



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 30, 2013

No. 111

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 30, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN ABNEY CULBERSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

THE NAME OF NFL'S WASHINGTON FOOTBALL FRANCHISE SHOULD BE CHANGED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, it's me again. I rise today on behalf of our Native American community to speak on a subject of great concern—the use of the term “redskins” by the National Football League's Washington franchise.

Recently, our nationally recognized commentator, Mr. Rush Limbaugh, at-

tempted to wash away years of pain, suffering, and humiliation endured by our Nation's first inhabitants by questioning their motives in seeking to rid the NFL of this most racist, disparaging, and patently offensive word.

As with most of the non-Native American general public, Mr. Limbaugh does not appear to know the violent and abusive history behind this racial epithet. I would like to take this opportunity to provide Mr. Limbaugh and the American people some much-needed clarity on the subject.

You see, Mr. Speaker, much of the outcry over the name of the NFL's football franchise is due, in large part, to the Federal Government's protection of disparaging trademarks granted to the franchise for the Redskins. Governing Federal law established since 1946 requires that the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office deny registration for any such words.

The origin of the term “redskins,” Mr. Speaker, is commonly attributed to the historical act of not only killing Native Americans, but also cutting off certain body parts and scalping the heads of even women and children as evidence and are then paid by the colonial officials. These scalps, Mr. Speaker, were described as redskins.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, Native Americans are human beings; they are not animals. Despite this most despicable act of genocide against the Native American people, the U.S. Patent Office in 1967 granted the NFL's Washington football franchise a federally registered trademark for the same word. Mr. Speaker, this should never have happened. Native American nations have treaty and trust relations with the Federal Government as is clearly recognized by the Supreme Court of the U.S. Constitution.

Sixty-six years after the law was established, the word “redskins” continues to enjoy such protections. In fact, the NFL's Washington football

franchise has six federally registered trademarks for the same word. This was not the work of the Native American community, which Mr. Limbaugh calls “a bunch of PC jerks.” It was the work of a Federal agency that ignored the law and its duty to shield our Native peoples from degrading trademark registration.

Mr. Limbaugh asks: “Why does the Federal Government have to get involved?” With due respect, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government is part of the problem. After years of pleading with the NFL, with the Washington franchise owner Mr. Dan Snyder, with the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board, with the D.C. District Court, and with the D.C. Court of Appeals, the Native American community is left right where they started—with a \$1.6 billion football franchise freely exploiting the shameful memory of the ethnic cleansing that was forced upon the Native American people.

Mr. Limbaugh also states: “So the Redskins may not be a popular name with some people.” Mr. Speaker, I submit this is not a popularity contest. It is not even about sports. This is a moral issue that reaches far back to the time when Native Americans were not only considered outcasts, but deemed “enemies, rebels, and traitors” by the colonial government. The only sporting involved was the game of hunting and killing Indians like animals for money.

To Mr. Limbaugh, to Mr. Snyder, to Mr. Goodell, and all NFL club owners, I ask: Haven't American Indians suffered enough? Have they not paid the price placed on their heads, their scalps, their skins? Mr. Speaker, I think the answer is clear. Enough is enough.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5095

NINTH UNANSWERED BENGHAZI QUESTION

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, there are only 3 more days until the August recess. Given that no new public hearings are scheduled on Benghazi, it's apparent that the questions I've been asking for the past two weeks—and the American people have been asking for more than 10 months—will not be answered by the 1-year anniversary of the Benghazi attack, if ever.

After a year of investigations in five different committees, we still do not know what happened and no one's been held responsible. The House and the Senate have failed. Is it any wonder that the American people are losing confidence in their government?

This is even more remarkable given that over 2 months ago, senior administration officials admitted to the media that they failed to properly respond to the attack in Benghazi; yet the Congress never pressed the matter further.

In a little-noticed article published on Friday, May 17, CBS News' Sharyl Attkisson reported that:

Obama administration officials who were in key positions on September 11, 2012, acknowledge that a range of mistakes were made the night of the attacks on the U.S. missions in Benghazi.

Attkisson continued:

The list of mea culpas by Obama administration officials involved in the Benghazi response and aftermath include standing down the counterterrorism Foreign Emergency Support Team and failing to convene the Counterterrorism Security Group, among others.

One of the key revelations from anonymous senior administration officials is the admission that it refused to deploy the Foreign Emergency Support Team, FEST. According to the article:

The FEST's own mission statement describes a seasoned team of counterterrorism professionals who can respond "quickly and effectively to terror attacks, providing the fastest assistance possible" including "hostage negotiating expertise" and "time-sensitive information and intelligence." In fact, FEST leader Mark Thompson says Benghazi was precisely the sort of crisis to which his team is trained to respond.

The article continued:

As soon as word of the Benghazi attack reached Washington, FEST members "instinctively started packing," said an official involved in the response. "They were told they were not deploying by Patrick Kennedy's front office. In hindsight, I probably would've pushed the button."

It's particularly notable that administration sources pin the decision not just on the State Department leadership, but also on the White House.

While it was the State Department that's said to have taken FEST off the table, the team is directed by the White House National Security Council.

Speaking of the White House role in directing the response, Attkisson re-

ported that the National Security Council also failed to convene the interagency Counterterrorism Security Group, CSG, that evening.

The article noted:

According to a public military document, it's part of a plan to "synchronize the efforts of all the government agencies that have a role to play in the global war on terrorism." But on September 11, 2012, the Obama administration did not convene this body of terrorism expert advisers.

Given the number of agencies involved in the response, including the State Department, CIA, and Defense Department, it's hard to understand why the NSC's interagency terrorism response group wouldn't be convened.

As Attkisson noted, because the CSG wasn't assembled:

There's evidence that some high-level decision-makers were unaware of all available resources. In October, on a phone call that included then-Deputy National Security Adviser Dennis McDonough, now White House Chief of Staff, NSC spokesman Tommy Vietor initially told CBS News: "I don't know what FEST is. It sounds antiquated."

Who are the anonymous senior administration officials who admitted these mistakes to CBS? Why haven't they testified to Congress about these mistakes? Why wasn't the FEST team deployed immediately?

Last week, General Ham admitted that he believed Ambassador Stevens may have been taken hostage by terrorists. Given the FEST's team terrorism and hostage negotiation expertise, who made the decision not to deploy them? Why didn't the White House convene the CSG that night to coordinate the interagency response to the attack? And if that group wasn't responsible for coordination, who was?

Which agency was leading the response that night? Was the State Department directing the Pentagon not to deploy its planes or response teams, while also not sending the FEST team?

Mr. Speaker, I conclude with an important quote in the CBS article from NSC spokesman Tommy Vietor:

From the moment President Obama was briefed on the Benghazi attack, the response effort was handled by the most senior national security officials in government.

The mistakes these anonymous senior officials admit to mattered. Lives were on the line, and ultimately, lives were lost. The Congress must compel these "most senior national security officials" responsible for the response team that night to testify publicly.

We need a bipartisan select committee. If we do not do it, the Congress and the House will have failed.

MEDICARE ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, 48 years ago today, Lyndon Johnson, in Independence, Missouri, signed into law the Medicare program in the presence of former President Harry S. Truman.

It's important when you think about that event, which I would argue transformed our country, to go back in time and remember that seniors in 1965, only half had health insurance of any sort; 30 percent of America's seniors lived in poverty; and life expectancy for America's seniors was age 70. If you fast forward today, 48 years later, we have universal health insurance coverage for all seniors, life expectancy is now age 79, and only 7 percent of seniors live below the poverty line.

The decision by Congress earlier that year—it was April of 1965 when our colleague, Congressman JOHN DINGELL, was sitting in the Speaker's Chair and brought the gavel down when the Medicare law was passed—has, again, paid off huge dividends in terms of transforming America's health care system.

Back then, Medicare only covered doctor visits and hospital visits. Today, it covers a broad range of services for seniors—dialysis, medical equipment, outpatient services, such as prescription drug coverage—and as a result, the health care sector of our country has grown. For many, it has created literally careers and opportunities to pursue a system which, again, has produced great results for the folks who live in our country over age 65 and people on disability.

Today, we have challenges that Medicare faces, but there is good news. The Trustees for Medicare recently issued their annual report, and it showed that the solvency of the Medicare trust fund this year was extended out an additional 2 years to 2026. And beyond that date, Medicare does not go bankrupt to zero. There is a shortfall, in terms of the projections by the Trustees, of roughly about 10 percent—a serious problem, but one that we can manage using smart changes to the system. And the Trustees, in their reports, pointed to the Affordable Care Act, when it was signed into law by President Obama in 2010, as extending by 9 years the solvency of the Medicare system.

For seniors, under the Affordable Care Act, they are now getting more help with prescription drug assistance. They were stranded in the doughnut hole prior to 2010. Now they get over half of the cost of those prescription drugs while they're in the doughnut hole discounted. They are also getting free preventive care services—whether it's colonoscopies, annual checkups, smoking cessation programs. All of those essential services for primary care now carry no out-of-pocket costs because of the Affordable Care Act.

The fact is that those changes have extended the solvency of the Affordable Care Act. We have not cut benefits for seniors. We have not made unwise choices, such as the Ryan budget, which proposed raising the eligibility age for seniors to qualify for Medicare to age 67 and would butcher the program into private health insurance for people under age 55, in other words, turning the clock back to where we

were 48 years ago when President Johnson signed that measure into law.

The best way to celebrate Medicare's birthday—which, again, has transformed the lives of every American family since it was enacted in 1965—is to make smart changes to the system, to build on the progress of the Affordable Care Act, to make sure that it's going to be there for our children and our grandchildren, just like the people who had the wisdom to vote for that program 48 years ago and signed it into law—again, with the vision and prophesy of Harry S. Truman, who, as a Senator representing the State of Missouri, had proposed Medicare as a law and then saw, before his time on Earth ended, it actually come to fruition.

□ 1215

Medicare is a wonderful program. It is a program which every family is touched by and has experienced and benefited from. Our best way to celebrate its birthday today is to redouble our efforts to extend its solvency and to make sure that all American families, today and in the future, are able to enjoy its wonderful benefits.

AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, last week, as we debated the Defense appropriations bill for the upcoming year, my good friend, JIM MCGOVERN, a Democrat from Massachusetts, joined me in a measure that would guarantee that Congress would vote on funding the Enduring Strategic Partisanship Agreement with Afghanistan. This agreement with Afghanistan is a 10-year agreement that will start after 2014. It has been negotiated and will soon be signed by President Obama and President Karzai.

During the debate, I quoted the former Commandant of the Marine Corps with regard to this agreement. I called him and asked him what he thought about the agreement. He sent me a paragraph back. I used one sentence that I will use again today, Mr. Speaker:

Simply put, I am not in favor of this agreement signed. It basically keeps the United States in Afghanistan to prop up a corrupt regime. It continues to place our troops at risk.

The amendment failed. I want to thank the 76 Republicans who joined me in that vote, along with 100 Democrats, but it failed.

The problem is we really have no oversight in Afghanistan. It is a joke at best. The joke is, though, it is not really a joke because of the young men and women who are dying in Afghanistan, even today. The waste, fraud, and abuse in Afghanistan goes unchecked. We sent inspectors general over there. They do their best, but it is a no-win situation in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, according to a Washington Post-ABC News poll just last week, only 28 percent of the American people believe the war in Afghanistan has been worth fighting. I believe that that number would be even lower if they knew that we are going to sign a 10-year agreement with Afghanistan after 2014. If they were polled on that, I believe that the 28 percent would go down to about 8 percent.

The American people are just finding out that we have this 10-year agreement with Afghanistan where we keep spending billions of dollars per month and have a presence of at least 10,000 to 15,000 military.

During this same week last week, a poll was done of Congress, and 12 percent of the American people approve of Congress. If it gets much lower, we will be right at zero. And I'm not sure the American people will be wrong if they give us a zero, quite frankly, especially when I look at the fact that we continue to spend money in Afghanistan; we continue to cut programs right here in America for our young, our old, and our infrastructure.

The American people are frustrated and fed up because they don't think we in Congress are listening to them. When it comes back to Afghanistan and the fact that we would allow a 10-year agreement to go on with a corrupt leader in Afghanistan, it makes no sense to the American people; it makes no sense to many of us in Congress in both parties.

Mr. Speaker, during that debate, I made the statement on the floor 10 minutes after 11 p.m. that night that probably no one on the floor—and in fairness to that statement, there were only about 10 or 12 people on the floor—that they probably did not realize, but from March 1 until July 1 we had lost 78 of our soldiers and marines in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I brought this poster down today. It is a family. It happens to be the Army. They are prepared to walk behind a caisson, probably at Arlington, to bury an American hero. The sad part about it, Mr. Speaker, is there's a wife, I'm assuming—it looks like probably the wife. She has sunglasses on and a black dress. She's holding the hand of her little girl, who appears to be 6, 7, maybe 8. The little girl is holding her mother's hand and the little girl has her finger in her mouth.

How many more families in this country have to go through a sadness and a tragedy like this family while we sit here in Congress and we never debate the war? We debate the funding that we did last week. It was a 10-minute debate—5 for my amendment and 5 against. Mr. MCGOVERN and I had 5 minutes. Yet we do not debate the policy that continues to send troops, continues to send money, and all we do is continue to let this war go on and on and on.

Mr. Speaker, it's not fair to the families who have loved ones in the mili-

tary. Again, I will continue to come to the floor one time a week and rail about the policy in Afghanistan. It is a failed policy. History has said no nation has ever changed Afghanistan, and we are not going to change Afghanistan no matter how much money we spend or how much blood we spend. It is not fair to our military.

Mr. Speaker, I will close by asking God to please bless our men and women in uniform, to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform. I will ask God in His loving arms to hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq.

I will ask God to bless the House and the Senate, that we will do what is right in the eyes of God for God's people.

I will ask God to please bless the President, that he will do what is right in the eyes of God for God's people today and God's people tomorrow.

And three times I will say, God, please, God, please, God, please, continue to bless America.

GLOBAL FOOD SECURITY ACT of 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, in the world's poorest countries, nearly 1 billion people struggle with hunger every day. Chronic food insecurity limits a child's ability to grow and to learn.

Across Africa and Asia, hardworking farmers need help producing enough food to feed their families throughout the year. Many of these farmers are women. In fact, it is estimated 80 percent of the agricultural workers are women.

Earlier this year, I traveled to Tanzania and South Sudan where women farmers told me that they needed access to better seeds, tools, and training. With assistance from the United States and with our support, they can grow enough food to feed their families and have extra to sell as produce.

Last week, I introduced the Global Food Security Act, along with Representatives AARON SCHOCK and JIM MCGOVERN. This bill directs the President to develop a strategy to improve global nutrition, food security, and agricultural development. More than 35 NGOs and faith-based groups also support this bill.

This bill will improve food security for millions around the world, which is the right thing to do, but it will also make America more secure and protect our own national interest.

I urge my colleagues to support the Global Food Security Act.

HONORING WALTER DURHAM

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

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Walter Thomas Durham, a man who did great things for Tennessee and for the future generations of Tennesseans.

Tennessee has one of the great histories of our United States. Tennesseans fought and tipped the balance of the Revolutionary War at the Battle of Kings Mountain. Tennessee produced three of the first 17 Presidents. Tennessee had more Civil War battles than any other State, except Virginia.

Tennessee is proud of its history, and Walter Durham is a giant in the world of Tennessee history. Like so many brave members of his generation, Mr. Durham served in the U.S. Army in World War II, seeing action in north Africa and Italy with the U.S. Army Air Corps. He went to Vanderbilt University and, after he graduated, started a building supply company in Gallatin called Durham Building Supply. He went on to launch another business, Gallatin Aluminum Products Company, which he and his partners later sold.

Then, in the early 1970s, he was encouraged by his doctor to establish a hobby that would reduce his stress. So, at the suggestion of a friend, Mr. Durham started a book on the history of Sumner County. As Sumner County's history goes, the county has a pretty amazing one. Some of middle Tennessee's early forts and settlements were in Sumner County. Sumner County had characters such as Kasper Mansker and Thomas "Big Foot" Spencer, a man of legendary size and strength who once spent a cold winter alone, living in a hollow sycamore tree. Sumner County was a place where there were violent raids made on early forts and cabins by Creek and Chickamaugan Indians. In fact, his book on Sumner County's history would be the first of 24 that he wrote on the local and State history.

He wrote books about the history of thoroughbred racing in Tennessee; Tennessee Governor William Trousdale, who fought in the War of 1812; James Winchester, another veteran of the War of 1812 and a man who cofounded the city of Memphis with Andrew Jackson; and a book about General Daniel Smith, a U.S. Senator and the surveyor who created the first map of Tennessee. He wrote a very detailed two-volume history of Nashville during the Civil War, and these two books were the ones he later said he was the most proud of. He also wrote a book called "Volunteer Forty-Niners," about people who left Tennessee to take part in the California Gold Rush. In fact, Tennesseans were some of the first people to hold public office in California.

In short, Walter Durham created an entire shelf of books that people interested in Tennessee's history should have in their libraries, and he generously gave the book rights and proceeds to various entities across the State.

In addition to writing, he was a long-time member of the Tennessee Histor-

ical Society and served as its President from 1973 to 1975. He was also the chairman of the Tennessee Historical Commission and the founding president of the Tennessee Historical Alliance, now known as the Tennessee Preservation Trust.

In 2002, Tennessee Governor Don Sundquist appointed him to the official post of the Tennessee State Historian. He was appointed by Governor Phil Bredesen in 2008 to continue to hold his title until his death.

Two years ago, he was awarded the honorary doctorate from Tusculum College to commemorate his work on behalf of Tennessee's historical significance.

Mr. Durham also took time to encourage others. Ten years ago, a young man in Tennessee decided to start an organization to help public school-teachers teach Tennessee history and civics using the Internet. His very first endorsement letter was from Walter Durham, a man who handwrote every one of his books in pencil. These handwritten manuscripts now reside at the Vanderbilt Library Archives.

He was also a devoted Sunday school teacher at the First United Methodist Church in Gallatin.

Mr. Durham passed away on May 24, 2013. He is survived by Anna Armstrong Coile Durham, his wife of 64 years, and his four children and four grandchildren. Tennessee and the Durham family will miss this great man.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXF) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

We give You thanks, O God, for giving us another day.

Bless now the men and women of the people's House. Call forth leaders from their number, who understand that courage exercised in the fulfillment of their legislative responsibilities might cost them popularity now, but reap them praise in the future from our American descendants.

May they take solace in knowing that it has always been this way with great leaders.

We thank You for their hard work. Give them the consolation of knowing, in finding difficult but necessary solutions to America's challenges, they

will have done their best work for all of our Nation.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TAKANO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

ALERT ACT

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

Mr. HOLDING. Madam Speaker, in North Carolina, small businesses are a primary driver of the economy. These businesses, like many across the country, are harmed by excessive regulation.

Over the past 4 years, our Nation's cumulative regulatory cost burden has increased by \$520 billion. What's worse is this administration has failed to disclose, as required by law, the effects of new regulations in a timely manner. The administration is required to submit a regulatory agenda twice a year, but they have consistently failed to do so.

Madam Speaker, small businesses are not given enough notice of how new regulations will affect their tough decisions, whether to cut a worker's hours or wages or adjust their business plan otherwise. That is why I introduced, Madam Speaker, the ALERT Act, H.R. 2804, the All Economic Regulations are Transparent Act, to ensure that the administration publishes its regulatory agenda in a timely manner.

Madam Speaker, the least this administration can do for small businesses is follow the law and provide notice as to what regulations are coming down the pipeline.

MEDICARE ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. TAKANO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate an important accomplishment for our Nation, as it was 48 years ago today that President Johnson signed Medicare into law, thus cementing a promise to our Nation's seniors.

Before Medicare, nearly 30 percent of seniors lived below the poverty line and American life expectancy was 70 years old. Since then, the poverty rate has plummeted all the way down to 7.5 percent and life expectancy has risen to 78-1/2 years.

Madam Speaker, Medicare is a sacred promise that we made, and it is a sacred promise that we must keep, despite the House Republicans' addiction to slash-and-burn policies. If the House Republicans got their way, they would replace Medicare with a voucher system, removing the certainty of what seniors will receive. These are benefits that have been earned and paid for, but turning Medicare into a voucher system will result in reduced benefits and increased health care costs.

The Democratic Party, however, believes that working families should not lose their life savings in their golden years to pay for health care, and they should not suffer without treatment due to an inability to pay for medical services. The Democratic Party believes that seniors deserve the certainty of Medicare.

Madam Speaker, on this day, the 48th anniversary of Medicare, I pledge to uphold the promises we made to seniors and to never turn my back on working families.

HONORING COLONEL GEORGE E. "BUD" DAY

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Madam Speaker, I would like to dedicate my time to one of America's greatest warriors, Colonel George E. "Bud" Day, who passed away this past weekend.

A veteran of three wars, a POW at the infamous Hanoi Hilton, and a Medal of Honor recipient, Colonel Day set the standard for service to country. A patriot in the truest sense of the word, Colonel Day never stopped working and looking out for his brothers in arms. After the military, he spent 40 years as an advocate for his fellow veterans.

Colonel Day was a loving husband, a father, a grandfather, and someone I was honored and very humbled to represent here in Congress. Our community and countless others will miss his unwavering perseverance and optimism.

