they did not inform Democratic members until 24 hours before they departed.

In September 2013, Oversight Committee Republicans planned a second delegation to Libya without contacting Democratic members at all. Ranking Member CUMMINGS requested that the trip be postponed to allow Democrats to join, but his request was denied.

This is no way to conduct a serious investigation, and this is one of the reasons why so many people on our side of the aisle have called foul over the way the House Republican leadership is dealing with this important issue.

So before the House grants any new authorities to the select committee, I would be grateful for some assurance from my chairman that this new authority will not be misused in the highly partisan manner demonstrated by Chairman ISSA at the Oversight Committee.

Mr. SESSIONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for yielding to me, and I appreciate him bringing this issue up, as he did in the Rules Committee at the time of the hearing.

I want to assure the gentleman and each of the Members of this body that the gentleman who will be the new chairman of the committee, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY), has every intent to make sure that his work, the assignments that will be given as they move forward, including travel, will be done on a fair basis.

Mr. GOWDY is aware of and knows the sensitive nature of not only the investigation, but also how this will be handled; and Mr. GOWDY, I assure you, is very prepared to match and to meet the Members that Ms. PELOSI has put on the committee, and I think that you will see that the Members who will serve as a result of the Speaker appointing them will serve with honor and distinction and will work well and fairly together.

I thank the gentleman for asking the question.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman for his answer and for his reassurances, and we will certainly be watching. In our opinion, fairness means consultation with the Democrats and not leaving us out of the loop.

Again, I would point out to my colleagues that the inquiries into the Benghazi situation thus far have been highly partisan, and the Oversight Committee, in particular, I think, has been run in an inappropriate manner.

So I appreciate the gentleman's assurances, and we will watch and hope that what the gentleman just said will actually occur.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule that allows for consideration of H.R. 4681, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2014 and 2015.

I am troubled that just 11 amendments were allowed under the rule and many solid amendments that would enhance oversight and transparency were blocked, particularly an amendment by

Representative GABBARD to expand the authority and oversight of the intelligence community by the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board.

With respect to the underlying bill, I would like to discuss a number of provisions that deserve to be highlighted.

The bill sets the stage for potentially significant reforms to government contract employees' ability to access classified information that warrant thoughtful consideration by the House and further clarification.

Specifically, H.R. 4681 directs the Director of National Intelligence to ensure that elements of the intelligence community engage in continuous evaluation of its employees to detect behaviors that may result in unauthorized disclosures.

The bill also directs a cost-benefit analysis of replacing the standard periodic reinvestigation process with automated continuous evaluation programs. While I agree that there are weaknesses in the current security clearance process that warrant reform, it is important that, before wholesale changes are made, Congress expresses its expectations about the scope of such programs, establishes metrics for evaluating their efficacy, and ensures that due process protections for impacted individuals are available.

We have an obligation to 5.2 million Americans whose livelihoods depend on maintaining their security clearances to ensure that agencies that establish these programs do so in a manner that guards against abuses, including targeting and retaliation by supervisors, as well as improper or excessive invasions of privacy.

The urge to adopt continuous evaluation in response to high-profile incidents involving individuals with access to classified information who violated the terms of their oath is understandable. However, the adoption of continuous evaluation does not absolve the intelligence community of its obligations to bolster the protection of its classified holdings.

Regrettably, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4681 may send the wrong message to agencies, as it does not include language to direct agencies to raise the bar on access controls, thereby giving the impression that our concern is principally about employees' actions and behaviors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I also have concerns, Mr. Speaker, about the bill's view of the future of security clearance investigations and adjudications and the degree to which it sets the stage for computers and algorithms to replace humans in the process.

Specifically, it directs the DNI to conduct a cost-benefit analysis on reducing or eliminating the manual process for security clearance investigations and adjudications.

The guiding principle in the adjudication process is the concept of the whole person, where information is brought to bear to give a picture of an individual. The prospect that we would empower a computer to render judgment of a person's integrity, character, and loyalty to our Nation is troubling.

In the coming weeks, I will be introducing a comprehensive security clearance reform bill that, among other things, addresses known weaknesses in the current system, establishes expectations for continuous evaluation programs, and demands proper performance from investigative service providers.

It also would greatly expand the resources and responsibilities of the Public Interest Declassification Board. A well-resourced and robust board is essential to increasing accountability of the intelligence community. I am pleased that the underlying bill will renew the authorization of the board.