Colonel Day's legacy will endure for years to come. I ask that we keep him and the entire Day family in our prayers.

48TH ANNIVERSARY OF MEDICARE AND MEDICAID

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise this afternoon to celebrate the 48th anniversary of Medicare and Medicaid and the security they provide for seniors and persons with disabilities, half of whom live on less than \$22,000, total, a year. Half of all seniors before Medicare had no insurance at all.

Listen to my constituent, Nan Anderson from Evanston:

It was a tremendous relief to become eligible for Medicare. Basically, I am a well person but have had some costly procedures, all of which have been covered. Currently, I am recovering from a spinal fusion. If it weren't for Medicare, I would never have reached this point. Without the surgery, I would likely have been reduced to a dependent person. Now I know that I will be able to walk normally and unaided for several years.

We made improvements in Medicare in ObamaCare—lower drug costs, free preventive services, fraud-cutting, and improved quality. Medicaid pays for 40 percent of all long-term care costs.

Today, I voice my support for Medicare and Medicaid and my vigorous opposition to benefit cuts that will harm those who depend on them.

PHONEY SCANDALS—"I THINK NOT"

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, the President says the country is being distracted by phoney scandals. A more accurate statement would be the President is using phoney distractions to cover up the administration's scandals. Here are two of them:

Fast and Furious. The ATF, with Justice Department knowledge, smuggles 2,000 automatic weapons to Mexican drug cartels. Americans are killed. Two hundred Mexican nationals killed, including two police chiefs and even a beauty queen. No one is held accountable. Nobody goes to jail. Lower-level operatives blamed. Eric "Withholder" held in contempt for withholding evidence from Congress. The administration wants us to forget their fiasco.

Benghazi, Libya. Four Americans killed by terrorists. The United States refuses to send help during the fire-fight. Four Americans left behind. No killer is ever captured. The administration misleads the American public and blames the attack on a video, not the terrorists. No one goes to jail. No accountability. Lower-level operatives blamed. The administration wants us to forget their fiasco.

Are these distractions and phoney scandals the President is talking about? Well, tell that to the families of the murdered Americans and Mexican nationals. A Navy SEAL put it best: "Phoney scandals don't come home in body bags."

So, Mr. Speaker, the next time you visit with the President, tell him these "distractions"—these "phoney scandals"—are not going away. The American people are going to get the truth, whether the President likes it or not.

And that's just the way it is.

WOUNDED WARRIOR SERVICE DOG ACT OF 2013

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, today, I am introducing the bipartisan Wounded Warrior Service Dog Act of 2013. This important bill aims to address a demonstrated need among our veteran population. With so many veterans returning from war, bearing both physical and emotional scars, we must do all we can to provide treatment that works.

On a recent visit to the National Education for Assistance Dog Services, or NEADS, located in Princeton, Massachusetts, I heard amazing stories about how service dogs are helping to treat veterans with physical disabilities, as well as those suffering from posttraumatic stress. This nonprofit organization has connected many deserving veterans with service dogs over the past few years with incredible results.

In recent years, the demand for service dogs has grown significantly, and organizations like NEADS are having trouble meeting high levels of demand. To address this shortage, the Wounded Warrior Service Dog Act of 2013 would create a competitive grant program for nonprofits that train service dogs for use by veterans. It is my sincere hope that through this program we can better connect our veterans with service dogs in an effort to ease their transition into civilian life.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

JOBS AREN'T MADE WITH REDTAPE

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, it is not surprising that many Americans think the Federal Government is out of touch. Washington is filled with unelected regulators who have never owned a small business or created a job. These regulators are disconnected from the costs their rules impose on small businesses, which amount to roughly \$8,000 per employee each year.

Regulators fail to see that each unnecessary, duplicative, or contradictory rule they impose forces American entrepreneurs to waste time and money satisfying government instead of hiring new employees or investing in their families.

The American people are asking, "Where are the jobs?" and they are

asking for a government that makes sense. No one is asking for more red-tape.

House Republicans don't just talk about jobs. We defend them, and we take action to make it easier for job creators to grow and hire. Cutting back Washington's redtape is part of that work.

CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Safe Climate Caucus, I want to applaud President Obama's commitment to address global climate change.

As the concentration of carbon in the atmosphere climbed past 400 parts per million this past spring, which is a level not seen since before the dawn of humans when sea levels were 75 feet higher than they are today, we are facing the potential for irreversible climatic consequences that could trigger mass extinctions and endanger the future of humanity. So, it would be irresponsible for the President not to address this clear and present danger.

With the powers the President has been granted under existing laws, he has taken the responsible course, insisting upon limiting carbon emissions at existing major sources like coal-fired power plants, promoting renewable energy development on public lands, squeezing greater efficiencies out of household and commercial appliances, motor vehicles, and government facilities and operations, and working with other nations on a global strategy to address climate change.

For the sake of future generations, I do hope that the Republican majority will take a more responsible role in helping us to preserve the future of a more livable world.

OBAMACARE FRAUD INVESTIGATIONS

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, many of us were surprised on July 2 when the administration unilaterally suspended the employer mandate in the Affordable Care Act. Since there were going to be no reporting requirements under the employer mandate, how were people going to be judged as eligible for benefits under the Affordable Care Act? Well, we would simply take their word for it. "Self-attestation" became the watchword and buzzword in the administration.

Last Thursday, again, people were surprised that the Department of Health and Human Services' Inspector General's Office is going to lose 20 percent of its staff between now and 2015.

Well, wait a minute. We are going to a system of self-reporting, self-attesta-

tion, but we are cutting the staff of the office who is going to see that the funds are properly spent. Oh, by the way, all the while, we are going to be increasing the funding for the so-called navigators, people who are going to sign people up for the Affordable Care Act under their own self-attestation.

It seems like we are going in the wrong direction here. We do need to keep an eye on these funds. They could go out the door inappropriately. We owe it to the taxpayer to be more vigilant.

□ 1415

COLLEGE AFFORDABILITY

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

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak on the importance of college affordability.

This is very personal for me. Growing up, my parents struggled financially, but with student loans and financial aid, I was able to go to college and get a great education. I would not be standing in this Chamber today otherwise.

I am pleased that we will be voting on a bipartisan bill this week that will reverse the doubling of student loan rates that took place on July 1. The bill is a compromise, so it's not perfect. It doesn't include all of the protections that I believe our students need, like lower interest rate caps to keep costs down over the long term, but it does reduce interest rates for over 7 million undergraduates taking out loans this year, and it will save a college student with Stafford loans \$3,300 compared to today's rates.

This bill is a start, but it isn't enough. I call on my colleagues to continue working together on ways to bring down the costs of college for working families. Doing so will expand opportunity for all, spur long-term economic growth, and strengthen our middle class.

48TH ANNIVERSARY OF MEDICARE AND MEDICAID

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

Mrs. CAPPs. Madam Speaker, I rise in celebration of the birthday of Medicare and Medicaid.

Forty-eight years ago today, President Johnson solidified our historic promise to all Americans. This is what he said:

No longer will older Americans be denied the healing miracle of modern medicine. No longer will illness crush and destroy the savings that they have so carefully put away over a lifetime so that they might enjoy dignity in their later years. No longer will young families see their incomes and their own hopes eaten away simply because they are carrying out their deep moral obligations

to their parents and to their uncles and their aunts—and no longer will this Nation refuse the hand of justice to those who have given a lifetime of service and wisdom and labor to the progress of this progressive country.

Madam Speaker, let us honor this promise to our parents, to our neighbors, and to our children by protecting Medicare and Medicaid and making sure the care it offers is there when it's needed the most.

48TH ANNIVERSARY OF MEDICARE AND MEDICAID

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Madam Speaker, 118 million Americans—seniors, low-income families, the disabled—all rely on Medicare and Medicaid services in one way or another. These services guarantee benefits that give our Nation's most vulnerable peace of mind and an increased quality of life.

Today, we proudly acknowledge almost five decades of Medicare and Medicaid services. While most service providers are honest and law-abiding, it has recently come to my attention that there are a few that have affected the delivery and integrity of services to the people who rely on these programs. Congress has the power to change that.

Today, on the 48th anniversary of Medicare and Medicaid being signed into law, Congress must recommit itself to the safeguarding and strengthening of America's Medicare and Medicaid service systems. The promise of Medicare and the morality of Medicaid must never be compromised no matter how hard the political battles are.

48TH ANNIVERSARY OF MEDICARE AND MEDICAID

(Mr. GALLEG0 asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GALLEG0. Madam Speaker, today marks the 48th anniversary of the Medicare program, which has had a tremendous impact on the American public and on the quality of life of our seniors and our kids.

On July 30 of 1965, a fellow Texan, President Lyndon B. Johnson, signed Medicare into law—a program that at the time was considered incredibly controversial. At that time, about half of our Nation's seniors didn't have health coverage. Today, in Texas, more than 3 million seniors, including our parents and our grandparents, rely on this program for crucial medical care.

The law has allowed our seniors to live with the peace of mind that health coverage will be available to them in their golden years. It is now just as vital to the long-term health and security of Americans as it was in 1965. We need to continue to demonstrate our commitment to those who have built

this country by strengthening Medicare for future generations. I am very glad that we have done things like starting to close the Medicare doughnut hole so that seniors are starting to save money on their prescriptions. In the first 6 months of 2013, more than a million seniors with Medicare have received at least one free preventative service—and our seniors have earned this through a lifetime of work.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 3 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1504

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOLF) at 3 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2610.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 312 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. 2610.

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

□ 1505

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2610)

making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, with Mr. MESSER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, today I present H.R. 2610, a bill providing fiscal year 2014 appropriations for the Department of Transportation, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies.

The T-HUD bill conforms with the 302(b) allocation of \$44.1 billion in budget authority, and is in line with the House budget of \$967 billion. Under such an allocation, we prioritized programs and spending and were able to achieve three very important funding goals: first, meet the "ob lim" funding levels for the MAP-21, the highway authorization bill; keep the commercial airspace running smoothly; and preserve and renew the housing option for all HUD-assisted families under lease in fiscal year 2014.

Mr. Chairman, I imagine today we're going to hear a lot about the budget and the sequester, and I'll tell you, I agree. We need a deal. We need a deal that resolves the irresponsible meat-ax approach to the sequester and provides a top-line budget number that addresses concerns about taxes and spending.

But the Budget Control Act is the law, and no matter what number we'd like to write this to, the law gives us \$967 billion to fund the government. You get there either by across-the-board cuts or by prioritizing the funds available. I think we all agree that continuing across-the-board cuts is not the answer. We've seen examples why.

Earlier this year, across-the-board cuts caused air traffic controllers to be furloughed, consumer convenience to be sacrificed, and air safety to be endangered. In April, the House voted on a strongly bipartisan basis 361-41 to tap unspent FAA funds and put these air traffic controllers back to work.

Mr. Chairman, we know that across-the-board cutting is no way to run a government. Considering there still isn't an agreement on the sequester or a top-line budget number, it's imperative that we realign the funds we have available to ensure DOT and HUD have the resources they need to care for the population and infrastructure of this Nation. This is a chance to make sure the "must-do" priorities are addressed.

I assume we're going to hear a lot about infrastructure investment, and I will tell you we fund the authorized programs at the authorized program levels.

I assume we're going to hear a lot about housing needs, and I will tell you, we retain the housing option for HUD families currently receiving assistance, protecting the most vulnerable.

We are operating under an open rule, and I hope we can keep the debate and amendment process moving along today. We will be taking points of order against amendments that would increase our allocations or authorize on an appropriations act. Let me reemphasize to people who are going to be offering amendments that we will enforce points of order.

I'd like to thank my friend, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR), the T-HUD ranking member, for his comity and willingness to discuss what would be possible under a \$44.1 billion allocation.

I'd also like to thank Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member LOWEY, plus the members of the committee, and especially the subcommittee, for their hard work and commitment to this bill.

And speaking of subcommittee members, I'd like to give a special word of congratulations to a new and valued member of the Appropriations Committee. The gentlewoman from Washington, Ms. JAMIE HERRERA BEUTLER, and her husband, Daniel, recently welcomed their first child, a beautiful baby girl, into their family. This sweet girl is a miracle and a testament to the faith and hope that her parents have carried over recent months. We offer our continued praise for their strength, the wisdom of their doctors, and the joy of this new family.

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

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2014 (H.R. 2610)

(Amounts in thousands)

*Enacted level does not include the 251A sequester or Sec. 3004 OMB ATB

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
Office of the Secretary					
Salaries and expenses.....	102,481	113,108	102,481	---	-10,627
Immediate Office of the Secretary.....	(2,618)	---	(2,618)	---	(+2,618)
Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary.....	(984)	---	(984)	---	(+984)
Office of the General Counsel.....	(19,515)	---	(19,867)	(+352)	(+19,867)
Office of the Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy.....	(10,107)	---	(10,107)	---	(+10,107)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs.....	(10,538)	---	(11,572)	(+1,034)	(+11,572)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs.....	(2,500)	---	(2,500)	---	(+2,500)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration.....	(25,469)	---	(23,376)	(-2,093)	(+23,376)
Office of Public Affairs.....	(2,020)	---	(2,020)	---	(+2,020)
Office of the Executive Secretariat.....	(1,595)	---	(1,595)	---	(+1,595)
Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization.....	(1,369)	---	(1,369)	---	(+1,369)
Office of Intelligence, Security, and Emergency Response.....	(10,778)	---	(10,778)	---	(+10,778)
Office of the Chief Information Officer.....	(14,988)	---	(15,695)	(+707)	(+15,695)
Research and Development.....	---	14,765	14,220	+14,220	-545
National Infrastructure Investments.....	500,000	500,000	---	-500,000	-500,000
Rescission.....	---	---	-237,000	-237,000	-237,000
Aviation Consumer Call Center (legislative proposal)..	---	7,500	---	---	-7,500
Financial Management Capital.....	4,990	10,000	4,990	---	-5,010
Cyber Security Initiatives.....	10,000	6,000	2,000	-8,000	-4,000
Office of Civil Rights.....	9,384	9,551	9,384	---	-167
Transportation Planning, Research, and Development....	9,000	9,750	6,000	-3,000	-3,750
Rescission of unobligated balances.....	---	-2,750	-2,750	-2,750	---
Subtotal.....	9,000	7,000	3,250	-5,750	-3,750
Working Capital Fund.....	(172,000)	---	(172,000)	---	(+172,000)
Minority Business Resource Center Program.....	922	925	922	---	-3
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(18,367)	(18,367)	(18,367)	---	---
Minority Business Outreach.....	3,068	3,088	3,068	---	-20
Payments to Air Carriers (Airport & Airway Trust Fund)	143,000	146,000	100,000	-43,000	-46,000
Total, Office of the Secretary.....	782,845	817,937	3,315	-779,530	-814,622
Federal Aviation Administration					
Operations.....	9,653,395	9,707,000	9,521,784	-131,611	-185,216
Air traffic organization.....	(7,442,738)	(7,311,790)	(7,182,664)	(-260,074)	(-129,126)
Aviation safety.....	(1,252,991)	(1,204,777)	(1,199,777)	(-53,214)	(-5,000)
Commercial space transportation.....	(16,271)	(16,011)	(14,160)	(-2,111)	(-1,851)
Finance and management.....	(582,117)	(807,646)	(777,198)	(+195,081)	(-30,448)
Human resources programs.....	(98,858)	---	---	(-98,858)	---
Staff offices.....	(200,286)	(306,994)	(291,348)	(+91,062)	(-15,646)
NextGen.....	(60,134)	(59,782)	(56,637)	(-3,497)	(-3,145)
Facilities and Equipment (Airport & Airway Trust Fund)	2,730,731	2,777,798	2,155,000	-575,731	-622,798
Research, Engineering, and Development (Airport & Airway Trust Fund).....	167,556	166,000	145,000	-22,556	-21,000
Rescission of unobligated balances.....	---	---	-26,184	-26,184	-26,184
Grants-in-Aid for Airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund) (Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(3,435,000)	(3,200,000)	(3,200,000)	(-235,000)	---
(Limitation on obligations).....	(3,350,000)	(2,900,000)	(3,350,000)	---	(+450,000)
Administration.....	(101,000)	(106,600)	(106,600)	(+5,600)	---
Airport cooperative research program.....	(15,000)	(15,000)	(15,000)	---	---
Airport technology research.....	(29,250)	(29,500)	(29,500)	(+250)	---
Small community air service development program...	(6,000)	---	---	(-6,000)	---

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2014 (H.R. 2610)

(Amounts in thousands)

*Enacted level does not include the 251A sequester or Sec. 3004 OMB ATB

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Rescission of contract authority.....	---	-450,000	---	---	+450,000
Total, Federal Aviation Administration.....	12,551,682	12,200,798	11,795,600	-756,082	-405,198
Limitations on obligations.....	(3,350,000)	(2,900,000)	(3,350,000)	---	(+450,000)
Total budgetary resources.....	(15,901,682)	(15,100,798)	(15,145,600)	(-756,082)	(+44,802)
Federal Highway Administration					
Limitation on Administrative Expenses.....	(412,000)	(429,855)	(417,000)	(+5,000)	(-12,855)
Federal-Aid Highways (Highway Trust Fund):					
(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(39,699,000)	(40,995,000)	(40,995,000)	(+1,296,000)	---
(Limitation on obligations).....	(39,699,000)	(40,256,000)	(40,256,000)	(+557,000)	---
(Exempt contract authority).....	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)	---	---
Total, Federal Highway Administration.....	---	---	---	---	---
Limitations on obligations.....	(39,699,000)	(40,256,000)	(40,256,000)	(+557,000)	---
Exempt contract authority.....	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)	---	---
Total budgetary resources.....	(40,438,000)	(40,995,000)	(40,995,000)	(+557,000)	---
Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration					
Motor Carrier Safety Operations and Programs (Highway Trust Fund)(Liquidation of contract authorization)..	(251,000)	(259,000)	(259,000)	(+8,000)	---
(Limitation on obligations).....	(251,000)	(259,000)	(259,000)	(+8,000)	---
Motor Carrier Safety Grants (Highway Trust Fund)					
(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(310,000)	(313,000)	(313,000)	(+3,000)	---
(Limitation on obligations).....	(310,000)	(313,000)	(313,000)	(+3,000)	---
Rescission of contract authority.....	---	---	-95,957	-95,957	-95,957
Total, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration.....	---	---	-95,957	-95,957	-95,957
Limitations on obligations.....	(561,000)	(572,000)	(572,000)	(+11,000)	---
Total budgetary resources.....	(561,000)	(572,000)	(476,043)	(-84,957)	(-95,957)
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration					
Operations and Research (general fund).....	140,146	148,343	117,000	-23,146	-31,343
Operations and Research (Highway Trust Fund)					
(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(115,500)	(118,500)	(139,175)	(+23,675)	(+20,675)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(115,500)	(118,500)	(139,175)	(+23,675)	(+20,675)
Subtotal, Operations and Research.....	255,646	266,843	256,175	+529	-10,668
Highway Traffic Safety Grants (Highway Trust Fund)					
(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(554,500)	(561,500)	(561,500)	(+7,000)	---
(Limitation on obligations).....	(554,500)	(561,500)	(561,500)	(+7,000)	---
Highway safety programs (23 USC 402).....	(235,000)	(235,000)	(235,000)	---	---
National priority safety programs (23 USC 405)..	(265,000)	(272,000)	(272,000)	(+7,000)	---
High visibility enforcement.....	(29,000)	(29,000)	(29,000)	---	---
Administrative expenses.....	(25,500)	(25,500)	(25,500)	---	---
Rescission of contract authority	---	---	-152,281	-152,281	-152,281
Total, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.....	140,146	148,343	-35,281	-175,427	-183,624
Limitations on obligations.....	(670,000)	(680,000)	(700,675)	(+30,675)	(+20,675)
Total budgetary resources.....	(810,146)	(828,343)	(665,394)	(-144,752)	(-162,949)

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2014 (H.R. 2610)

(Amounts in thousands)

*Enacted level does not include the 251A sequester or Sec. 3004 OMB ATB

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Federal Railroad Administration					
Safety and Operations.....	178,596	184,500	184,500	+5,904	---
Railroad Research and Development.....	35,000	35,250	35,250	+250	---
Research Development and Technology.....	---	54,750	---	---	-54,750
Rail Service Improvement Program.....	---	3,660,000	---	---	-3,660,000
Northeast Corridor Improvement Program (rescission)...	---	---	-4,419	-4,419	-4,419
Next Generation High-Speed Rail (rescission).....	---	---	-1,973	-1,973	-1,973
National Railroad Passenger Corporation:					
Operating Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation.....	466,000	---	350,000	-116,000	+350,000
Capital and Debt Service Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation.....	952,000	---	600,000	-352,000	+600,000
Current Rail Passenger Service.....	---	2,700,000	---	---	-2,700,000
Subtotal.....	1,418,000	2,700,000	950,000	-468,000	-1,750,000
Total, Federal Railroad Administration.....	1,631,596	6,634,500	1,163,358	-468,238	-5,471,142
Federal Transit Administration					
Administrative Expenses.....	102,713	109,888	102,713	---	-7,175
Formula and Bus Grants (Hwy Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account (Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(9,400,000)	---	---	(-9,400,000)	---
(Limitation on obligations).....	(8,478,000)	---	---	(-8,478,000)	---
Public Transportation Emergency Relief Program.....	---	25,000	---	---	-25,000
Transit Formula Grants (Hwy Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account (Liquidation of contract authorization).....	---	(9,500,000)	(9,500,000)	(+9,500,000)	---
(Limitation on obligations).....	---	(8,595,000)	(8,595,000)	(+8,595,000)	---
Research and University Research Centers.....	44,000	---	---	-44,000	---
Research, Development, Demonstration, and Deployment Program.....	---	30,000	20,000	+20,000	-10,000
Transit Cooperative Research.....	---	7,000	4,000	+4,000	-3,000
Technical Assistance and Standards Development.....	---	7,000	4,000	+4,000	-3,000
Human Resources and Training.....	---	5,000	2,000	+2,000	-3,000
Capital Investment Grants.....	1,955,000	1,981,472	1,815,655	-139,345	-165,817
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority Capital and Preventive Maintenance.....	150,000	150,000	125,000	-25,000	-25,000
Rescission (H. Sec. 163)(S. Sec. 167).....	---	---	-81,338	-81,338	-81,338
Rescission of contract authority (H. Sec. 163).....	---	---	-70,000	-70,000	-70,000
Total, Federal Transit Administration.....	2,251,713	2,315,360	1,922,030	-329,683	-393,330
Limitations on obligations.....	(8,478,000)	(8,595,000)	(8,595,000)	(+117,000)	---
Total budgetary resources.....	(10,729,713)	(10,910,360)	(10,517,030)	(-212,683)	(-393,330)
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation					
Operations and Maintenance (Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund).....	32,259	32,855	30,582	-1,677	-2,273
Maritime Administration					
Maritime Security Program.....	174,000	208,000	174,000	---	-34,000
Operations and Training.....	156,258	152,168	143,768	-12,490	-8,400
Ship Disposal.....	5,500	2,000	4,000	-1,500	+2,000
Assistance to Small Shipyards.....	9,980	---	---	-9,980	---
Maritime Guaranteed Loan (Title XI) Program Account: Administrative expenses.....	3,740	2,655	2,655	-1,085	---
Total, Maritime Administration.....	349,478	364,823	324,423	-25,055	-40,400

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2014 (H.R. 2610)

(Amounts in thousands)

*Enacted level does not include the 251A sequester or Sec. 3004 OMB ATB

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration					
Operational Expenses:					
General Fund.....	20,721	21,015	20,528	-193	-487
Pipeline Safety Fund.....	639	639	639	---	---
Pipeline Safety information grants to communities.....	(1,000)	(1,500)	(1,000)	---	(-500)
Subtotal.....	21,360	21,654	21,167	-193	-487
Hazardous Materials Safety:					
General Fund.....	42,338	45,801	42,762	+424	-3,039
Special Permit and Approval Fees.....	---	-6,000	---	---	+6,000
Subtotal.....	42,338	39,801	42,762	+424	+2,961
Pipeline Safety:					
Pipeline Safety Fund.....	90,679	133,000	90,679	---	-42,321
Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.....	18,573	18,573	18,573	---	---
Pipeline Safety Design Review Fund.....	---	2,000	2,000	+2,000	---
Subtotal.....	109,252	153,573	111,252	+2,000	-42,321
Subtotal, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration.....	172,950	215,028	175,181	+2,231	-39,847
Pipeline safety user fees.....	-91,318	-133,639	-91,318	---	+42,321
Pipeline Safety Design Review fee.....	---	-2,000	-2,000	-2,000	---
Emergency Preparedness Grants:					
Limitation on emergency preparedness fund.....	(28,318)	(28,318)	(28,318)	---	---
(Emergency preparedness fund).....	(188)	(188)	(188)	---	---
Total, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration.....	81,632	79,389	81,863	+231	+2,474
Research and Innovative Technology Administration					
Research and Development.....	15,981	---	---	-15,981	---
Office of Inspector General					
Salaries and Expenses.....	79,624	85,605	79,624	---	-5,981
Surface Transportation Board					
Salaries and Expenses.....	29,310	30,775	29,310	---	-1,465
Offsetting collections.....	-1,250	-1,250	-1,250	---	---
Total, Surface Transportation Board.....	28,060	29,525	28,060	---	-1,465
General Provisions, this Title					
Section 193:					
(a) Deployment of MagLev Projects (rescission)....	---	---	-80,000	-80,000	-80,000
(b) Rail crossing safety and planning programs....	---	---	80,000	+80,000	+80,000
Total, title I, Department of Transportation..	17,945,016	22,709,135	15,297,617	-2,647,399	-7,411,518
Appropriations.....	(17,946,266)	(23,169,135)	(16,050,769)	(-1,895,497)	(-7,118,366)
Rescissions.....	---	(-2,750)	(-433,664)	(-433,664)	(-430,914)
Rescissions of contract authority.....	---	(-450,000)	(-318,238)	(-318,238)	(+131,762)
Offsetting collections.....	(-1,250)	(-7,250)	(-1,250)	---	(+6,000)
Limitations on obligations.....	(52,758,000)	(53,003,000)	(53,473,675)	(+715,675)	(+470,675)
Total budgetary resources.....	(70,703,016)	(75,712,135)	(68,771,292)	(-1,931,724)	(-6,940,843)

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2014 (H.R. 2610)

(Amounts in thousands)

*Enacted level does not include the 251A sequester or Sec. 3004 OMB ATB

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT					
Management and Administration					
Executive Offices.....	---	14,540	12,000	+12,000	-2,540
Administration, Operations and Management.....	537,789	---	---	-537,789	---
Administration Support Offices.....	---	505,313	479,000	+479,000	-26,313
Program Office Salaries and Expenses:					
Public and Indian Housing.....	200,000	220,299	197,000	-3,000	-23,299
Community Planning and Development.....	100,000	109,740	99,000	-1,000	-10,740
Housing.....	391,500	383,375	377,000	-14,500	-6,375
Policy Development and Research.....	22,211	21,687	21,000	-1,211	-687
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity.....	72,600	76,504	71,000	-1,600	-5,504
Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control...	7,400	7,642	7,000	-400	-642
Subtotal.....	793,711	819,247	772,000	-21,711	-47,247
Total, Management and Administration.....	1,331,500	1,339,100	1,263,000	-68,500	-76,100
Public and Indian Housing					
Tenant-based Rental Assistance:					
Renewals.....	17,242,351	17,968,278	17,000,000	-242,351	-968,278
Tenant protection vouchers.....	75,000	150,000	75,000	---	-75,000
Administrative fees.....	1,375,000	1,685,374	1,350,000	-25,000	-335,374
Family self-sufficiency coordinators.....	60,000	---	---	-60,000	---
Veterans affairs supportive housing.....	75,000	75,000	75,000	---	---
Sec. 811 mainstream voucher renewals.....	112,018	110,564	110,564	-1,454	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-15,000)	---	---	(+15,000)
Subtotal (available this fiscal year).....	18,939,369	19,989,216	18,610,564	-328,805	-1,378,652
Advance appropriations.....	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	---	---
Less appropriations from prior year advances.....	-4,000,000	-4,000,000	-4,000,000	---	---
Total, Tenant-based Rental Assistance appropriated in this bill.....	18,939,369	19,989,216	18,610,564	-328,805	-1,378,652
Rental Assistance Demonstration.....	---	10,000	---	---	-10,000
Public Housing Capital Fund.....	1,875,000	2,000,000	1,500,000	-375,000	-500,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-10,000)	---	---	(+10,000)
Public Housing Operating Fund.....	4,262,010	4,600,000	4,262,010	---	-337,990
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-8,000)	---	---	(+8,000)
Choice neighborhoods.....	120,000	400,000	---	-120,000	-400,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-2,000)	---	---	(+2,000)
Rescission.....	---	---	-120,000	-120,000	-120,000
Family Self-Sufficiency.....	---	75,000	60,000	+60,000	-15,000
Native American Housing Block Grants.....	650,000	650,000	600,000	-50,000	-50,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-3,000)	---	---	(+3,000)
Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant.....	13,000	13,000	---	-13,000	-13,000
Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Fund Program Account....	12,200	6,000	6,000	-6,200	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(976,000)	(1,818,000)	(1,818,000)	(+842,000)	---

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2014 (H.R. 2610)

(Amounts in thousands)

*Enacted level does not include the 251A sequester or Sec. 3004 OMB ATB

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<hr/>					
Native Hawaiian Loan Guarantee Fund Program Account... (Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	386 (41,504)	--- ---	--- ---	-386 (-41,504)	--- ---
Total, Public and Indian Housing.....	25,871,965	27,743,216	24,918,574	-953,391	-2,824,642
<hr/>					
Community Planning and Development					
Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS..... Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	332,000 ---	332,000 (-2,000)	303,000 ---	-29,000 ---	-29,000 (+2,000)
Community Development Fund:					
CDBG formula.....	2,948,090	2,798,100	1,636,813	-1,311,277	-1,161,287
Indian CDBG.....	60,000	70,000	60,000	---	-10,000
Integrated planning and investment grants.....	---	75,000	---	---	-75,000
Neighborhood stabilization program.....	---	200,000	---	---	-200,000
Disaster relief.....	300,000	---	---	-300,000	---
Subtotal.....	3,308,090	3,143,100	1,696,813	-1,611,277	-1,446,287
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-15,000)	---	---	(+15,000)
Community Development Loan Guarantees (Section 108):					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(240,000)	(500,000)	(500,000)	(+260,000)	---
Credit subsidy.....	5,952	---	---	-5,952	---
Rescission.....	---	---	-3,000	-3,000	-3,000
HOME Investment Partnerships Program..... Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	1,000,000 ---	950,000 (-5,000)	700,000 ---	-300,000 ---	-250,000 (+5,000)
Self-help and Assisted Homeownership Opportunity Program.....	53,500	---	30,000	-23,500	+30,000
Capacity Building.....	---	20,000	---	---	-20,000
Homeless Assistance Grants.....	2,033,000	2,381,000	2,088,000	+55,000	-293,000
Total, Community Planning and Development.....	6,732,542	6,826,100	4,814,813	-1,917,729	-2,011,287
<hr/>					
Housing Programs					
Project-based Rental Assistance:					
Renewals.....	9,050,672	10,007,000	9,050,672	---	-956,328
Contract administrators.....	289,000	265,000	---	-289,000	-265,000
Subtotal (available this fiscal year).....	9,339,672	10,272,000	9,050,672	-289,000	-1,221,328
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-15,000)	---	---	(+15,000)
Advance appropriations.....	400,000	400,000	400,000	---	---
Less appropriations from prior year advances.....	-400,000	-400,000	-400,000	---	---
Total, Project-based Rental Assistance appropriated in this bill.....	9,339,672	10,272,000	9,050,672	-289,000	-1,221,328
<hr/>					
Housing for the Elderly..... Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	374,627 ---	400,000 (-2,000)	374,627 ---	---	-25,373 (+2,000)
Housing for Persons with Disabilities..... Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	165,000 ---	126,000 (-1,000)	126,000 ---	-39,000 ---	---
Housing Counseling Assistance.....	45,000	55,000	35,000	-10,000	-20,000
Rental Housing Assistance.....	1,300	21,000	21,000	+19,700	---
Rent Supplement (rescission).....	---	-3,500	-3,500	-3,500	---
Manufactured Housing Fees Trust Fund.....	6,500	7,530	6,530	+30	-1,000
Offsetting collections.....	-4,000	-6,530	-6,530	-2,530	---
Total, Housing Programs.....	9,928,099	10,871,500	9,603,799	-324,300	-1,267,701
<hr/>					
Federal Housing Administration					
Mutual Mortgage Insurance Program Account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(400,000,000)	(400,000,000)	(400,000,000)	---	---

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2014 (H.R. 2610)

(Amounts in thousands)

*Enacted level does not include the 251A sequester or Sec. 3004 OMB ATB

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(50,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(-30,000)	---
Offsetting receipts.....	-9,676,000	-10,841,000	-10,841,000	-1,165,000	---
Proposed offsetting receipts (HECM).....	-170,000	-57,000	-57,000	+113,000	---
Administrative contract expenses.....	207,000	127,000	127,000	-80,000	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-1,000)	---	---	(+1,000)
General and Special Risk Program Account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(25,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(+5,000,000)	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	---	---
Offsetting receipts.....	-588,000	-926,000	-926,000	-338,000	---
Total, Federal Housing Administration.....	-10,227,000	-11,697,000	-11,697,000	-1,470,000	---
Government National Mortgage Association					
Guarantees of Mortgage-backed Securities Loan					
Guarantee Program Account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	---	---
Administrative expenses.....	19,500	21,200	19,000	-500	-2,200
Offsetting receipts.....	-100,000	-100,000	-100,000	---	---
Offsetting receipts.....	-647,000	-707,000	-707,000	-60,000	---
Proposed offsetting receipts (HECM) (Sec. 210)....	-23,000	-12,000	-12,000	+11,000	---
Additional contract expenses.....	---	1,000	1,000	+1,000	---
Total, Gov't National Mortgage Association....	-750,500	-796,800	-799,000	-48,500	-2,200
Policy Development and Research					
Research and Technology.....	46,000	50,000	21,000	-25,000	-29,000
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity					
Fair Housing Activities.....	70,847	71,000	55,847	-15,000	-15,153
Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control					
Lead Hazard Reduction.....	120,000	120,000	50,000	-70,000	-70,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-1,000)	---	---	(+1,000)
Management and Administration					
Information Technology Portfolio.....	---	285,100	100,000	+100,000	-185,100
Working Capital Fund.....	199,035	---	---	-199,035	---
Office of Inspector General.....	124,000	127,672	124,000	---	-3,672
Transformation Initiative.....	50,000	---	---	-50,000	---
(By transfer).....	---	(80,000)	---	---	(-80,000)
Total, Management and Administration.....	373,035	412,772	224,000	-149,035	-188,772
(Grand total, Management and Administration)..	(1,704,535)	(1,751,872)	(1,487,000)	(-217,535)	(-264,872)
=====					
Total, title II, Department of Housing and					
Urban Development.....	33,496,488	34,939,888	28,455,033	-5,041,455	-6,484,855
Appropriations.....	(40,304,488)	(43,192,918)	(36,831,063)	(-3,473,425)	(-6,361,855)
Rescissions.....	---	(-3,500)	(-126,500)	(-126,500)	(-123,000)
Advance appropriations.....	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	---	---
Offsetting receipts.....	(-11,204,000)	(-12,643,000)	(-12,643,000)	(-1,439,000)	---
Offsetting collections.....	(-4,000)	(-6,530)	(-6,530)	(-2,530)	---
(by transfer).....	---	80,000	---	---	-80,000
(transfer out).....	---	-80,000	---	---	+80,000
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(70,000)	(40,000)	(40,000)	(-30,000)	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(926,257,504)	(932,318,000)	(932,318,000)	(+6,060,496)	---
=====					

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2014 (H.R. 2610)

(Amounts in thousands)

*Enacted level does not include the 251A sequester or Sec. 3004 OMB ATB

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE III - OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Access Board.....	7,400	7,448	7,400	---	-48
Federal Housing Finance Agency, Office of Inspector General (legislative proposal).....	---	48,000	38,000	+38,000	-10,000
Offsetting collections (legislative proposal).....	---	-48,000	-38,000	-38,000	+10,000
Federal Maritime Commission.....	24,100	25,000	24,200	+100	-800
National Passenger Rail Corporation Inspector General.	20,500	25,300	25,300	+4,800	---
National Transportation Safety Board.....	102,400	103,027	102,400	---	-627
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation.....	215,300	204,100	185,100	-30,200	-19,000
United States Interagency Council on Homelessness.....	3,300	3,595	3,000	-300	-595
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Total, title III, Other Independent Agencies....	373,000	368,470	347,400	-25,600	-21,070
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
OTHER APPROPRIATIONS					
Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (P.L. 113-2)					
Department of Transportation					
Federal Aviation Administration					
Facilities and Equipment (emergency).....	29,600	---	---	-29,600	---
Federal Highway Administration					
Emergency Relief Program (emergency).....	2,022,000	---	---	-2,022,000	---
Federal Railroad Administration					
Operating Subsidy Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (emergency).....					
	32,000	---	---	-32,000	---
Capital and Debt Service Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (emergency).....					
	86,000	---	---	-86,000	---
Federal Transit Administration					
Public Transportation Emergency Relief Program (emerg)	10,900,000	---	---	-10,900,000	---
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total, Department of Transportation.....	13,069,600	---	---	-13,069,600	---
Department of Housing and Urban Development					
Community Planning and Development					
Community Development Fund (emergency).....	16,000,000	---	---	-16,000,000	---
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Total, Other Appropriations.....	29,069,600	---	---	-29,069,600	---
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2014 (H.R. 2610)
(Amounts in thousands)

*Enacted level does not include the 251A sequester or Sec. 3004 OMB ATB

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Grand total.....	80,884,104	58,017,493	44,100,050	-36,784,054	-13,917,443
Appropriations.....	(58,623,754)	(66,778,523)	(53,267,232)	(-5,356,522)	(-13,511,291)
Rescissions.....	---	(-6,250)	(-560,164)	(-560,164)	(-553,914)
Rescissions of contract authority.....	---	(-450,000)	(-318,238)	(-318,238)	(+131,762)
Advance appropriations.....	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	---	---
Emergency appropriations.....	(29,069,600)	---	---	(-29,069,600)	---
Offsetting receipts.....	(-11,204,000)	(-12,643,000)	(-12,643,000)	(-1,439,000)	---
Offsetting collections.....	(-5,250)	(-61,780)	(-45,780)	(-40,530)	(+16,000)
(by transfer).....	---	80,000	---	---	-80,000
(transfer out).....	---	-80,000	---	---	+80,000
(Limitation on obligations).....	(52,758,000)	(53,003,000)	(53,473,675)	(+715,675)	(+470,675)
Total budgetary resources.....	(133,642,104)	(111,020,493)	(97,573,725)	(-36,068,379)	(-13,446,768)

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. PASTOR of Arizona asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. The devastating impacts of the Ryan budget are on full display in the fiscal year 2014 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies bill.

My good friend, Chairman TOM LATHAM, was given an impossible allocation of \$44.1 billion. This is \$4.4 billion below the fiscal year 2013 sequestration level and \$10 billion below the level included in the Senate bill. As a result, the FY 2014 bill makes deep cuts to a number of critical transportation and housing programs.

Within the Department of Transportation, the bill cuts the programs and activities of the Federal Aviation Administration by \$756 million below the FY 2013 CR level. While the bill provides enough funds to avoid additional furloughs, it is unclear whether FAA will be able to completely lift the hiring freeze that has been in place during this fiscal year.

The FAA's NextGen program will also be impacted by delaying the important developmental work on many of the program's emerging technologies.

Amtrak's capital program is cut by more than \$350 million, which will jeopardize long distance service and some short haul routes. At these funding levels, Amtrak will have to suspend mechanical overhauls on equipment, which will result in slow orders and furloughs of hundreds of mechanical employees and engineers.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development sustained even deeper cuts. The bill reduces funding for the CDBG, the Community Development Block Grant, program to \$1.6 billion, which is the lowest level since the program was created in 1975. The HOME program is funded at \$700 million, which is the lowest level since the program began in 1992.

The bill funds the Public Housing Capital Fund at its lowest level since 1987, adding more than \$1 billion in deferred capital maintenance to an existing \$26 billion maintenance backlog.

In closing, I do want to commend the chairman, TOM LATHAM, for funding the critical safety missions of the Department of Transportation and for honoring the obligation limitations in the surface and aviation bills. The chairman has also included sufficient funding to move 10,000 more homeless veterans off the street and into housing.

Despite the chairman's efforts, I have great concerns with the bill as it is currently written. I remain hopeful that we can achieve a more realistic allocation as the appropriations process moves forward this year.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1515

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), a great member of the committee.

Mr. COLE. Thank you for yielding, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Fiscal Year 2014 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act. I want to commend my good friend, Chairman LATHAM, for making some tough choices, but making those choices in a manner that was fair, transparent, and rational. I also want to thank my good friend, Mr. PASTOR, the ranking member on the other side of the aisle. He's always a pleasure to work with. He's always a delightful Member and he always contributes. I know while this bill may not be everything that he would like, he certainly added a great deal in the course of our deliberations.

The reality is that because of sequestration, the allocation this subcommittee was given is meager. The bill provides \$44.1 billion in discretionary spending—a reduction of many billions below the fiscal year 2013 enacted level. But let's be clear: that reduction is due to the Budget Control Act and the mechanism of sequestration, not the Ryan budget, which simply recognizes the realities that have been agreed upon and passed into law. It's worth noting that our friend, the President of the United States, recommended the sequester, which we're trying to enact in this budget.

At the same time, even with these cuts, the bill has maintained funding for the FAA Contract Tower Program, a program which is vitally important to maintaining safe national airspace.

The bill also provides funding to continue assistance to all families anticipated to hold section 8 and public housing vouchers at the beginning of fiscal year 2014. I know that was a tough mark to make, Mr. Chairman, and one that I appreciate that you did make because you put people first.

Additionally, this bill fully funds the President's request for veterans housing vouchers at \$75 million, a point that my friend, Mr. PASTOR, made.