Before I yield back, Mr. Speaker, I would note that, while I am pleased that the bill authorizes intelligence operations within DHS, I am disturbed that, in advance of today's vote, members of the Homeland Security Committee staff were not granted access to the classified annex of this legislation, as it is relevant to the committee's oversight jurisdiction.

I would hope that, as this bill moves through the legislative process, the stovepipes that exist within this Chamber that hinder critical information-sharing and oversight can be overcome for the benefit of the American people.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. May I inquire of the gentleman if he has any additional speakers?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am ready to close whenever you are.

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

I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule for all of the reasons I stated earlier, but, Mr. Speaker, I want to close with one final thought: this intelligence bill includes several provisions regarding the use of contractors, security clearance reform, strengthening investigations by the inspector general, and so on.

We need to recognize that these reforms were not initiated by us. They are a result of the massive release of leaked information that brought very serious matters about actual and potential abuses by our intelligence agencies on how they monitor and maintain data on ordinary law-abiding citizens.

This leaked information caused alarm throughout our society, by our constituents, by our press, and by Members of Congress—and rightfully so. It caused alarm among some of our closest international allies—and rightfully so.

So while we may hold different views about the individual who confiscated and leaked the information, let us all recognize that none of the NSA and

FISA reforms recently passed by this House—and none of the reforms included in this bill—would have happened if that information had not been leaked because we would not have known about the abuses being carried on in our name by various intelligence agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I respect those men and women who serve our Nation in our intelligence agencies, but I don't respect a culture that intentionally keeps the American people and the Congress in the dark about the extent and nature of our intelligence operations.

More reforms are still needed; more transparency is still needed. I believe we can be safe and protect the American people without sacrificing the liberties that we all treasure.

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

□ 0945

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am actually pleased to stand before the House today in support of this rule as well as the underlying pieces of the legislation, H.R. 4681 about intelligence and H.R. 4745 called the T-HUD bill.

From the testimony that we received in the Rules Committee on these measures, it appears that both of these measures have enjoyed bipartisan cooperation in their formation and from their respective committee processes.

One of the toughest responsibilities that a Member of the Congress has is to help prioritize the Federal expenditures of resources that we take from the American people. Sometimes, worthy projects and programs have to be trimmed to meet budget requirements and prioritization. While there are some spending choices—which I disagree—contained in H.R. 4745, overall, it is still a balanced measure which will provide for American infrastructure so essential for the economic growth and jobs, and maintains discipline by adhering to the top-line funding levels arrived at through that 2-year budget agreement that was passed by Congress. The \$52 billion for transportation provided in these agencies is \$7.8 billion below the President's request and still actually \$1.8 billion less than the 2014 enacted level.

Members have a chance, under the open rule of this resolution provided, to argue for changes in the prioritization. I am pleased that one of the things this bill recognizes is that States are different. Those of us who live in the wide-open West have been able to use transportation to help the desert blossom. We should not try to restrict every State to the same standards with a one-size-fits-all approach. The committee was very wise in what they actually did.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

The Chair would ask occupants of the gallery to cease audible conversation.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, switching gears to the intelligence reauthorization measure, every Member of the House takes seriously our responsibility to preserve individual liberty and freedoms under the Constitution.

We also have a constitutional obligation to provide for the common defense, because without a strong national defense, which includes the indispensable work of the defense intelligence agencies, personal freedoms are also at risk. The question is achieving and maintaining a balance in deciding how to best preserve inalienable constitutional rights against possible incursions by technologists, whether inadvertent or intentional, as our Nation deals with the very real threats both at home and abroad.

Technology gives us wonderful tools, but it can also be a fertile ground for abuse of privacy. We have a responsibility as Members of Congress to exercise oversight in U.S. intelligence agencies, and that can be difficult since much cannot be debated in open forums with any degree of specificity without bringing great harm to the national security. That is why we have the expertise of standing committees. Not only do they understand these issues, it saves time by allocating the proper amount of time to the discussion of these issues in advance. And from the testimony received in the Rules Committee, I believe that Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member RUPPERSBERGER have demonstrated a strong bipartisan commitment on this issue.

Provisions of this bill are aimed at bolstering personal and individual privacy. Passage of H.R. 4681, when you combine it with the passage last week of the U.S. FREEDOM Act, is a good step towards enhancing our U.S. intelligence capability as well as congressional oversight on these issues.