Mr. Chairman, I know Mr. LATHAM and every member of this committee would like to spend more money on infrastructure; but because of our \$17 trillion crushing debt and because of unrestrained growth and entitlement spending, this is where we are and this is where we will be until we confront out-of-control entitlement spending.

Many of my friends on the other side of the aisle seem to reject this hard reality. Some believe we will never have to balance our budget. Some believe that trillions of dollars in additional tax increases are the solution. And some think that we don't need to make any changes in our entitlement programs. That approach, in my view, simply won't work.

The deficit we have is far too high, but it is less than half of what it was

when Republicans retook the House in 2010. That's progress. But more progress will need to be made until America actually balances its books. And that, I believe, will set the stage for faster, more robust economic growth.

I pledge to work with my friends on both sides of the aisle to find a compromise that will allow us to make vitally important investments while still lowering the deficit, but that compromise must involve entitlement reform. Until then, we frequently will continue to see important programs, such as the ones in this bill, starved for investments that they need.

So we need to get on to that bigger deal that my friend, Mr. LATHAM, talked about. I think the product of that deal will be much more robust appropriations for this particular subcommittee.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I want to commend both the chairman and the ranking member for their hard work on this bill. But no amount of hard work could redeem this bill, and I am rising in strong opposition. We call it the THUD bill. Well, the bill makes about the same sound as it spells—thud.

The majority's bill says of our transportation and infrastructure commitments, We don't care if the wheels fall off. It says of our housing and development commitments, We don't care if the roof caves in. Thud.

While I appreciate the hard work of the members of this subcommittee and of the dedicated staff on both sides of the aisle, the funding levels included in this bill are just unacceptable. They're impossible. The 302(b) allocation received by this subcommittee is 15 percent lower than it was last year. And that was already low. It's 19 percent below the Budget Control Act. It's nearly \$10 billion below the level that the Senate is considering in the same bill.

This funding level reflects the reckless discretionary spending caps adopted by the House majority in the Ryan budget resolution, which not only locked in sequestration; it doubled down on sequestration in order to shelter defense and homeland security bills from some of the cuts. This made allocations for our domestic investments even worse—far, far beyond the usual zone of political disagreement. The Transportation and Housing bill we're considering today is a prime example of this impossible tradeoff.

On the transportation side, the bill makes deep cuts to the capital programs of the Federal Aviation Administration, Amtrak, and the Federal Transit Administration's New Starts program. It zeroes out funding for the TIGER program, which has been enormously successful at advancing critical

surface transportation projects in communities across the country, and yet has had to leave thousands of meritorious proposals unfunded. Once again, the bill includes no funding for the development of high speed rail.

Funding for our housing needs is even worse. The bill reduces funding for the Community Development Block Grant program, a program that over the years has been known for its bipartisan support, to \$1.6 billion. That's the lowest level since this program was created in 1975. The HOME program is funded at \$700 million, the lowest level since that program began in 1992. And the bill rescinds funding for the Choice Neighborhoods program, the successor program of Hope VI. That means the bill lacks funding for any comprehensive revitalization program whatsoever.

During the Appropriations Committee markup of this bill, Democrats offered a series of amendments to restore these damaging cuts and produce a bill that more adequately meets our Nation's critical housing and infrastructure needs. All of those amendments were rejected on party-line votes.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps the most tragic and disappointing fact about this bill is that the cuts it imposes could be avoided if the Republican leadership would only appoint budget conferees to go negotiate, with their Senate counterparts, a long-term deficit reduction deal that would lift sequestration and preserve vital investments in our future.

Alternatively, Republican leaders could reconsider their refusal to talk with the President. That offer from December still stands. They should work with him to address the real drivers of the deficit—tax expenditures and entitlements—thus, lifting sequestration, along with the drag it represents on our economy and the mockery it makes of the appropriations process.

The bill before us is exhibit A of this travesty. I urge my colleagues to raise their voices and their votes against it.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished friend from Chicago (Mr. QUIGLEY).

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I became a member of the Appropriations Committee this Congress to make the tough funding choices that determine our national priorities, but this year's budget allocations have taken those choices away from us.

This bill is being touted as a budgetary tradeoff, but there are no tradeoffs in this bill. There are only cuts. Investments in our infrastructure are needed more than ever. Yet this bill makes some of the most significant cuts to vital transportation programs in decades.

We all remember the Recovery Act. An interesting fact about the Recovery Act is about 6 or 7 percent of that bill

dealt with infrastructure, but that 6 or 7 percent of that bill created about two-thirds of the jobs that the act created.

Unfortunately, in this bill there's no funding for TIGER grants, which fund infrastructure projects like the Elgin-O'Hare Western Access Project in my district, and no funding for Core Capacity Grants to fund desperately needed improvements to transit systems like the Chicago Transit Authority. Instead of increasing safety and capacity in air travel, we're slashing funding to the FAA's air traffic control modernization program. Instead of expanding rail service, we're cutting Amtrak's capital program by 37 percent.

The housing numbers are even worse. This bill cuts funding to housing programs that not only work but have a proven track record of saving the taxpayer money. There's no funding for the Choice Neighborhoods program, which helps communities revitalize distressed neighborhoods. There are significant cuts to the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS program, which is used to house some of the most vulnerable among us, and also another program which saves money. Community Development Block Grants, used by communities across the country, have been cut in half and are at their lowest levels since the Ford administration.

We're cutting investments in our future and essential services to those in need to pay for bloated defense spending the Pentagon often itself says it doesn't need. In the final analysis, countries that succeed invest in research, education, and infrastructure. Mr. Chairman, we're cutting all three.

I joined this committee to make the smart funding choices that will propel our Nation forward, but this bill does just the opposite. I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY).

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I, first of all, want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, the ranking member, and all of the members of the subcommittee for their very good work. Given the allocation they have, they have done their very best.

I would follow up on a number of remarks by my colleagues, including the chairman, and that is we need a deal. And my plea to the membership is we cannot continue to go on like this.

This process no longer is on time. Our year starts October 1. In 2007, we finished in February. In 2008, we finished in December. In 2009, we finished in March. In 2010, we finished in December. In fiscal year 2011, we finished in April. In 2012, we finished in December. This year, we finished on March 26.

Since 2007, we should have enacted 84 individual appropriation bills. We have

enacted nine individually—about 10 percent of our work. Unfortunately, the body has made the work of this subcommittee, the full committee, and the other 11 subcommittees very difficult.

For fiscal year 2013, our committee was given a target in the summer of 2011, under the Budget Control Act. The target was changed under a resolution passed by the House for the budget in the spring of 2012. The target was changed again on January 1, 2013. Subsequently, we have sequestration. My plea to the general membership is, please, just give this exceptional committee one target and let us do our work.

I also am fearful because we are operating most agencies, including the Department of Transportation and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, under a continuing resolution that, for the vast majority of my colleagues, makes no difference. You wouldn't run your house or your business exactly the way you did last year.

□ 1530

We made these agencies wait 7 months to tell them they can keep doing the same thing for another 5 months, and on October 1 of this year we're going to do it again.

Some people say we're spending too much money. I agree, which is why I have actually brought a chart to the floor. We balanced a budget under President Nixon in 1969 for 1 year. We balanced a budget for 4 years under President Clinton. During those years, Federal spending was about 18.9 percent of GDP. For fiscal years 2011, 2012 and 2013, it was about 22.7. The response of this body is: we will do the Budget Control Act, and we will have mindless sequestration and treat all discretionary accounts the same.

Some people say we don't have enough revenue. They're absolutely right. When President Nixon and President Clinton balanced a budget for those 5 years, revenue was 20.1 percent of GDP. Today, it is 16.2.

We had a bill passed on January 1 that effectively now has limited us as far as any future revenue. I would point out 204 Members of this body voted for that bill in a bipartisan fashion, and 219 Members of this body today, in a bipartisan fashion, voted for the Budget Control Act, even though most of them complain about sequestration.

Today, we have the allocations this great subcommittee is faced with, and we are pounding our discretionary accounts. The fact is, in 1963 over 67 percent of what we spent as a national government was an investment in the future, in our children's future. In fiscal year 2012, that was down to 26 percent.

For those who want to continue this madness of going after discretionary spending, and particularly domestic discretionary spending—Department of Transportation, Housing and Urban Development—I would point out that

year, if we had eliminated the Government of the United States, eliminated the Congress and the Presidency and every agency except the Department of Defense and the entitlement programs, and did nothing on taxes, our deficit last year was \$472 billion. It is estimated this year, if we got rid of the Department of Transportation—which I think some people are trying to do with this allocation—if we got rid of HUD, if we got rid of the government, except for defense, except for entitlements, and did nothing on taxes, this year's deficit would be \$153 billion.

The American Society of Civil Engineers this year gave our country—the United States of America, the greatest country on Earth—a D-plus for our infrastructure. I have a bridge that was blown up in my district next to ArcelorMittal and BP. That's not helping create jobs.

They claim we are about \$1.6 trillion short between now and 2020 investing in infrastructure. That's what this bill is about, investing in the future.

We do need a deal; and the chairman mentioned it, the ranking member mentioned it. We do have to talk about entitlements for the sake of our children. What about our children when Social Security is insolvent in 2033? What about our children when Medicare is insolvent in 2024? We need to address those issues; and we need to address the issue of revenue to make sure we have enough to invest in those highways, in those classrooms, in those research institutes so that we can have a full and vibrant economy going forward.

For those who want to balance the budget and are about this madness of sequestration and crushing domestic discretionary spending, hurting defense discretionary spending, I would also point out that the Congressional Budget Office indicated in October of 2011 that for fiscal year 2012, one-third of the deficit would have gone away if we simply were at full employment.

So it is time to talk to each other. It is time to put everything on the table. It is time to invest in this country. And I would hope we do that sooner rather than later.

I appreciate very much the gentleman yielding me time.

Mr. LATHAM. I would inquire of the gentleman from Arizona if he has any more speakers.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, we're waiting for the ranking member of the full committee. She is on her way. So I will fill in the best I can.

Mr. LATHAM. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. First of all, I want to thank my colleague, Mr. VIS-CLOSKY, who is the ranking member on the Defense Appropriations, for his excellent presentation. Also, I join him in making that request to our leadership, both the majority and the minority, that we begin the conversation. We only have a few days before September

30 rolls around. So I would hope that we take his comments seriously and get to work and continue the process of the appropriation and lift the sequestration.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I would yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the distinguished ranking member of the full committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, what a difference a year makes. Last year, Chairman LATHAM put forward a responsible bill that invested in our Nation's infrastructure and the housing needs of our most vulnerable citizens. The bill we consider today, which is \$7.7 billion below the FY 2013 CR level and \$13.9 billion below the President's request, is a stark contrast. For example, last year's bill funded Amtrak's capital program at the highest level ever. This year's bill funds Amtrak at the lowest level in a decade, which will likely cause furloughs of mechanical employees and slower service.

Last year, the chairman spoke out against an amendment offered by Mr. CHAFFETZ to cut the CDBG program to \$2.95 billion—still \$1.3 billion higher than the level in this bill. Member after Member on the majority side spoke out against the cut, noting how important CDBG was to economic development in cities and States across the country. In fact, 17 Republican appropriators, including Chairman ROGERS and Chairman LATHAM, helped to defeat this wrong-headed cut by a vote of 157–267.

What changed? Have these programs become ineffective? Have local infrastructure needs and homelessness disappeared? Or do House Republicans simply support raising local taxes to fund affordable housing and infrastructure investments? Because that will be the result.

Unfortunately, what has changed is that the reckless Republican Ryan budget guts investments in domestic priorities that increase American prosperity. In fact, this bill alone would mean the loss of between 125,000 and 140,000 Tenant-Based Rental Vouchers, cause 146,000 people who are now housed to become homeless, and result in 7,110 fewer jobs created, and \$1.4 billion in lost economic output due to the \$237 million rescission to the TIGER program.

Instead of investing in affordable housing to help people make the transition from dependency to independence and investing in infrastructure to fix deficient transportation systems and create jobs, Republicans would rather defund the Affordable Care Act, block-grant Medicaid, privatize Medicare, while protecting subsidies for Big Oil and tax breaks for the very wealthiest Americans.

The Senate is currently marking up bills at the level to which Democrats and Republicans agreed in the bipartisan Budget Control Act. The Senate T-HUD bill provides a more responsible path that invests in job creation and

assistance to families suffering in this economy. For example, the Senate provides nearly \$10 billion more than the bill we consider today for infrastructure investments that have received strong bipartisan support and would create jobs, including \$1.45 billion to fund Amtrak, more than \$3 billion for the Community Development Block Grant program, \$550 million for the TIGER grant program, and \$1 billion for the HOME program.

If we are to avert a developing crisis and make progress on long-term fiscal challenges, Senate Democrats need a partner in the House majority to conference the budget. The American people, local governments, and small business owners want this budget standoff to end so that we can avoid shutting down the government in October and help them build a stronger economy.

When will Republicans stop holding their livelihoods hostage to the Ryan budget? House Democrats are ready to work with our Republican colleagues to responsibly address our fiscal challenges. However, if they continue to move farther away from consensus by turning once bipartisan bills like this one, T-HUD, into red meat messaging bills for their base, Congress will have a difficult time reaching a balanced agreement before the CR expires in 2 months.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, before I yield back my time, as we start this amendment process, I want to thank and commend the staff of the subcommittee. These are the individuals who worked very hard to bring this bill forward. They worked many hours and put in a lot of time and effort, so before we start the amendment process I want to recognize their hard work.

So I'd like to thank, from the minority staff, Kate Hallahan and Joe Carlile; from the majority staff, Dena Baron, Doug Disrud, Carl Barrick, Cheryle Tucker, and Brian Bernard because they spent countless hours bringing this bill to us.

Mr. Chairman, I commend Chairman LATHAM for doing what he could with this bad allocation, and I look forward to the amendment process.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. I intend to yield back here, but let me associate myself with the comments of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR) about commending the staff. He named everyone. I just wanted to, again, associate myself with that and thank him for being such a great partner through all this. It has been difficult, but the product we have is, I think, as good as we could possibly have with our allocation this year.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chair, the base bill contains divisive policy riders that would pointlessly prohibit federal investment in high-speed rail in California.

Rail has a long history in CA going back to 1869. Prior to “the last spike” joining Central Pacific and Union Pacific railroads, CA was isolated from the rest of the country.

Once the transcontinental railroad was completed, CA started to develop into the urbanized, industrialized economic and political powerhouse that it is today—the 12th largest economy in the world.

What we’re talking about here is jobs. Connecting LA and San Francisco will generate 66,000 jobs annually for 15 years and 2,900 permanent operations jobs for Phase 1. In the Central Valley, initial construction will produce 20,000 jobs annually for five years.

If you want to talk about Return on Investment, the initial state investment of \$2.6 billion from state bond funds will produce a net economic impact of \$8.3 to \$8.8 billion—a 3 to 1 return.

Every year, auto congestion drains \$18.7 billion in lost time and wasteful fuel from the state’s economy.

Our auto congestion is not something we can build ourselves out of . . . travel on CA’s interstate system is increasing at a rate 5 times faster than capacity is added.

Now is the time to invest in High Speed Rail in CA. This bill prohibits federal investment in high-speed rail in California, and fails to make other critically needed investments in our nation’s failing infrastructure: a 37% cut in Amtrak capital funds which will result in deferred maintenance; and a \$139 million cut to Federal Trust Transit Administration capital investment grants that will cancel scheduled projects in California and other states.

American’s sense of itself as an exceptional nation was true when we were investing in our national infrastructure, whether it was: electrification of our rural communities, building our interstate highway system, or connecting the East Coast to the West Coast by rail.

We need to dream big again and not be afraid to make those same kinds of investments in our national infrastructure, like high speed rail, and NextGen for a 21st century air traffic control system.

The American Society of Civil Engineers recently issued their report card for our nation’s infrastructure and the United States got a grade of D+.

This bill should be increasing our grade from a D+ to an A+.

We just need the political will.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, to build a vibrant economy, we must invest in building our nation’s infrastructure in a strategic and cost-effective way. Our businesses and communities need efficient transportation and goods movement; our aging neighborhoods need help to eliminate blight and to encourage additional private investment and business growth; and, our country needs to invest in job creation.

H.R. 2610 does not meet any of these needs. The uncompromising austerity of this bill strips our economy of its footing and imparts damage that will be felt for generations.

Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) programs—critical investments in our infrastructure—will be cut in half by H.R. 2610. These grants are used to stabilize low income neighborhoods with tools that support and stimulate economic vitality. For every federal dollar spent in CDBG funds another \$3 in private and public investment is leveraged.

In Long Beach, CA last year, these grants provided services for 384 new and existing

small businesses, creating many new jobs; provided comprehensive services to 18,000 Long Beach community members, promoting progress towards permanent housing and self-sufficiency—lifting people out of poverty and off government assistance; and, completed exterior repairs and upgrades at 115 business sites revitalizing Long Beach neighborhoods.

Unfortunately, H.R. 2610 eliminates TIGER (Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery Program) grants and it eliminates all funding for the Sustainable Communities Initiative—both are models of collaborative and efficient government. These two models support sustainable regional transportation systems and land use planning to promote economic health and workable communities, respectively.

America cannot afford to divest in its infrastructure. I ask for a “no” vote on H.R. 2610.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to the Fiscal Year 2014 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, THUD, appropriations bill being considered before the House. This bill fails in almost every regard to prioritize our Nation’s crumbling infrastructure, expand affordable housing opportunities for low- and moderate-income Americans, and strengthen local economies through direct investment and job creation.

The House bill cuts \$7.7 billion from the enacted level for FY2013, slashing funds for vital community development programs, TIGER grants and high-speed rail projects, and even key assistance grants for our most vulnerable segment of the population: homeless individuals and families. This bill already cuts more than \$4 billion below the post-sequester amounts for FY2013, consistent with the terrible assumptions included in the Ryan Budget that the Defense Department will be spared from this shared sacrifice. Simply put, this bill will place the burden of these cuts squarely on the backs of low- and moderate-income Americans.

The FY2014 THUD appropriations bill is just another example of House Republicans’ refusal to work across the aisle to develop a sensible and bipartisan budget agreement that does not threaten our economic growth and competitiveness. Instead, my Republican colleagues have deliberately chosen to ignore the demands of the American people by developing a budget that makes drastic cuts to public programs without any deliberation on the basis of need or the public good.

Mr. Chair, the FY2014 THUD appropriations bill is simply unworkable in its current form. The drastic and indiscriminate cuts found in this bill will undermine critical investments in our Nation’s infrastructure, hollow out vital housing programs, and destroy jobs.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment who has caused it to be printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2610

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

Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary, \$102,481,000, of which not to exceed \$2,618,000 shall be available for the Immediate Office of the Secretary; not to exceed \$984,000 shall be available for the Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary; not to exceed \$19,867,000 shall be available for the Office of the General Counsel; not to exceed \$10,107,000 shall be available for the Office of the Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy; not to exceed \$11,572,000 shall be available for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs; not to exceed \$2,500,000 shall be available for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs; not to exceed \$23,376,000 shall be available for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration; not to exceed \$2,020,000 shall be available for the Office of Public Affairs; not to exceed \$1,595,000 shall be available for the Office of the Executive Secretariat; not to exceed \$1,369,000 shall be available for the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization; not to exceed \$10,778,000 for the Office of Intelligence, Security, and Emergency Response; and not to exceed \$15,695,000 shall be available for the Office of the Chief Information Officer: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Transportation is authorized to transfer funds appropriated for any office of the Office of the Secretary to any other office of the Office of the Secretary: *Provided further*, That no appropriation for any office shall be increased or decreased by more than 5 percent by all such transfers: *Provided further*, That notice of any change in funding greater than 5 percent shall be submitted for approval to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$60,000 shall be for allocation within the Department for official reception and representation expenses as the Secretary may determine: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, excluding fees authorized in Public Law 107-71, there may be credited to this appropriation up to \$2,500,000 in funds received in user fees: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for the position of Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Today’s bill is part of the House majority’s irresponsible charade of a budget process. The sequester cuts affecting 2013 spending levels are having a tangible impact on American families and hurting our economy: 70,000 children losing access to Head Start; 4 million fewer Meals on Wheels delivered; \$1.5 billion in cuts to the National Institutes of Health’s lifesaving medical research and jobs; degraded military readiness; furloughs and reduced paychecks for hundreds of thousands of Federal employees; and delayed safety modernization at airports.

□ 1545

My friends on the other side of the aisle want it both ways. They adopted

a budget resolution that endorses the sequester levels for next year, locking in a top-line figure \$92 billion below the Senate's and the President's budget levels, while they pretend they fixed the sequester for defense. They cut more than required on the domestic side and did nothing to shield defense programs from legally mandated cuts under sequestration. If the House bills are enacted, defense will be cut \$48 billion in January as a result of the sequester because the majority has not enacted legislation to stop it—\$48 billion when General Dempsey has made it very clear to those of us who have had recent talks with him that our readiness is at stake.

The Republicans allocated more adequate funding to the initial bills to fund military construction, veterans affairs, defense, and homeland security. The remaining bills have quickly revealed the Republicans' thoroughly inadequate investments to sustain job creation and invest in America's future prosperity.