It is a good bill. It is a fair rule. I urge its adoption.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the Rule for H.R. 4681, the "Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2014," and H.R. 4745, the "Transportation, Housing and Urban Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2015."

H.R. 4681 is a bill authorizing appropriations for our nation's intelligence agencies for Fiscal Year 2014 through Fiscal Year 2015. The bill provides funds for the conduct of intelligence and intelligence-related activities.

H.R. 4745 makes appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015.

Our nation is long past due for a Transportation and Housing and Urban Development Appropriations bill. This bill is about jobs—jobs—jobs.

Unfortunately, H.R. 4745's \$17.1 billion in discretionary appropriations for the Department of Transportation for fiscal year 2015, is \$727.3 million below the funding for fiscal year 2014.

Included in the legislation is \$15.7 billion in total budgetary resources for the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), which is \$7.3 million below the fiscal year 2014 enacted level and \$446 million above the request.

This will provide full funding for all air traffic control personnel, including 14,800 air traffic controllers, 7,300 safety inspectors, and operational support personnel.

The bill also fully funds the FAA's Next Generation Air Transportation Systems (NextGen) at \$852.4 million, and funds Contract Towers at \$140 million.

These investments will help ease future congestion and help reduce delays for travelers in U.S. airspace.

The Bush Intercontinental Airport and William P. Hobby Airport will benefit from funding provided under this bill: nearly 40 million passengers traveled through Bush Intercontinental Airport (IAH) and an additional 10 million traveled through William P. Hobby (HOU); more than 650 daily departures occur at IAH; IAH is the 11th busiest airport in the U.S. for total passenger traffic; IAH has 12 all-cargo airlines handles more than 419,205 metric tons of cargo in 2012.

The funds being sent back to states will repair critical transportation infrastructure that is vital to local, state and the national economy.

Further the bill provides for funding for our Nation's housing and urban development programs that fund block grants, special housing programs that serve our Nation's elderly, young, disabled, and veterans.

The legislation includes a total of \$40.3 billion for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, a decrease of \$769 million below the fiscal year 2014 enacted level and \$2 billion below the Administration's request.

The bill does not contain funding for any new, unauthorized "sustainable," "livable," or "green" community development programs.

Affordable safe housing is vital to the well-being of elderly, low-wage workers, the unemployed, under-employed, disabled persons and our Nation's veterans.

In 2012, Texas ranked second among the 50 states among states with workers earning at or below the federal minimum wage.

According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, of the 6.1 million workers paid hourly rates in Texas in 2012, 282,000 earned exactly the prevailing federal minimum wage of \$7.25 per hour, while 170,000 earned less.

In the State of Texas the percentage of persons living in poverty makes the funds provided for housing and mass transit systems including light rail critical: 34% of children live in poverty; 21% of adults (19–64) live in poverty; and 17% of elderly live in poverty.

The funds provided will make it possible for low wage workers to have affordable options for travel as well as support access to affordable housing.

SECTION 8 AND PUBLIC HOUSING

Included in the bill is \$26.3 billion for Public and Indian Housing. This is an increase of \$6.2 million above the fiscal year 2014 enacted level and \$1.2 billion below the requested level. This funding will provide for continued assistance to all families and individuals currently served by this program. The

bill also fully funds the President's request for veterans' housing vouchers at \$75 million.

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

The bill contains \$6.2 billion for Community Planning and Development programs—a reduction of \$383 million below the fiscal year 2014 enacted level.

The Community Development Block Grant formula program is funded at \$3 billion—effectively equal to last year's level.

HOME Investment Partnerships Program is funded at \$700 million, a reduction of \$300 million below the fiscal year 2014 enacted level.

Homeless assistance grants are funded at \$2.1 billion—the same as the previous year's level—which is sufficient for all current grants to be continued.

My thanks to the House Rules Committee for making my amendment in order under the rule for H.R. 4681, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014.

The Jackson Lee Amendment is simple and one that the majority of the House can support.

The Jackson Lee Amendment requires the Director of the Office of National Intelligence to conduct an assessment of the reliance of intelligence activities on contractors to support Government activities, including an assessment of contractors performing intelligence activities, which would include intelligence analysis.

I want to thank the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence for including my amendment in an en bloc for consideration during the debate on amendments, which will take place later.

I will speak more on the Jackson Lee Amendment when it comes before the House for consideration under an en bloc amendment to H.R. 4681.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 2014 AND 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 4681.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 604 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4681.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.