Perhaps no other bill's programs mean as much to the communities in our districts as the bill we are considering today, yet it guts affordable housing and community development and underfunds rail, air, and road transportation networks.

The same majority wrote a very different bill last year that reflected an understanding of the impact these programs have on our economy and Americans' livelihoods.

Compare the House bill to the Senate version, which is almost \$10 billion higher. Seventy-three Senators, including 19 Republicans, voted to proceed to floor debate. The House bill, on the other hand, was reported from committee on a straight party-line vote.

I would be hard-pressed to find a better example of fiddling while Rome burns than the House majority's budget and appropriations process this year. They continue to trot out bills despite White House veto threats and despite even worse sequestration cuts right around the corner.

I have asked at our committee to suspend our markup until we conference a budget resolution with the Senate so that we can negotiate a reasonable top line for the appropriations process. There is no sense in the House proceeding alone with levels totally unacceptable to the White House and the Senate, yet we will be here late into the evening again considering amendments to a bill that is going nowhere.

When the House returns after the August recess, we will have only 9 legislative days until the end of the fiscal year: 9 days to negotiate a path forward, 9 days to avert a government shutdown, 9 days to do the jobs we were sent here to do—work together to invest in America and build up our economy.

I genuinely hope our majority will be prepared in the fall for the necessary compromise these negotiations require,

because this bill shows they are not prepared for responsible governance today.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the report for this year's Transportation, Housing and Urban Development bill, the "THUD" bill, as I noted earlier, states:

The Nation is in desperate need for infrastructure and investment.

I am glad we can agree on that. We are indeed in desperate need, yet the bill before us hardly reflects that. It chooses to prioritize spending cuts over putting Americans back to work. It is part of a budget process that places antitax ideology above all and refuses to address the main drivers of the deficit. Instead, it simply doubles down on sequestration, making sequestration even worse with respect to the domestic bills so as to give some measure of protection to defense. It is an atrocious process, and this bill is Exhibit A for this travesty.

We all know America's surface transportation network is essential for moving goods and services, as well as people, in an efficient manner. Unfortunately, that transportation system is becoming increasingly outdated and ineffective. The American Society of Civil Engineers recently gave America's infrastructure a cumulative grade of "D."

Congestion, aging trains and roads, and thousands of structurally deficient bridges are imposing real costs on the American people and on the American economy. It is estimated that Americans spend 4.2 billion hours a year stuck in traffic. I can testify to sharing that experience last Sunday. This costs the economy \$78.2 billion annually. The poor condition of our roads costs motorists another \$67 billion a year in repairs and operating expenses.

The civil engineers stated that "current spending amounts to only about half of the needed investment." Instead, similar to the proposed Ryan budget, this Republican fiscal year 2014 THUD bill would underfund programs that provide critical investments in transportation alternatives and smart growth, providing about \$2 billion in total for transit programs, which is about a 17 percent cut from last year.

The bill would completely eliminate funding for the overwhelmingly popular and successful TIGER grant program, which invests in multimodal projects, including roads and bridges, transit, high-speed and intercity passenger rail, freight rail, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and ports—these things that promise to achieve critical national objectives and make our communities more livable and sustainable. On top of that, the bill would even rescind funding for the fiscal year 2013 TIGER grant process that is already under way.

The bill also decreases funding for the Federal Transit Administration's New Starts and Small Starts program, which is the primary source of Federal support for major transit capital projects that are locally planned, implemented, and operated. They are critical for leveraging local investment to implement transit alternatives.

And then for yet another year, the bill provides zero dollars for development of high-speed rail corridor development. I speak as a representative of a State where high-speed rail development between Raleigh and Charlotte is well under way and holds great promise. Yet this bill denies further resources, denies that kind of support for other parts of the country. Our Nation has a major competitiveness gap in this area. These investments make sense. Sometimes you have to spend some money to make some money, and high-speed rail investments have a synergistic impact. They upgrade our rail infrastructure, they improve the mobility of goods and people, and they create jobs.

Finally, Amtrak. This bill is pathetic with respect to Amtrak—only \$950 million total. Of this, only \$600 million goes to the capital account. That is a 37 percent reduction from last year and more than \$1 billion less than the administration's request for capital.

You can figure out how this is going to work. You subtract from that amount Amtrak's required mandatory debt service, that is \$200 million; safety-critical work and inspections and maintenance mandated by Federal law, that is another \$200 million; and new equipment expected to be delivered this year that will add capacity and improve returns on long-distance trains, that is \$100 million. So you see where that money is going. It leaves almost nothing for capital investment in the national system, including improving accessibility for passengers with disabilities.

When you are cutting things this closely, it means the work you are going to do is going to be done less efficiently. Amtrak will have to fix problems only as they occur. It will defer major work. That is bad policy. It is bad economics. If Amtrak deteriorates, service will suffer, revenue will suffer, Amtrak's costs will go up, and that will eventually be reflected in higher appropriations needs in the future.

Mr. Chairman, transportation investments help improve the mobility of millions of Americans and provide alternatives to congested roadways. They foster the development of more livable communities and are proven job-creators. It is absolutely penny wise and pound foolish to shortchange these investments. I urge defeat of this bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, by gutting investments in transportation

and housing, the majority is proposing to bring our Nation backward at a time when we must be building the infrastructure needed to compete and win in a competitive global economy.

For example, with today's legislation, the majority is proposing to slash the Community Development Block Grant program by almost half. These cuts would be devastating to the working poor in communities like Rochester, New York, which I represent, where block grants provide housing assistance and investments in neighborhoods that are woefully underserved.

Furthermore, the majority is proposing to gut investments in infrastructure projects, and particularly passenger rail. They do so at a time when rail ridership continues to grow across the country.

In Rochester, the Amtrak ridership has been increased by 89 percent since 2008, despite the fact that decades of underinvestment have resulted in aging rails, delayed trains we have to sidetrack to let the freight go by, and a crumbling train station.

I want to say something about this train station. It was built over 45 years ago as a temporary train station. It has not, in all these years, been ADA compliant. You cannot imagine what it is like to get somebody in a wheelchair from the station up onto the train, or to watch a mother with a stroller struggle to get up there because it is impossible to do. 144,000 people went through that railroad station last year, and they deserve something more like the 21st century.

I have fought years to improve train travel; and we are finally getting to build, with a TIGER grant, a new intermodal station in the heart of the city. Like countless other cities and towns, our work has been supported by Federal TIGER grants, which have provided vital support in modernizing our city's infrastructure. The funding is allowing Rochester and countless other communities to build the roads, rails, and runways we need to compete for the jobs of the future. But we cannot allow that to happen if we cut out the very means by which we fund them.

Ridership, as I have said, on Amtrak's high-speed Acela, which I wish we had—we only have one sort-of-high-speed rail in New York—continues to reach record highs, and States like California and Illinois and North Carolina are already building high-speed rail lines. That is terribly important.

As cochair of the bicameral Congressional High-Speed Passenger Rail Caucus, I will soon be joined today by fellow members who realize the incredible value of Amtrak and nationwide passenger rail to our country.

The truth is that our rail system reaches throughout our economy and supports tens of thousands of jobs. The bill before us today endangers these jobs, including the jobs of 20,000 Amtrak employees and the private businesses who sold \$1.3 billion worth of domestic goods and services to Amtrak last year.

As my colleagues will tell you, endangering jobs today and our economy is a recipe for failure, especially at a time when our infrastructure really needs to be upgraded. As we rebuild places like Afghanistan, it always makes me so angry. If they are going to be building high-speed rail there, I want to build it in New York, in America somewhere.

Let me tell you this story, which I think will bring it home to all of you.

In 1893, the president of New York Central Railroad, for reasons I'm not really clear, lived way out in upstate New York. He had to commute to New York City every day during the week and spent the weekends at home. In 1893, they decided they would have a race with steam engines, so they raced the few miles between Buffalo and Rochester to see which one of those engines were the fastest. Mr. Chair, they set a world record by traveling at 112½ miles an hour between Rochester and Buffalo.

Today, we are on the same track. It hasn't been improved any, but we can't go anywhere near like that. There is no way we can get even close to 80 miles an hour. We can't do that. Mostly it is about 40. It takes a lot longer now to travel from Rochester to Buffalo than it did in 1893.

□ 1600

Crumbling infrastructure like this is not only harmful to our economy but is an embarrassment to a Nation that has never been scared to dream big, and while it is true that our Nation has faced challenges over the past few years, we need big answers.

The proposed bill fails our country now and into the future. Now is not the moment to stop investing in our country nor is it the time to resign ourselves to a future of diminished success. Instead, it is a time to roll up our sleeves and to put our country back to work.

We can answer the call of a generation by investing in the future, and we can build a better, more prosperous America one road, one runway, and one rail line at a time. So I urge my colleagues to reject the cynical and backwards-looking legislation that is before us.

I yield back the balance of my time.

[From the New York Times, May 12, 1893]

GREAT SPEED ON THE CENTRAL

EMPIRE STATE EXPRESS ENGINE TRAVELS AT THE RATE OF 112½ MILES AN HOUR

BUFFALO, NY, May 11.—If the New-York Central officials wanted a record for their new engine, No. 999, preparatory to exhibiting her at the World's Fair, they have got one now that beats the world. It is 112½ miles an hour.

On Tuesday the Empire State Express, drawn by this marvelous machine, made 102 miles an hour, a great record in itself, but Engineer Charles Hogan said she was not feeling well that day and could do better. She was given a night's rest here, and yesterday morning was brought out, looking ponderous, trim, and stately, and sent down to Syracuse for another trial.

The Empire State Express arrived in Syracuse on time, and Hogan and No. 999 were ready to take her. The engine was coupled on and the train left Syracuse on time. Hogan let her out a few times on the way to Rochester, just to see if she was feeling good, and finding that she responded to every touch of the throttle he contentedly bided his time. He did not want to get ahead of his schedule and he brought her into the Rochester depot at just the right moment. The test of speed was to come between Rochester and this city. Soon after leaving Rochester Hogan slowed her down a little, for he intended to make up the time at the western end of the trip. Passing Batavia, the train was rushing along at an easy gait of a mile a minute. Then Hogan let her out. The speed increased as the engine flew along, and just before reaching Crittenden the record of Tuesday of a mile in thirty-five seconds was equaled. But this was exceeded just this side of that station, when the new world's record of a mile in thirty-two seconds was made.

This is equivalent to 112½ miles an hour. A speed nearly as great was kept up until Forks Station was reached, and then Hogan slowed her down and allowed her to enter Buffalo at her customary speed, arriving on time.

The passengers on board said that the train flew along with the same steadiness that would have accompanied a slower rate of speed. There was no unusual swaying or jolting, and only persons who were looking out for manifestations of extraordinary speed would have noticed that the clinkety-click of the rails sounded like the roar of musketry, and the telegraph poles along the track seemed like pickets in a fence.

At a meeting of the Executive Committee of the New-York Central Railroad yesterday the determination was reached to begin the running of the twenty-hour train to Chicago on the 28th inst. The train will be known as the "Exposition Flier." The question of fare has not yet been definitely settled. Doubtless the action of the Trunk Line Presidents today will have some effect on the rate. An advance of from \$5 to \$10 on the regular fare will probably be charged. The speed of this fast train will be about fifty miles an hour.

Mr. NADLER. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the FY14 Transportation-HUD appropriations bill.

This bill is the perfect illustration of the majority's cruel and misguided priorities. We hear a lot from the other side about how we need to cut the budget, reduce the deficit and rein in spending, but, clearly, that's just rhetoric. Last week, the majority put a bill on the floor that increased defense spending substantially, including extra funding for programs the administration and the military didn't want and have no intention of using. The reality is that the majority in this House is perfectly willing to increase spending for things they care about, like military contracts, but not for ensuring adequate housing, investing in economic and community development or even in transportation infrastructure.

The bill before us today is so bad that it's hard to imagine how it can be fixed. The House bill is fully \$10 billion less than the Senate bill, and it's virtually impossible to find offsets for amendments to improve the bill, but

it's important for us to highlight some of the egregious cuts, such as the drastic cuts to the Amtrak capital and operating budget. Just a few years ago, Congress passed the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act, PRIIA, which authorized a total of \$9.8 billion for Amtrak for the fiscal years 2009 through 2013, but the actual appropriations for Amtrak over this time period was \$2.5 billion below the authorized amount.

There is no question we need to invest more in our railroads. A working group for the National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission reported that the total capital cost estimate of establishing a national intercity passenger rail network between now and 2050 would be about \$357 billion, or a little over \$8 billion annually. We are nowhere near that, and the bill before us today takes us in exactly the wrong direction. This bill slashes Amtrak's capital program by 37 percent and Amtrak's operations by 25 percent from last year's enacted level.

These funding levels would have a drastic impact on Amtrak's ability to maintain service. Once you take into account Amtrak's financial obligations, such as contract payments and federally mandated safety work, Amtrak would have only \$100 million to cover the investment needs of the entire system. The Northeast corridor alone requires about \$780 million per year to address longstanding state of good repair needs, and Amtrak will have to defer maintenance, which will cause service delays and interruptions, and increased costs in the long run.

This is idiotic. I know some people are Amtrak haters no matter the facts, but here are a few more facts that are noteworthy.

Commuter lines on the Northeast corridor carry 235 million passengers every year. These are mostly business travelers who rely on the reliability of Amtrak's rail in order for them to get to work and foster economic growth. If Amtrak cannot maintain the rails adequately, all of these commuter rail systems around all of our major cities will stop being efficient, will stop being able to transport their people.

Amtrak employs nearly 20,000 people in 46 States. Amtrak employees paid more than \$64 million in State and local taxes last year. Amtrak did business for suppliers equaling about \$1.3 billion last year. Cutting funding for Amtrak jeopardizes all of this economic activity and all of the good-paying jobs associated with it. It will ultimately cost taxpayers a lot of money in the long run.

Amtrak provides a vital service for communities all around the country. We should be increasing investments in Amtrak and developing intercity and high-speed rail. This bill includes no funds whatsoever for the TIGER grant program. In fact, it rescinds \$237 million in previous TIGER funds. The bill also includes no funding for the

Projects of National and Regional Significance account, which is authorized under the MAP-21 bill that we passed last year but that is now subject to general fund appropriations. The New Starts program will fund some new transit programs, but that account is cut as well, and there is only enough funding to maintain commitments to projects currently in the pipeline. So there are, essentially, no programs to fund any new construction of major transportation projects.

The majority has offered no solutions for how to invest in future economic growth, to facilitate interstate commerce and to maintain our global competitiveness. I urge my colleagues to reject these disastrous cuts to Amtrak, these disastrous cuts to TIGER and to general infrastructure, and to support moving us back toward an intelligent transportation policy. I have to urge a "no" vote on the FY14 Transportation-HUD appropriations bill.

Later in this debate, I will discuss the equally disastrous cuts in Community Development Block Grants. It's just another example of how this bill is dismantling the United States.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. FATTAH. I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of New York). The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I come to address the House, the Congress of the United States.

We are the wealthiest country in the world. We are the most powerful country in the world. We have one program that focuses on improving the lives and life chances of people in our lower-income communities across our country. It's called the Community Development Block Grant. It was created under Republican President Richard Nixon in 1974.

Since its inception, we have invested about \$132 billion in some 1,209 communities across our country. Over the life of this program, we have invested about the same amount as we took to build the International Space Station. In 1 year, we spent approximately the same amount in Afghanistan. This year, we are spending \$3.3 billion on the Community Development Block Grant, which is the lowest amount in the history of our Nation.

What the majority, my friends on the other side, are proposing in this appropriations bill is to spend the least amount ever on this effort. They want to slash it from \$3.3 billion to \$1.6 billion. Now, it's not that they are mean-spirited. It is because the allocation for this bill is fatally deficient. It is too low to meet the needs of the greatest country on Earth in so many respects that we could be here all day in pointing out the deficiencies, but I want to focus on just this one program.

Because it was created by a Republican President, it operates in the most, I think, approving way for those on the other team. That is to say that

these are grants for which all of the decisions are made at the local level by Republican and Democratic Governors, by Republican and Democratic local officials. They decide what the priorities are going to be to help uplift these communities. So it's unfortunate that they would single out this particular program—the only program that we have to help the neediest communities across our country. I've seen it. It has worked in local business districts, encouraging small business development. I've seen its work in helping seniors put in major systems repair and heating and windows or roofing so that they can be protected in the winter.

This is a great program, even though it was developed by a President of the other party. It operates through local decisionmaking. It's already at the lowest level ever, and if you added up what we've invested in it in all of these years, it wouldn't add up to what we've spent in building the International Space Station. If we added up all that we've spent on it in all of these years, it barely gets to the number we spend in 1 year in Afghanistan, but we still think somehow we should cut it in half.

It's a wrongheaded decision. I would ask that we reconsider it. I know the allocation is tough, but it's going to be a lot tougher on so many more Americans who live in communities, in being reminded of what Jay-Z said, that have their shades on and are just waiting on the Sun to shine their way. I would ask my colleagues to think about that as we go forward. Think about the wrongheadedness of this and how unworthy it is for the greatest country on Earth to say to its citizens who need our help that somehow we can spend money in Afghanistan—in some far off place—or that we can build a great International Space Station, which I support, but that we can't do anything about the challenges in these neighborhoods. I ask the entire House to live up to our responsibilities in a much different way than we are doing now.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRIFFIN OF ARKANSAS

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 13, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$500,000)".

Page 56, line 25, after the first dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$500,000)".

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

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, on March 29, 2013, the ExxonMobil Pegasus pipeline in Mayflower, Arkansas, spilled thousands of gallons of oil into the homes and onto the properties surrounding the ruptured pipelines. I am committed to making things right for the people of Mayflower by ensuring that another spill like this doesn't occur again in Arkansas.

The U.S. Department of Transportation Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, PHMSA, is responsible for regulating and ensuring the safe and secure movement of oil and petroleum products to industry and consumers through our Nation's interstate pipelines. As an interstate pipeline, the inspection of the Pegasus pipeline was PHMSA's responsibility.

Pipelines move nearly two-thirds of the oil and petroleum products transported annually. Interstate pipelines deliver over 11.3 billion barrels of petroleum each year. The cost to transport a barrel of petroleum products from Houston to the New York Harbor is about a dollar. American pipelines are indisputably the safest way to move oil, and I remain supportive of the pipeline infrastructure as it will provide important jobs and energy to Americans, but we've got to make sure these pipelines are safe. Every year, pipelines transport more than 11 billion barrels of oil, and last year, less than five ten-thousandths of 1 percent of it was lost to spills.

We've got to do what we can to make sure spills that did occur don't happen again. Although the number of spills is a minimal fraction of what we safely transport throughout the country, I know that we can still make more certain the safety of our Nation's pipelines. I continue to support the safe transport of our Nation's oil and petroleum products, and I have introduced my amendment to increase the budget for PHMSA's operational expenses by \$500,000 to further ensure the safety of our Nation's pipelines.

This appropriation finances the operational support costs for PHMSA, including agency-wide functions of administration, management, policy development, legal counsel, budget, financial management, civil rights, human resources, acquisition services, information technology, and governmental and public affairs.

I ask that the House support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

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

Mr. LATHAM. I think it is very well thought out. The gentleman does have it offset, so the committee position on this side would be to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), who talked about the underfunding of so many important

programs in this bill but, in particular, of the Community Development Block Grant program.

When we talk about our national security, it means more than the number of missiles that we possess, and it means more than the number of military bases we have overseas. It means as well—and just as importantly—many of the priorities that are contained in the Transportation and Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill.

That is why it pains me to come to the floor today to lament about how woefully underfunded key transportation, infrastructure and housing programs are in this bill—programs that revitalize our communities, help our neighbors secure affordable housing, and support smart economic development.

□ 1615

The bill, as it is before us today, simply put, is unfixable at its current allocation level. There are programs like the HOME program, which is at its lowest funding level in its history. Just so my colleagues understand, the HOME program is a critical Federal investment utilized by States and localities to provide affordable rental and homeownership opportunities for low-income households. As we recover from a damaging recession, these cuts in this program will put further strain on affordable housing opportunities.

This bill also severely underfunds tenant-based rental assistance, project-based rental assistance, and the Public Housing Capital Fund. I continue to hear from housing advocates in my home State of Massachusetts, and their message is consistent and clear: we need more funding in these accounts to ensure that all families have access to affordable, comfortable, and stable housing.

The families that we're talking about aren't losing sleep overnight wondering whether they're going to be attacked from some country overseas. They're losing sleep overnight because they don't know whether they're going to have shelter to protect their own families. They're worried about their own security in this country, and yet we are underfunding these programs so significantly.

I'm especially concerned, as my colleague from Pennsylvania stated, about the proposed reduction in Community Development Block Grant funding. This bill cuts CDBG formula grants by nearly 50 percent and funds this program at its lowest level since its creation in the 1970s.

In April, I joined with 143 bipartisan Members on a programmatic request letter to appropriators in support of \$3.3 billion for this program. In July, after the subcommittee's legislation was released, 101 bipartisan Members wrote to the Appropriations Committee again expressing support for effective funding levels. There is demonstrated bipartisan support for Com-

munity Development Block Grants, Mr. Chairman, because these dollars are at work in communities in each of our districts.

Last week, Governor Deval Patrick of Massachusetts announced that 38 communities in Massachusetts will receive over \$31 million in CDBG funding. These dollars will fund housing rehabilitation, child care centers, cityscape improvements, and social services, just to name a few. I also want to point out that every \$1 in Community Development Block Grants leverages an additional \$3.55 in funding to revitalize our communities. Investing these Federal dollars in our cities and in our towns spurs redevelopment efforts and provides a high return on our investment. These funds also create and save jobs. Since fiscal year 2005, these funds have created or retained over 300,000 jobs. If my friends on the other side of the aisle are serious about job creation, CDBG is not the place to cut.

Realizing the need for effective funding, the Senate appropriations bill funds the program at \$3.15 billion. So, should this bill go to conference, Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject these cuts in the House bill and support robust funding for Community Development Block Grants, a program with a proven record of supporting community development efforts across our country.

Let's stop these reckless and harmful cuts to our communities. We ought to be on the floor today fixing sequestration. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle should be on the floor today appointing conferees on the budget so that we can negotiate more reasonable allocations on these appropriations bills.

I would remind my colleagues that this is not some abstract debate that we're having here today on the floor. These cuts will hurt real people. They will pave the way for more deterioration of our cities and towns. They will cost jobs and they will hurt our economy. Enough is enough. We're supposed to be helping people, not hurting people. It's time for Congress to get its priorities straight.

I urge my colleagues to support the CDBG program, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I rise to enter into a colloquy with my colleague, Mr. LATHAM, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. LATHAM. I would be happy to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I know that you know that our Nation suffers from a spending-driven debt crisis and the only real remedy is to quit spending money that we don't have. But because the President would not

work with us to enact meaningful, targeted spending discipline, his sequester has been enacted.

Mr. Chairman, we are stewards of the taxpayers' dollars; and with the President's sequester in place, I believe that it's more critical than ever that our Nation's transportation funding be spent wisely, including funding for the FAA's Contract Tower Program because, Mr. Chairman, in Washington, it's not always how much money you spend that counts; it's how you spend the money.

I would ask the distinguished chairman to work with me and other Members to ensure that this critical funding is allocated to the facilities that represent the greatest cost benefit to the taxpayer.

Mr. LATHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENSARLING. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. I appreciate the gentleman's attention to this issue. I look forward to working with him and the FAA to ensure that our limited Federal dollars go to towers that provide the greatest benefit to the taxpayer.

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the chairman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 2610. This bill, which was crafted to conform to the strangling and senseless limits of the Ryan budget, would cut the total discretionary funding for the Transportation-HUD appropriations measure by \$7.7 billion below the enacted fiscal year 2013 appropriation and by more than \$4 billion below the level of funding provided after sequestration took effect.

These cuts would devastate programs like the Community Development Block Grant program and the HOME program, which are essential to supporting development in cities throughout our Nation and to providing housing and other services to our most vulnerable citizens.

This bill would also be devastating to our national passenger rail service, Amtrak; and that is the specific issue I will address today.

The bill before us would cut the capital grant provided to Amtrak by some \$352 million and cut the operating grant by \$119 million below the enacted fiscal year 2013 levels. Such cuts would likely force Amtrak to reduce its maintenance levels and furlough maintenance personnel. Such cuts may even lead to reduced service on the Northeast corridor, the critical link on the eastern seaboard among Washington, D.C., Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, and Boston.

In their views on the Transportation-HUD appropriations measure, the mi-

nority noted that this bill is out of touch with reality and that it is nowhere more evident than in the proposed funding level for Amtrak.

While the House majority has undertaken a relentless effort to destroy Amtrak, the traveling public has made it clear they consider Amtrak to be an essential part of our Nation's transportation network.

Amtrak finished fiscal year 2012 having carried more than 31 million passengers—the highest number of passengers in any year since Amtrak was created. This total included more than 11 million passengers who traveled on the Northeast corridor. Together, the long-distance routes had their highest passenger volumes in 19 years and Amtrak set 12 consecutive monthly ridership records in fiscal year 2012. To put this number in perspective, if Amtrak were an airline, it would be the sixth largest in the country.

Americans have voted with their ticket purchases, and they are choosing to ride Amtrak in greater numbers. In fact, record ridership growth is continuing in fiscal year 2013. Rather than seeking to destroy a service critical to our Nation's mobility, we should be investing in this system to ensure it can continue to meet increased passenger demand with increased speed and efficiency.

Significant infrastructure improvements are needed all along the Northeast corridor to create truly high-speed rail service. In Maryland, for example, the B&P tunnel, which carries every train traveling into Washington, D.C., from all points north of the city, must be replaced. This tunnel was opened in 1873 and its design limits train speeds to 30 miles per hour. We would not think of relying on technology from the 1870s in other aspects of our lives. We wouldn't want medical technology or communications technology from the 1870s. And we should not be content to rely on transportation infrastructure from the 1870s.

The President has rightly threatened to veto this bill; and rather than waste the House's time on legislation like this that threatens to degrade our transportation networks and delay passengers and commerce, we should be considering bills that will make long overdue investments to expand our mobility and support our economic growth. Rather than cutting investments in Amtrak, we should be investing in the development of truly high-speed rail on the Northeast corridor and throughout the northeastern United States.

And before we consider this or any other appropriations measures, the House and Senate should follow regular order by appointing conferees who can resolve a budget that can be adopted by both bodies and that can then guide the development of appropriations measures for fiscal year 2014.

I urge Members to oppose this misguided legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, this Transportation-Housing and Urban Development bill before us today is the latest in a long series of appropriations bills from the House majority that grossly underfunds the fundamental priorities of American families. Every time we see a new appropriations bill come from this majority, the vital national needs that are meant to be covered in that legislation have been cut to the bone.

In this case, this bill makes deep cuts in everything from the upkeep of the traffic control system to Amtrak to Community Development Block Grants and HOME grants. This bill endangers our infrastructure, our public safety, and our communities. It is yet another example of the problems created by the majority's obsessive fixation on slashing all nondefense spending programs to the detriment of the priorities we were elected to uphold.

Let's step back for a moment and look at the big picture. The Budget Control Act of 2011 placed strict limits on appropriations—defense as well as domestic—that are scheduled to remain in place through 2021. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has estimated that these caps will reduce spending by a total of \$840 billion over 10 years, compared to the policies previously in place.

Now, on top of these Budget Control Act caps, we also have the deep and indiscriminate across-the-board cuts caused by sequestration. Despite claims to the contrary by this majority, the effects of the sequester cuts are real. They're real and they are damaging. We are talking about children losing access to Head Start and the opportunities for their growth and development that early childhood education provides. Low-income women will lose access to the cancer screenings that could save their lives. Seniors will be hungry because Meals on Wheels distribution has been pared back.

When the new school year starts in September, school districts already struggling to make ends meet will face an additional across-the-board 5 percent cut in Federal aid. And in terms of medical research, the National Institutes of Health will be supporting the smallest number of research project grants this year in more than a decade.

These cuts will have profound and lasting consequences for families, for students, for the pace of scientific research. But despite that, the majority apparently thinks that the problem with sequestration, at least when it comes to domestic spending, is that the cuts were too small. They have been assembling a series of bills for 2014 that cut the resources for nondefense programs by a total of almost \$47 billion below the 2013 postsequester level.

That is not the right direction for this country. That's not what we ought to be doing.

In total, the majority's 2014 budget bills will bring funding for nondefense appropriations to their lowest level on record as a share of GDP, with records on this basis going back to 1976. In other words, the majority proposes to spend less, relative to the economy, on things like infrastructure, scientific research, education, environmental protection—the key investments that grow our economy—than at any time in nearly the last 40 years.

Within the total, some bills are targeted for larger cuts than others. Sequestration already cuts the transportation, housing, and infrastructure programs covered in today's bill by more than \$3 billion, and this legislation would slash another \$4.4 billion.

□ 1630

That's bad enough, but the largest cuts of all come in the Labor-Health and Human Services-Education bill, which the majority seems to consider the very lowest priority. The allocation to that bill starts with this year's \$7 billion in sequestration cuts, and then cuts \$28 billion more. Think about it for a moment. For programs like education, medical research, job training, public health, the majority does not just want to double down on sequestration; they want to quadruple down.

This is not about saving money or reducing the deficit. This is about ideology, pure and simple. The majority's approach is not required by the Budget Control Act. On the contrary, in total, their bills are \$47.7 billion below the Budget Control Act cap on non-defense spending, and that is the cap with sequestration in place.

Because this bill is already far leaner than even the BCA and sequestration require, there are no offsets to be had to ameliorate the deep and dangerous cuts to Community Development Block Grants, housing, Amtrak, or mass transit. The bottom line is the majority is very explicitly trying to underfund the priorities in this legislation. They have put forward a budget that sets our government and our Nation up to fail.

This is not the right choice for America, for our kids or our future. Responsible budgeting means making key investments that grow the economy and improve American families' quality of life. This is just not a responsible budget. I urge defeat of this grossly inadequate bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to join my colleagues in strong support of the Community Development Block Grant program and the tremendous benefits that this program has afforded millions

of low- and moderate-income Americans since its inception in 1974 under Republican leadership. The Community Development Block Grant is a vital tool that the Department of Housing and Urban Development uses to provide for new developments and affordable housing in local communities all across the country.

The fiscal year 2014 House Transportation-Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill indiscriminately slashes the grants by almost half, or \$1.6 billion less than the current \$3.3 billion for fiscal year 2013. These cuts do not reflect a change in need or have any basis in reality, and they would do incredible harm to local communities across the entire Nation.

The House version of this bill is simply unworkable in its current form, and it plainly ignores many of the benefits that the CDBG program provides for the 1,209 State and local governments that receive these grants. Since 1974, CDBG has invested over \$135 billion in local economies. Every dollar that has been invested leverages an additional \$3.55 in non-CDBG funding, which can go toward improving existing infrastructure, new jobs, and housing repairs, as well as homeownership assistance. By slashing CDBG funding, the House majority will invariably bring harm to countless low- and moderate-income Americans. I'm not prepared to do that, and neither are many of us, even many Republican colleagues.

Cuts from years prior have already had devastating consequences. The city of Dallas, for example, is considering another round of cuts or eliminating certain programs entirely in light of projected budget reductions. For Dallas, this could mean eliminating grants for affordable housing developers, shrinking the Mortgage Assistance Program, and decimating new home construction in areas targeted by CDBG revitalization.

Mr. Chairman, the fiscal year 2014 Transportation-Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill will bring considerable harm, and considering it this week is just another example of the misguided policies of the current Republican majority. As long as the current majority Republicans refuse to work together with House Democrats to develop a sensible budget framework, the American people will continue to suffer the consequences of draconian cuts to invaluable social programs.

When we shut down everything, it does not help us economically. It shuts us down. It moves us backwards. There is a right way and a wrong way, and we cannot continue to do it the way this current Republican majority is pushing.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to join my colleagues today in advocating for critical investments to rebuild our Nation's transportation infrastructure. The bill we are considering this week makes devastating cuts that will have serious consequences on our ability to compete in the global economy and ensure the stability and well-being of local communities.

The fact of the matter is that our infrastructure is crumbling, with the American Society of Civil Engineers grading the United States with a D-plus on their annual report card assessing the condition of America's infrastructure. In my home State of Rhode Island, 21 percent of our 757 bridges are structurally deficient and in need of repairs.

In the short-term, supporting our Nation's roads, rails, and airports will generate job growth in a construction sector that remains hard hit from the recession—employing the talented, capable men and women of the building trades to rebuild America.

In a rapidly changing global economy, the ability to quickly and safely transport goods, services, and information is a real advantage. To compete successfully, every American business, from energy companies and manufacturers to technology companies and farmers, must have access to a world-class connected transportation system.

But to maintain this edge, virtually every expert has said we must continue to invest in rebuilding America. If you don't believe me, look at the strategic decisions being made by competing nations. Just last week, China's Ministry of Rails announced plans to invest another \$32 billion to upgrade their rail system. In June, President Putin proposed investing \$43 billion to build a new superhighway in Moscow, modernize the Trans-Siberian Railway, and construct a brand-new 500-mile high-speed rail line.

While Russia and China are betting on their economic future, my friends on the other side of the aisle have offered a bill that would unquestionably set us back. This bill guts investments in our railroads, cutting more than \$468 million in funding for Amtrak compared to fiscal year 2013 enacted levels and eliminates all funding for high-speed rail.

This bill cuts intercity passenger rail despite recent reports demonstrating how rail has been an area of growth. According to a report from the Brookings Institution last year, Amtrak was our Nation's fastest growing mode of transportation in the last 15 years.

My local train station in Providence, Rhode Island, has seen ridership totals increase by more than 137 percent, and Amtrak is not just used by tourists.

So, demand for intercity passenger rail service has grown exponentially in the last decade and our competitors abroad have noticed, investing billions in their rail systems. But here, some of my colleagues have decided to slash

funding and put our rail system at risk. This is clearly the wrong approach.

Of course, this legislation does not only jeopardize our Nation's rail system; it also slashes funding for municipal and State governments hoping to invest in critical local projects.

This bill eliminates all funding for the TIGER grant program in fiscal year 2014, and it rescinds \$237 million of the \$500 million appropriated for the current fiscal year.

The TIGER program invests in innovative, multimodal transportation projects, providing for upgrades of bridges, roads, ports, and other transportation infrastructure that are critical to regional economies. But perhaps most importantly, this is a program that encourages local stakeholders to plan for their future and think about innovations to local transportation infrastructure that will spur growth and create jobs. This is exactly how Federal investments are supposed to work.

Unfortunately, this bill once again leaves our State and local partners without the resources needed to help strengthen local communities. Sadly, it gets worse. This bill also jeopardizes the still-fragile recovery of our housing market and communities at risk.

For example, this bill decimates funding for the Community Development Block Grant program, which was signed into law by a Republican President who recognized the importance of assisting communities by providing flexibility to invest in everything from wastewater treatment facilities to housing and economic development. This critical program is a lifeline for families facing difficult economic challenges and provides critical resources to promote economic development and improve quality of life.

Today, this bill cuts CDBG funding levels almost in half compared to current enacted levels, the lowest level of funding since it began, and a billion dollars less than President Ford requested for the program in 1975. Let that sink in. This bill cuts our investments in local projects so drastically that we have reduced programs to less than 60 percent of what they were nearly four decades ago.

Mr. Chairman, this bill clearly does not reflect our values and priorities as a Nation. I urge my colleagues to reject this reckless and shortsighted bill, and to work together on a plan to respond to our urgent transportation and infrastructure needs and a plan that dedicates resources to strengthening local communities. Our ability to promote growth, create jobs, and compete in a global economy depends on it.

I yield back the balance of my time.
Ms. CHU. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CHU. Mr. Chairman, I am in strong opposition of the underlying bill, as it makes damaging cuts to

Community Development Block Grants. A cut of \$1.6 billion—a nearly 50 percent reduction from the previous year—is not smart policymaking. These draconian cuts will no doubt have lasting harmful effects on our communities throughout the country.

Since 1974, over 1,200 communities relied on CDBG funds to support development projects and make other important improvements. These funds are used in providing social services for the poor and senior citizens, improving dilapidated housing facilities, supporting local food banks, and maintaining local parks. CDBG funds are critical investments made by the Federal Government to bring important benefits to local communities.

My district, for example, stands to lose almost \$2.2 million next year if these cuts go into effect. That's nearly half of what they got last year. And it's on top of hundreds of thousands of cities in my district have already lost due to the poorly designed automatic cuts known as sequestration. The city of Pasadena will see their funding drop from \$1.7 million to under \$1 million. The city of Alhambra will see their funding drop from around \$800,000 down to only \$430,000.

These cuts are more than lines on a piece of paper. They will have real impacts on my neighbors and my community. Take People for People, a food bank run by the West San Gabriel Valley Church Council for the last 25 years. People for People provides the homeless and needy families with clothes and boxes of food. During the recession, they saw a 20 percent spike in the numbers of families who came to them for help. Last year, they were able to support hundreds of families that are suffering right now. Hundreds of families stay afloat with local donations and a \$27,000 grant through CDBG. But this year, because of Federal Government cuts, they will receive 75 percent less, merely \$7,000.

But People for People isn't the only program that will get hit. Countless other nonprofit service organizations around the San Gabriel Valley will be forced to serve fewer low-income residents at a time when they need it the most. CDBG funds have helped fund tutoring, health services, small business assistance, senior services, food assistance, and fair housing services. Cities will have to cut back on home rehabilitation programs that improve blighted neighborhoods and public facilities, improvements that make cities safer and more accessible. And fewer construction projects mean fewer construction jobs, too.

During this time of economic recovery, we cannot pull out the rug from programs that are vital to helping our constituents. Our cities, our communities, and our constituents cannot afford these drastic cuts to CDBG funding. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this terrible bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1645

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

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I rise today because our Transportation-HUD Appropriations Act is insufficient to maintain our national transportation infrastructure and invest properly in community development and safe, affordable housing.

This Transportation-HUD Appropriations Act really guts investments critical to strong, sustainable communities. And, in particular, it decimates the Community Development Block Grants program, slashing it in half to the lowest level since the program began in 1975.

This isn't just something that hurts Democrats. It hurts Republicans, it hurts everybody. It's across the board. And so, for the Community Development Block Grant program to work and ensure access to decent, affordable housing, to provide services to the most vulnerable in our communities, and to create jobs through the expansion and retention of businesses, we've got to reject this proposal before us.

Communities across the country rely on the Community Development Block Grant to provide critical services for low-income people and their families, as well as economic development assistance to small businesses and infrastructure improvements.

To this day, the Community Development Block Grant remains the principal source of revenue for localities to use in devising flexible solutions to prevent economic and social deterioration in lower-income neighborhoods and communities throughout the Nation.

These grants are an important tool for helping local governments tackle serious challenges facing their communities, making a difference in the lives of millions of people and their communities across the Nation.

Now, Detroit is a longstanding Community Development Block Grant grantee, receiving an average of \$33 million in annual funding, while Wayne County, which Detroit is in, receives an additional \$5.3 million. Yet, this proposal in the appropriations bill would drastically cut these funds.

The CDBG program in Detroit and Wayne County, includes preserving low- and moderate-income neighborhoods, offering a range of housing choices, constructing urban infrastructure, improving the appearance of urban and rural communities, increasing the quality of neighborhood-based living, and decreasing negative environmental impacts.

For my conservative friends to continue to focus solely on reducing the deficit, in particular doing so on the backs of the most vulnerable Americans, is unnecessary and not appreciated. Although deficit reduction is an important task, Congress can't balance

the budget on the backs of working families. And sharply reducing programs like the Community Development Block Grant and HOME is going the wrong direction.

I would say, this is the second major cut for the Community Development Block Grant funding since the Great Recession. The CDBG Coalition, consisting of national organizations representing local elected officials, State and local government practitioners, development organizations, and nonprofit organizations, all strongly oppose these cuts.

These are individuals working daily in their communities, with the most acute awareness of what their communities need. So, in support of them and our constituents, we must fund CDBG formula grants at no less than the \$3.3 billion in FY14.

So, Mr. Chairman, once again I ask the Congress to stop trying to balance the budget on the backs of working families.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, during the appropriation process, over 100 Members and I expressed our concern about the low funding level for Community Development Block Grants.

These grants are one of the most successful, cost-effective Federal programs that encourage economic growth in our cities and communities across the country. According to the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, every \$1 of CDBG investment leads to an additional \$3.55 of investment from outside sources.

In California's 35th Congressional District, the cities of Pomona, Chino, Ontario, Fontana, and Rialto, where people of all parties reside, currently receive Community Development Block Grant funding. This funding is used to build affordable housing, construct sidewalks, and invest in energy efficiency, water conservation, gang prevention, and after-school programs.

These programs maintain strong neighborhoods and promote a higher quality of life for residents in the district. With the proposed cuts in this bill, it is estimated that they will lose 50 percent of funding for next year.

I strongly oppose these devastating cuts. I ask that other Members consider their communities and oppose these cuts too.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. Let me start with the fact that I choose to believe that Mr. LATHAM does not like this bill. Mr. LATHAM's not listening to me. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to say that I start

my debate, that I choose to believe that you do not like this bill. I know you. I've worked with you over a long period of time.

This bill is insufficient to meet the obligations of this subcommittee. It is unworthy of the support of this House.

Mr. Chairman, there are many things wrong with the 2014 Transportation-Housing and Urban Development appropriation bill, but perhaps none more egregious than its severely painful cuts to the Community Development Block Grants.

Now, let me start with this observation. This is not about a poor people's program. It helps some poor people, but it helps communities—rich, moderate, and poor.

This is not about the 47 percent. This is about the 100 percent.

The Community Development Block Grant program was enacted on a bipartisan basis in 1974 and signed into law by the President, Gerald Ford, former minority leader of this House, President of the United States. From its beginning, it has served as a model of how bipartisan compromise in Congress can help tackle important challenges on the local level.

For nearly 40 years, these grants have been awarded on a formula basis to State and local governments for infrastructure development, the creation and maintenance of affordable housing units, anti-poverty initiatives.

It makes communities better. It empowers Members of Congress to be able to help their local communities who elect them. These grants save lives in our largest cities and in our smallest towns, in Alaska, in Hawaii, and in Maryland.

The cuts in this bill would reduce Community Development Block Grants by more than half. America is not bankrupt. America need not claim defeat and retreat. America has the resources, if it has the will, to grow our economies, to grow our communities, and to make them better.

We appropriated around \$3.8 billion for these grants in fiscal year 2012, while this bill would cut that figure to just \$1.6 billion. To put this into perspective, in 2001 we spent \$4.7 billion under George Bush II on Community Development Block Grants.

After years of whittling away at those critical grants which empower our States, counties, and cities to help the most vulnerable have a chance at finding jobs and putting roofs over their heads, it would be devastating to communities whose budgets are already pushed to the limit and rely on these grants to serve all of their residents.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle talk a great deal about fiscal responsibility. But what about social responsibility?

Now I'm a strong proponent of fiscal responsibility. But if fiscal responsibility is not coupled with social responsibility, it is not worthy of this House or this country.

Community Development Block Grants are an instrument of our common citizenship and, yes, our common humanity. In this case, however, they are a poignant example of the Republican strategy of disinvestment in America and abandonment of our communities and their people. Surely we're better than that, Mr. Chairman.

When we considered the Veterans Affairs, military construction, and Defense appropriations bills that included robust funding, we knew those funds had to come from somewhere. Here it comes.

Like our Republican friends, we believe we must invest in a strong, national defense, as Chairwoman MIKULSKI has been doing on the Senate Appropriations Committee. But we do not share the Republican majority's view that we ought to abandon our domestic priorities in the process. We're better than that.

None of us are surprised that their strategy to deal with the sequester is to ignore its consequences and impose cuts even deeper, even deeper, even deeper than the sequester calls for. In fact, I know of a number of our colleagues on the Republican side who see the folly in such strategy but cannot or will not speak up, for fear of the political consequences from the radical right. This bill is proof that such a strategy is underway.

It's not only an abdication of responsible leadership, it is a recipe for gridlock, as Democrats in the House and Senate could never agree to it. Reject this bill. We can and must do better.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chair, this is a slash-and-burn budget. I don't know why we bother.

Whether you're looking at the community block grant or the section I'm going to say a few words about, the Amtrak section, you can see what we're about—we're supposed to reauthorize a highway bill this year and a railway bill this year. That certainly won't matter if the Transportation and HUD appropriations bill simply ignores authorized infrastructure spending and building.

The federal government has Amtrak because the private sector insisted that we take it. They showed, they proved that you can't run a railroad without public subsidy.

Amtrak has done an amazing job considering how little public subsidy it has gotten. The private sector gave it to us because they couldn't handle the operating expenses, and they couldn't handle the capital costs.

Now, Amtrak, by the ticket, is basically handling the operating expenses. Shame on us that we will not come forward to do our part with the capital expenses. With a 37 percent cut in capital expenses, that is the way, Mr. Chairman, to run a railroad into the ground

that otherwise is doing very well on its own dime.

There is a thirty-five percent difference between the House and Senate bills. The Republican bill is bipartisan. Yet, we're about to pass a bill here that nobody would consider in the Senate, and that the President would have to veto.

Why are we going through these appropriations exercises that amount to nothing?

□ 1700

Amtrak is more than sustaining itself. Virtually each month this year, it has had record ridership. Amtrak actually recovers almost 80 percent of its operating costs out of ticket revenue. That's amazing. It seems to me Amtrak ought to be rewarded rather than, as this bill does, be punished.

Amtrak carries 31 million passengers every year, and it keeps increasing. Travellers are preferring rail and 20,000 people across 47 States work for Amtrak. Yes, we know about it best here in the East, where Amtrak also has 1 million daily commuters.

This is our national railroad. It's unbelievable that we would be content to see every single nation in the world that considers itself an advanced nation be generations ahead of us on railroad development. We are two generations behind, for example, on high-speed rail. Yet there are zero dollars in this bill for high-speed rail.

Amtrak is very well managed. In the committee we have heard what they have done and how they have done it. But they can't manage without at least some recognition from the Congress that we, too, have a role to play in the railroad. No railroad in the world is unsubsidized. This one is subsidized very little. It is still able to run most of its trains over 100 miles an hour.

We ought to understand who we're talking about. We're not just talking about the Acela from the District of Columbia to New York. Among the 25 busiest Amtrak stations are Seattle, Harrisburg, and Bakersfield, California.

At a time when the airlines are in trouble and have reduced their operations, Amtrak keeps growing in ridership each month. I have a winning operation here. But this bill sends it back into losing for us. We don't need to do that. We have a railroad that offers middle class jobs to 20,000 people, 200 of them in the District of Columbia. Let's do what we need to do in the T-HUD bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GALLEGGO

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 5, strike "not to exceed".

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

Mr. GALLEGGO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a very simple amendment. It simply strikes three words,

"not to exceed," with respect to the budget of an office that I consider to be pretty important, and that is the Intelligence, Security, and Emergency Response.

As you look through the bill, every single part of the Office of the Secretary has a separate line item, and in looking at the bill, I noticed, for example, that for emergency response and security we have budgeted a little over \$10 million. On the other hand, we have budgeted about twice as much for the lawyers for the Office of General Counsel. The lawyers somehow get twice as much as emergency response and security. Frankly, as I look at the list and how the money is divided, we spend \$24 million roughly, which is nearly more than two times as much for the Assistant Secretary for Policy—all of that being more important than security.

For me, as a Member of Congress who represents some 59,000 square miles, including five ports of entry and 800 miles of the Texas border with Mexico, an area, frankly, where we have seen emergencies and emergency response before, frankly, where the Congress is consistently and rightfully concerned about security, it seems to me that we would give the Department of Transportation some additional flexibility.

This doesn't raise per se the amount of money that's available to them. What it does is give them additional flexibility so that in the event they don't spend the line items from the other items like the Office of Public Affairs or the Office of General Counsel, it gives them the flexibility to spend more money for intelligence, security, and emergency response.

I think if you ask every single individual Member of Congress what is more important, the lawyers or the Department of Transportation Office of Intelligence, Security, and Emergency Response; what is more important, the lawyers at the Department of Transportation or the Office of Intelligence, Security, and Emergency Response, all of these kinds of things, especially for a Member from the border, I think security is more important.

Again, it doesn't cost more money. It doesn't appropriate any more money, per se. What it does is gives the agency the ability to move money around and the flexibility to provide additional money, should it become necessary. Frankly, one never knows what kind of emergency is going to come up. One never knows what is going to happen, whether it's going to be a natural disaster or a terrorist attack. It always pays to have the emergency response folks have the level of flexibility that they need in order to understand that regardless of what happens, they have the opportunity to do their jobs and to do their jobs well.

Additional budget flexibility in times of limited dollars and limited budgets, I think, is very key. So what this amendment would propose to do is simply strike those three words, "not to exceed," so that there would poten-

tially be an opportunity for the Department of Transportation to spend more money on emergency response and security than the little over \$10 million that's allotted to them for the whole year.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise to say that I am not opposed to the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I support the gentleman's amendment. It ensures that the Office of Intelligence, Security, and Emergency Response would receive no less than \$10.778 million. This office performs important security functions of the Department of Transportation.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GALLEGGO).

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

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

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my strong opposition to the draconian cuts to the Community Development Block Grant, or CDBG, program in this legislation.

The CDBG program has a proven record of success in stabilizing and revitalizing communities across the country by directly providing funds to local communities and giving them the flexibility to decide where the funding will have the greatest impact. In the last 7 years, CDBG has assisted over a million low- and moderate-income homeowners to rehabilitate their homes, keeping neighborhoods and communities safe and stable.

More than 30 million people have benefited from CDBG-funded public improvement programs, including senior and child care centers, homes for persons with disabilities, safe streets, and shelters for victims of domestic violence. Funds have also been used to provide public services to millions of low- and moderate-income households, including employment training, meals to seniors, and services for abused children.

But the real impact of CDBG is not seen on the national scale. It is seen on the streets and in the neighborhoods of

the communities that receive these funds. In my district, CDBG funds have established adult literacy programs, legal support for immigrant victims of domestic violence, and youth summer employment opportunities. It has preserved public housing and addressed vacant housing and lots in at-risk neighborhoods, providing support and guidance for small, locally owned businesses.

Because of the flexibility CDBG provides, the city government has been able to identify the most pressing needs and the most at-risk communities and allocate funds as they are needed. When we invest CDBG funds in our cities, we see an immediate impact in the neighborhoods as nonprofit and private entities follow, bringing new development and opportunities for residents.

Mr. Chairman, CDBG was a change from the old way in which specific programs were specifically funded. People in this House—mostly Republicans, I must say—said, Give more flexibility to local governments; instead of giving to 20 categorical-specific programs, fund them into one or two Community Development Block Grants so they can be used more efficiently. We have done that. We have combined a lot of categorical programs into CDBG, and now we want to tear it to pieces.

Despite the success that CDBG has had, the bill we are debating on the floor today would cut funding to \$1.6 billion, which is a 50 percent cut from this year, and the lowest funding level in the 40-year history of the program—lower than when President Ford supported it, even without inflation adjustments.

In New York, CDBG funding would fall from \$164 million to \$82 million. These funding levels will leave hundreds of thousands of New Yorkers and millions of Americans without access to the vital services and support that CDBG provides.

How did we get here? Why are we voting to gut this proven, efficient, flexible program? Why are we voting for a 50 percent cut in an already much too small allotment? The answer is simple: the slash-and-burn Republican budget. The same budget that provides tax breaks for the wealthy and large corporations and unneeded increases in defense spending while slashing funding for Medicaid, food stamps, and WIC has left appropriators with such small funding allocations that this bill was unworkable and unrealistic from the start.

So here we are, slashing programs that serve and protect the most vulnerable among us—programs that are proven to save us money in the long run and programs that support flexibility and accountability in our communities.

We may disagree, Mr. Chairman, on how to keep our economy strong, but we should all agree that we must stop piling these cuts on the backs of seniors and the working poor, women,

kids, and the middle class. Stop these cuts to our communities. We should reject this bill unless it's grossly increased in the aggregate, which it won't be, as we know. So we should reject this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I agree with my colleague from New York. This bill has too many cuts, and I will oppose final passage. But it does have comparable funding levels between the House and Senate for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, which administers distracted driving prevention grants to the States. This is an area where we need to do more.

Every year thousands of accidents, many fatal, result from people texting or talking on their phones while driving. I'm not just talking about using a hands-free device. I'm talking about someone driving with one hand while talking on a cell phone or texting with the other hand.

In 2011, 3,331 people in the U.S. were killed in crashes involving a distracted driver—up from 3,267 in 2010. And in 2011, more than 387,000 people were injured in an accident involving a distracted driver, and 416,000 were injured in 2010. In 2012, the last year of updated data, 10 percent of injury crashes resulted from distracted driving. It's clear that we must use every opportunity available to push for strong distracted driving laws, much the same as we did for drunk driving, which worked.

So I encourage my colleagues to renew their commitment to address the deadly issue of distracted driving. My Districted Driving Prevention Act, H.R. 1664, withholds funding from States that do not make both texting and talking on a phone while driving a primary offense, and goes further than the U.S. Department of Transportation's efforts to raise awareness and provide grants. These are important efforts, and they should be funded adequately; but they don't go far enough.

To date, only nine States make both texting and talking on a phone while driving a primary offense: my home State of New York, followed by California, Connecticut, Delaware, the District of Columbia, Nevada, New Jersey, Washington, and West Virginia. That's a start, but it falls short of establishing a national highway safety baseline that saves lives.

□ 1715

In conclusion, let me say, when study after study shows us that distracted driving is just as dangerous as drunk driving, Congress cannot continue to ignore the problem when only nine States have taken action that meets a reasonable standard of safety. Anything less leaves our roads unsafe, our

constituents in danger, and more unnecessary deaths as a result.

I urge adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

For necessary expenses related to the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology, \$14,220,000, of which \$8,218,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation, to be available until expended, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred for training: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the powers and duties, functions, authorities and personnel of the Research and Innovative Technology Administration are hereby transferred to the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology in the Office of the Secretary, including the authority to accept funding from modal administrations for support of Global Positioning System activities pursuant to reimbursable agreements with the Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology in the Office of the Secretary; *Provided further*, That notwithstanding 49 U.S.C. 102 and 5 U.S.C. 5315, there shall be an Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology within the Office of the Secretary, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, to lead such office; *Provided further*, That any reference in law, regulation, judicial proceedings, or elsewhere to the Research and Innovative Technology Administration shall be deemed to be a reference to the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology of the Department of Transportation.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LATHAM

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, No. 19.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, beginning on line 4, strike all through page 5, line 6 and insert the following:

For necessary expenses of the Research and Innovative Technology Administration, \$14,220,000, of which \$8,218,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation, to be available until expended, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred for training.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, this is a technical amendment that provides the existing \$14.7 million in DOT funding to the Research and Innovative Technology Administration, rather than a new Assistant Secretary.

This amendment is noncontroversial and addresses concerns of the Science and the Transportation and Infrastructure Committees. It does not affect the scoring of the bill.

I urge its adoption, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENTS
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in division F of Public Law 113-6, \$237,000,000 are permanently rescinded.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT CAPITAL

For necessary expenses for upgrading and enhancing the Department of Transportation's financial systems and re-engineering business processes, \$4,990,000, to remain available through September 30, 2015.

CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVES

For necessary expenses for cyber security initiatives, including necessary upgrades to wide area network and information technology infrastructure, improvement of network perimeter controls and identity management, testing and assessment of information technology against business, security, and other requirements, implementation of Federal cyber security initiatives and information infrastructure enhancements, implementation of enhanced security controls on network devices, and enhancement of cyber security workforce training tools, \$2,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2015.

OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Civil Rights, \$9,384,000.

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING, RESEARCH, AND
DEVELOPMENT

(INCLUDING RESCISSIONS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for conducting transportation planning and research, \$6,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That of the unobligated balances made available by Public Law 111-117 and designated for a single project in the accompanying conference report, \$750,000 are hereby permanently rescinded: *Provided further*, That of the unobligated balances made available by Section 195 of Public Law 111-117, \$2,000,000 are hereby permanently rescinded.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

For necessary expenses for operating costs and capital outlays of the Working Capital Fund, not to exceed \$172,000,000 shall be paid from appropriations made available to the Department of Transportation: *Provided*, That such services shall be provided on a competitive basis to entities within the Department of Transportation: *Provided further*, That the above limitation on operating expenses shall not apply to non-DOT entities: *Provided further*, That no funds appropriated in this Act to an agency of the Department shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund without majority approval of the Working Capital Fund Steering Committee and approval of the Secretary: *Provided further*, That no assessments may be levied against any program, budget activity, subactivity or project funded by this Act unless notice of such assessments and the basis therefor are presented to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and are approved by such Committees.

MINORITY BUSINESS RESOURCE CENTER
PROGRAM

For the cost of guaranteed loans, \$333,000, as authorized by 49 U.S.C. 332: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed \$18,367,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program, \$589,000.

MINORITY BUSINESS OUTREACH

For necessary expenses of Minority Business Resource Center outreach activities, \$3,068,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 49 U.S.C. 332, these funds may be used for business opportunities related to any mode of transportation.

PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS
(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

In addition to funds made available from any other source to carry out the essential air service program under 49 U.S.C. 41731 through 41742, \$100,000,000, to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That in determining between or among carriers competing to provide service to a community, the Secretary may consider the relative subsidy requirements of the carriers: *Provided further*, That no funds made available under section 41742 of title 49, United States Code, and no funds made available in this Act or any other Act in any fiscal year, shall be available to carry out the essential air service program under sections 41731 through 41742 of such title 49 in communities in the 48 contiguous States unless the community received subsidized essential air service or received a 90-day notice of intent to terminate service and the Secretary required the air carrier to continue to provide service to the community at any time between September 30, 2010, and September 30, 2011, inclusive: *Provided further*, That basic essential air service minimum requirements shall not include the 15-passenger capacity requirement under subsection 41732(b)(3) of title 49, United States Code: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act or any other Act shall be used to provide essential air service to communities that require a rate of subsidy per passenger in excess of \$500.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF
ALASKA

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk. The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after "communities" insert "in the 48 contiguous States".

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I want to thank Chairman LATHAM for his leadership on this bill. It's difficult times.

This is a very simple amendment. In 1978, when Congress deregulated the airline industry, it also provided a means to protect rural communities. The Essential Air Service program ensures the continuation of service to communities that would have lost all air service through deregulation. While this is a vital program, I respect the efforts of the chairman to find cost sav-

The bill excludes communities from participating in the program if they receive a per-passenger subsidy of greater than \$500. Current law excludes communities if they receive over \$1,000 per passenger, with the exception of communities in Alaska and Hawaii. This recognizes that communities in Alaska and Hawaii are completely dependent on air travel.

Alaska has limited road infrastructure. Eighty-two percent of Alaskan communities do not have a road system. In many of these communities, everything has to come in by air. My amendment clarifies that the proposed reforms will not alter the longstanding recognition of the realities in Alaska and Hawaii—no roads, no alternatives, complete dependence on aviation.

My amendment has no score per CBO and does not impact funding levels of the program. My amendment provides a no-cost solution to ensure the most remote areas of our Nation are not excluded from participating in this program. I'd just like to remind my colleagues if you take all the land east of the Mississippi River to the Atlantic Ocean, from Maine to Florida, that's Alaska. And you think about it, in that area, there's 253 Congressmen and 52 Senators. That's really different. Hawaii has the same problem—not quite as large, but we have only one way to communicate, and that's with air service.

I urge the passage of this amendment. It is a very simple amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LATHAM. I just will stand up in favor of the amendment and I will be calling a recorded vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Hawaii is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Young amendment. This amendment will continue the administration of the Essential Air Service program, recognizing the unique characteristics of both Hawaii and Alaska.

The Essential Air Service program was put into place to guarantee that small communities, like the communities in our States, will continue to maintain a minimal level of scheduled air service with access to the national air transportation system. Especially in times of medical emergencies or natural disasters, this literally is the difference between life and death for the people in our communities.

In a State like Hawaii, where I'm from, where island communities are separated by the Pacific Ocean, access to air service is oftentimes the only transportation option available if service needs to be provided with any regularity or within specific time constraints.

One example is Kalaupapa, a community on an isolated peninsula on the north shore of Molokai. When Hansen's disease was first introduced to the Hawaiian Islands, all people afflicted with this disease were sent to this rural community, Kalaupapa. Today, it is a refuge for the remaining residents and patients who, now cured, would still like to live there. If not for the assistance of the Essential Air Service program, the only way to get in and out of that community is a 3.5 mile trail down a 1,700-foot sea cliff used by mule riders and hikers. This trail is extremely steep and challenging and has been made impassable in the past because of heavy rains. This is just one example of why this continued air service is critical to the people who continue to live in this community.

Hawaii and Alaska, as illustrated, have unique geographical limitations and challenges. Whereas other communities are generally accessible by vehicle, that's not always the case in the noncontiguous States; 3½ miles doesn't sound very far until you're looking up the side of a steep cliff from the back of a mule.

The amendment being offered by Representative YOUNG would continue this program's recognition of our exceptional geographic challenges. This amendment maintains the current practice of Alaska and Hawaii being exempt from restrictions on what communities are eligible for the Essential Air Service program.

Currently, only two communities in Hawaii qualify—Kalaupapa and Kamuela—but maintaining this air service is critically important for all people who live in these areas.

I would also just like to take a moment to recognize my colleague from Hawaii, Congresswoman COLLEEN HANABUSA. She has worked very closely with Congressman YOUNG on this amendment and would have liked to have been here to speak in strong support of it today were it not for Tropical Storm Flossie, where she is stuck in Hawaii, across the Pacific Ocean away.

I would like to thank Representative YOUNG for offering this amendment and for his leadership, and strongly urge my colleagues to support the Young amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I want to make sure that my friends who live far, far away from where I live do understand that many of us understand the dynamics that they've presented. Arguably, their argument is unassailable, and I rise in support of their amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$250)".

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

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, the Essential Air Service program is an expensive government handout. It is, in effect, welfare for airplanes.

Page 9 of the bill expressly states that the per passenger subsidy extended to rural communities—and by the way, we're not talking about Hawaii and Alaska here; we're talking about places like Muscle Shoals—for a flight that would not otherwise exist is capped at \$500. I think that's too high. I don't know why we should be, in effect, paying people \$500 to fly to Muscle Shoals. I don't see the sense of that at a time when we're cutting food stamps and cutting block grants to communities. I think it's a poor way to spend taxpayer funds. My amendment would reduce this subsidy to a still-very-high \$250 per passenger because \$500 per passenger is simply outrageous.

If passengers don't want to pay for aviation routes, then they simply shouldn't exist. For 500 bucks per passenger, we could literally rent a limousine for every single person aboard each flight and drive them to the single nearest commercial airport.

I understand the need for rural services in necessary aspects of life, like Postal Services, telephones, and even the Internet; but I cannot understand the need to subsidize regular airline flights that would otherwise not exist to the tune of \$500 per passenger.

The bill before us today would cut community development funds in half—to the lowest level since the program began in 1975. It would cut HOME Investment Partnerships to the lowest level since that program began in 1992. And it would drastically reduce the amount of section 8 rental assistance and increase homelessness. Under these circumstances, I cannot stand by in good conscience and allow a subsidy like this to continue.

I offer this amendment today because it's more important to put a roof over the heads of the poor than it is to hand out corporate welfare to United Airlines and to support aviation routes that simply should not exist.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

We have, in the bill, restrained the growth of this program, keeping the total amount at \$216 million—\$116 million of which is from fees and \$100 million provided in discretionary appropriation for the fiscal year 2012 program level. So it's at the same level as it was before; we don't have any increase.

Mr. Chairman, I really urge the administration, the authorizers, if they want to reform this program, to actually get to work, do it—not on an appropriation bill where we have had no discussion, no debate. It is an issue that should be handled by the authorizers rather than on this appropriation bill.

We need the comprehensive reform so that isolated communities can be served while restraining growth in this program. But I do urge a "no" vote, Mr. Chairman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I would agree with Chairman LATHAM that this reform needs to come about, and it shouldn't be in an appropriation bill. Hopefully, the T&I authorizing committee will look at this issue and come to a decision.

It was interesting that the amendment before this amendment, we basically waived Hawaii and Alaska. And here we are now limiting the Essential Air Service to \$250. I would tell you, as we tried to explain to my colleague from Florida, that this would probably cause 100—maybe a little more—smaller communities not to be able to link to the national air service. So this is not the time to do it.

So I would rise in opposition to this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$100,000,000)".

Page 150, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$100,000,000)".

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

□ 1730

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, my amendment simply continues the

good work started by the amendment of the gentleman from Florida and pulls the plug on this tired old program.

Recently, the much-maligned sequester required a 4 percent cut in the FAA budget, which its leadership then immediately translated into a 40 percent flight delay until the public rebelled.

The total sequester cut to the FAA was roughly \$636 million, and they took that out on the traveling public; yet they had \$243 million to pay for empty and near-empty flights from selected airports in tiny communities under this program that is laughingly called "Essential Air Service." It is, in fact, the least essential air service imaginable.

Since we last visited this issue, the FAA reauthorization bill made some minor reforms to the program. For example, we are no longer subsidizing air travel from communities that are within a 90-mile radius of a major airport, and the per passenger subsidy has been capped at \$1,000 per passenger.

These minor reforms mean that one airport in Ely, Nevada, has been dropped from the program and two more are about to be. That's a start. But still, it is no excuse for shoveling, as this appropriation does, a total of \$216 million at this program between direct taxpayer subsidies and fees into next year.

In other words, in this austere age of sequestration, when the White House is shuttered to the public and soldiers are being told to pay for their own Internet access, the House of Representatives proposes at best a token reduction in this wasteful, unfair, and outdated program while cutting real essential air services like air traffic control. With all due respect, what in the world are we thinking?

Remember, this was supposed to be a temporary program when we deregulated commercial aviation. It was supposed to last for just a few years to give rural communities a chance to adjust. That was 35 years ago.

It is true there are over a few tiny communities in Alaska—like Kake's 700 hearty souls—who have no highway connections to hub airports, but they have plenty of alternatives. In the case of Kake, they enjoy year-round ferry service to Juneau. In addition, Alaska is well served by a thriving general aviation market and the ubiquitous bush pilot. Rural life has great advantages and great disadvantages, and it is not the job of hardworking taxpayers who choose to live elsewhere to level out these differences.

Apologists for this wasteful spending tell us it is an important economic driver for these small towns, and I'm sure that's so. Whenever you give away money, the folks you are giving it to are always going to be better off. But the folks you are taking it from are always going to be worse off to exactly the same extent. Indeed, it is economic drivers like this that have driven Europe's economy right off a cliff.

Last year, one Member rushed to the microphones to suggest this was essential for emergency medical evacuations. We heard an echo of that a moment ago. It has nothing to do with medical evacuations. This program subsidizes regular, scheduled, commercial service that practically nobody uses. If it actually had a passenger base, we wouldn't need, in effect, to hand out \$1,000 bills to the few passengers who use it, would we? An airline so reckless with its funds would quickly bankrupt itself. The same principle holds true for governments.

The Washington Post is not known as a bastion of fiscal conservatism, but I cannot improve upon the Post's recent editorial when it said:

Ideally, Essential Air Service would be zeroed out, and the \$200 million we waste on it devoted to a truly national purpose: perhaps deficit reduction, military readiness, or the social safety net. Alas, if Congress and the White House were capable of making such choices, we probably never would have had sequestration in the first place.

There are many tough calls in setting fiscal priorities, but this isn't one of them. If the House of Representatives—where all appropriations begin, with a Republican majority pledged to stop wasting money—cannot even agree to cut this useless program off from the trough, how does it expect to be taken seriously on the much tougher choices that lie ahead?

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the gentleman's amendment.

The Essential Air Service program ensures that small and rural communities have access to the national air transportation system. The program plays a key role in the economic development of many rural communities by ensuring that air service continues.

Does the program need reform? Absolutely, it does, yes. That is why we cap the per passenger subsidy at \$500, which is down from the current \$1,000 cap per passenger.

We have also cut the discretionary funding in this bill by \$46 million, leaving a total program level of \$216 million—\$100 million in discretionary funding and \$116 million from fees. This is an 18 percent reduction. We already have imposed a significant cut to this program.

We will continue to push the administration to reform the program and work with the Transportation Infrastructure Committee, but an outright elimination of the funding in this bill is a hit to rural communities that I cannot support.

I urge defeat of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word to speak in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. The Essential Air Service program was designed to continue air service for small communities that had scheduled air service prior to airline deregulation. It is funded through annual appropriations and overflight fees that are collected when foreign air carriers traverse through U.S. airspace.

This amendment cuts the overall program in half. Many small communities would lose their air service, including, we believe, four communities in the State of California: Crescent City, El Centro, Merced, and Visalia.

This is not the way to reform this program. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, as a co-sponsor of this amendment, I rise to speak in support of eliminating the Essential Air Service program.

I thank my colleague from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) for his work on this amendment.

Another Californian once said, "There's nothing more permanent than a temporary government program." Mr. Chairman, I'm sure all my colleagues recognize that famous line from former President Ronald Reagan. His statement was accurate then, just as it is accurate now, regarding the Essential Air Service program.

This program was intended to be temporary. It was created as a transition program in the seventies after airline deregulation to help rural airports adjust to a free market system. We are now more than 25 years after the intended end date of 1988, and the taxpayers are still footing the bill.

This is yet another example of Washington's spending problem, Mr. Chairman. It has to stop.

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I certainly understand all Federal programs should be prepared and subjected to cost-saving measures, and Essential Air Service is actually no different. That is why we passed reforms during the FAA reauthorization last year to improve efficiency and save taxpayer dollars.

Additionally, the underlying bill today already includes a reduction in funding for the EAS program. While there is room for savings in all programs, totally eliminating EAS outright would be counterproductive.

The Essential Air Service program serves an important purpose in rural and remote areas. Businesses in rural America actually compete more effectively with even the limited air service that might be available.

Last year, the House rejected this amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to do so once again.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION

SEC. 101. None of the funds made available in this Act to the Department of Transportation may be obligated for the Office of the Secretary of Transportation to approve assessments or reimbursable agreements pertaining to funds appropriated to the modal administrations in this Act, except for activities underway on the date of enactment of this Act, unless such assessments or agreements have completed the normal reprogramming process for Congressional notification.

SEC. 102. The Secretary or his designee may engage in activities with States and State legislators to consider proposals related to the reduction of motorcycle fatalities.

SEC. 103. Notwithstanding section 3324 of title 31, United States Code, in addition to authority provided by section 327 of title 49, United States Code, the Department's Working Capital Fund is hereby authorized to provide payments in advance to vendors that are necessary to carry out the Federal transit pass transportation fringe benefit program under Executive Order 13150 and section 3049 of Public Law 109-59: *Provided*, That the Department shall include adequate safeguards in the contract with the vendors to ensure timely and high-quality performance under the contract.

SEC. 104. The Secretary shall post on the Web site of the Department of Transportation a schedule of all meetings of the Credit Council, including the agenda for each meeting, and require the Credit Council to record the decisions and actions of each meeting.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION OPERATIONS (AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

For necessary expenses of the Federal Aviation Administration, not otherwise provided for, including operations and research activities related to commercial space transportation, administrative expenses for research and development, establishment of air navigation facilities, the operation (including leasing) and maintenance of aircraft, subsidizing the cost of aeronautical charts and maps sold to the public, lease or purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, in addition to amounts made available by Public Law 108-176, \$9,521,784,000, of which \$6,484,000,000 shall be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, of which not to exceed \$7,182,664,000 shall be available for air traffic organization activities; not to exceed \$1,199,777,000 shall be available for aviation safety activities; not to exceed \$14,160,000 shall be available for commercial space transportation activities;

not to exceed \$777,198,000 shall be available for finance and management activities; not to exceed \$56,637,000 shall be available for NextGen and operations planning activities; and not to exceed \$291,348,000 shall be available for staff offices: *Provided*, That not to exceed 2 percent of any budget activity, except for aviation safety budget activity, may be transferred to any budget activity under this heading: *Provided further*, That no transfer may increase or decrease any appropriation by more than 2 percent: *Provided further*, That any transfer in excess of 2 percent shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 404 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section: *Provided further*, That not later than March 31 of each fiscal year hereafter, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall transmit to Congress an annual update to the report submitted to Congress in December 2004 pursuant to section 221 of Public Law 108-176: *Provided further*, That the amount herein appropriated shall be reduced by \$100,000 for each day after March 31 that such report has not been submitted to the Congress: *Provided further*, That not later than March 31 of each fiscal year hereafter, the Administrator shall transmit to Congress a companion report that describes a comprehensive strategy for staffing, hiring, and training flight standards and aircraft certification staff in a format similar to the one utilized for the controller staffing plan, including stated attrition estimates and numerical hiring goals by fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the amount herein appropriated shall be reduced by \$100,000 per day for each day after March 31 that such report has not been submitted to Congress: *Provided further*, That funds may be used to enter into a grant agreement with a non-profit standard-setting organization to assist in the development of aviation safety standards: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for new applicants for the second career training program: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the Federal Aviation Administration to finalize or implement any regulation that would promulgate new aviation user fees not specifically authorized by law after the date of the enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That there may be credited to this appropriation as offsetting collections funds received from States, counties, municipalities, foreign authorities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred in the provision of agency services, including receipts for the maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities, and for issuance, renewal or modification of certificates, including airman, aircraft, and repair station certificates, or for tests related thereto, or for processing major repair or alteration forms: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not less than \$140,000,000 shall be for the contract tower program, of which \$10,350,000 is for the contract tower cost share program: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act for aeronautical charting and cartography are available for activities conducted by, or coordinated through, the Working Capital Fund.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$500,000)".

Page 11, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$500,000)".

Ms. SPEIER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, on July 6 of this year, Asiana Airlines Flight 214 from Incheon, South Korea, crashed on its final approach to San Francisco International Airport, which is in my district. Initial reports made clear that low airspeed was a crucial factor in that crash. It was a horrible accident. Three Chinese 16-year-old girls on their way to a summer camp in southern California lost their lives. It could have been an absolute catastrophe, because there were over 300 people, including crew, that survived that horrific day.

Low airspeed has been a concern for air safety for almost 20 years. In 1996, the FAA's Human Factors Team concluded that flight crews needed better warnings that the aircraft was reaching low airspeeds. In 2003, following the crash that killed our congressional colleague Senator Paul Wellstone, the National Transportation Safety Board recommended the FAA study whether to require installation of low airspeed audible and visual alert systems. Following the Colgan Air crash in Buffalo, New York, a recommendation was reissued in 2010 on installation of redundant audible and visual warnings of impending hazardous low speed conditions.

Now, after almost two decades since the initial recommendation and over 3 years since the recommendation after Colgan, the FAA has not addressed this question of whether existing commercial aircraft should be required to install low airspeed warning systems. I fear that without direction from Congress, the FAA could take years to complete this study. That is why I am offering this amendment, which provides the FAA \$500,000 to conduct and complete a study on this important question within 1 year.

Low airspeed alert systems that cry out "airspeed low" are available and require a simple software change. These differ from the tonal alerts that sound similar to other pilot alerts. The FAA should investigate whether existing low airspeed tonal warnings, such as those in a Boeing 777, provide a sufficient level of pilot warning or if, instead, a verbal warning, such as those in the newer 737s, provides a higher level of safety.

When the alert signals to a pilot that they are traveling at too low of an airspeed, they have at best a few seconds to react. It is vital that planes have alerts that are instantly recognizable, clear, and unambiguous.

Airline safety advocates argue that verbal alerts are more effective at

alerting a pilot that they are flying at too low of an airspeed because they are instantly recognizable to a pilot. If a verbal warning is found to be more effective, the FAA should take expedient action to require both new aircraft and existing aircraft to incorporate a verbal warning.

Mr. Chairman, I had the pleasure just last week to talk to Sully Sullenberger, the pilot of the "Miracle of Hudson River," and he said something very compelling to me. He said that when a pilot is in a position of reacting during a crash, they need every one of their senses being alert; the senses when you are holding the throttle, the senses when you hear low speed alert, and the senses when you see "stall." I thought that was very compelling.

We have a number of cases that suggest now that low airspeed alerts that are verbal should be incorporated. The FAA has dragged its feet. I believe that this particular amendment would be very helpful and save many lives in the future.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepts the amendment. It is a good amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, we believe that these moneys would expedite the study to see if better warnings could be given at low speeds, so we approve the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1745

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, line 9, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$3,497,000)".

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, to echo the words of my colleagues, Ranking Members NITA LOWEY and ED PASTOR, my good friend, the allocation provided for T-HUD appropriations under the Ryan budget, which was "deemed passed" by my Republican colleagues, is simply unworkable.

From funding for the Federal Aviation Administration, TIGER grants, public transit programs, Amtrak, high-speed rail, Community Development Block Grants, and the HOME affordable housing program, House Republicans are offering a bill that not only makes devastating cuts to our Nation's transportation infrastructure but to vital programs in housing, health care,

education, labor, and other services that millions of Americans rely on, in order to spare defense spending from sequestration.

In particular, this bill makes detrimental cuts to aviation programs and investments in our national air system. It cuts FAA operations by \$185 million below the President's budget request. It slashes \$575 million, 21 percent, from the FAA's Facilities and Equipment account, and it casts doubt on the future hiring of air traffic controllers and inspectors.

NextGen is a full, multiyear effort to modernize our Nation's air traffic control system by transitioning from a ground-based navigation system to a satellite-based navigation system. As it is implemented, NextGen will help reduce delays, expand air traffic system capacity, and mitigate aviation's impact on the environment while ensuring the highest levels of safety. Currently, the FAA is moving from NextGen program development into baseline and operational programs, and passengers and operators are beginning to experience the benefits of these investments. However, while the bill preserves funding for the NextGen programs currently under deployment, it forces the FAA to greatly slow down its NextGen modernization of the air traffic control system.

My amendment restores funding for NextGen programs to the fiscal year 2013 level within the Operations Planning account. It really does represent a small amount, approximately \$3.5 million, over the FY 2014 House funding level of \$56.6 million for a total of \$60.1 million. The increased funding would help ensure that the FAA remains on schedule with regard to NextGen implementation while giving it the flexibility to decide how best to move forward in this challenging budget environment.

I do recognize that the chairman and ranking member were given a difficult task, and I respect that, but we cannot fail to recognize the future of our NextGen implementation, so I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

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

The committee shares the gentleman's support of NextGen programs. However, this amendment increases one activity in the operations account and makes no other further adjustments. The result is individual program levels that exceed the account level, which one cannot do.

To meet our allocation, the subcommittee looked closely at all accounts and at all programs. The subcommittee placed a high priority on FAA operations with just a 2 percent cut below the budget request. Within the operations account, the sub-

committee balanced the number of high priority areas, including NextGen, aviation safety and air traffic control. This amendment throws this account off balance. The programs within the account would no longer add up to the top line, and the FAA could simply ignore the subcommittee's direction on other program levels in the account. So, therefore, we urge a "no" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. The amendment increases funding for the FAA's NextGen office by \$3.5 million. As stated by my colleague from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), it is for future development. I would agree with him that it is something that we need to invest in and that this would accelerate the implementation of NextGen, which is greatly needed. Our air traffic control system is aging and needs modernization. Yet, as Mr. WOLF has pointed out, the allocation is so tight that moving money in the account will cause some problems.

My hope would be that if there is a reconciliation with the Senate that this would be given a higher priority in the funding levels as we work in conference with the Senate.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT
(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for acquisition, establishment, technical support services, improvement by contract or purchase, and hire of national airspace systems and experimental facilities and equipment, as authorized under part A of subtitle VII of title 49, United States Code, including initial acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; engineering and service testing, including construction of test facilities and acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; construction and furnishing of quarters and related accommodations for officers and employees of the Federal Aviation Administration stationed at remote localities where such accommodations are not available; and the purchase, lease, or transfer of aircraft from funds available under this heading, including aircraft for aviation regulation and certification; to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, \$2,155,000,000, of which \$458,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2014; \$1,697,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources,

for expenses incurred in the establishment, improvement, and modernization of national air space systems: *Provided further*, That upon initial submission to the Congress of the fiscal year 2015 President's budget, the Secretary of Transportation shall transmit to the Congress a comprehensive capital investment plan for the Federal Aviation Administration which includes funding for each budget line item for fiscal years 2015 through 2019, with total funding for each year of the plan constrained to the funding targets for those years as estimated and approved by the Office of Management and Budget.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk. The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, line 9, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: “(reduced by \$870,031,000) (increased by \$870,031,000)”.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I do wish to point out that the bill before us today makes deep cuts to FAA facilities and equipment. Make no mistake that these reductions will directly impact and delay the implementation of NextGen. I've spoken to this issue. This particular amendment makes available approximately \$870 million for NextGen capital programs, which is at the FY 2013 enacted level. This increased funding would help ensure that the FAA remains on schedule with regard to NextGen implementation.

Let me make it very clear. I fought very hard, along with my colleagues, both current and former—Republican and Democrat—to bring the NextGen facilities to the West Palm Beach airport. We were very successful in that regard, but I am troubled that we might not get to full implementation if we continue the reductions that I see that are set forth.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise once again to offer an additional amendment to H.R. 2610, the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies (T—HUD) Appropriations Act for FY 2014.

According to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), by the end of the NextGen mid-term in 2020, NextGen improvements will:

Reduce delays by 41 percent;

Cumulatively save 1.6 billion gallons of fuel and reduce carbon dioxide emissions by 16 million metric tons; and

Provide \$38 billion in cumulative benefits to aircraft operators, the traveling public, and the FAA through delay reduction, fuel savings, and other efficiency improvements.

However, the bill before us today makes deep cuts to the FAA's Facilities and Equipment account in the amount of \$575 million, or 21 percent.

Make no mistake. These reductions will directly impact and delay the implementation of NextGen.

Certain NextGen activities currently underway face significant reductions in this bill.

One example is the Optimization of Airspace and Procedures in the Metroplex

(OAPM) program, which is the FAA's fast-track initiative to implement new navigation procedures and airspace improvements to reduce fuel consumption and aircraft emissions in some of the United States' busiest airspace.

This could delay the completion of their designs and the beginning of the implementation phase.

My amendment makes available approximately \$870 million for NextGen capital programs, which is the FY 2013 enacted level.

This increased funding would help ensure that the FAA remains on schedule with regard to NextGen implementation, while giving it the flexibility to decide how best to move forward in this challenging budget environment.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESEARCH, ENGINEERING, AND DEVELOPMENT
(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)
(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for research, engineering, and development, as authorized under part A of subtitle VII of title 49, United States Code, including construction of experimental facilities and acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant, \$145,000,000, to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund and to remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation as offsetting collections, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, which shall be available for expenses incurred for research, engineering, and development: *Provided further*, That, of the unobligated balances from prior year appropriations available under this heading, \$26,183,998 are rescinded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 16, strike “That,” and insert “That \$61,960,000 shall be available for NextGen research and development, as authorized by section 48102(a) of title 49, United States Code: *Provided further*,”.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, in Switzerland yesterday, there was a collision of trains—one moving north and the other moving south. A good friend of Mr. WOLF's and of Mr. PASTOR's and mine served as chairman and ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, James Oberstar. In addition to the many things that Jim suggested during his tenure here, I think back to some

of the things that would have put us in a better position than we are today, particularly with regard to overall infrastructure, roads and rail.

I can't understand—and I was saying to the young staffer working with me—what it is that causes the rail industry, both abroad and here, to not have the necessary equipment that would allow one train on the same track to let the other train coming from the opposite direction, and vice versa, know that they are both on the same track. There just seems to be something wrong with that when we have the kind of sophisticated equipment that we do.

NextGen, in the air area of the world, allows for us to avoid those kinds of problems and to increase efficiency and safety. It ultimately reduces delays and saves fuel, particularly if we get on with what I'm asking for, which is \$62 million for NextGen research and development activities from the FAA's Research, Engineering and Development account.

Again, I am not asking for anything that I think would do anything less than help all of us. We don't just live in these places. We fly there. The aviation industry contributes nearly \$1.3 trillion to the United States economy. Furthermore, the FAA's air traffic controllers manage nearly 70,000 flights per day, which, on an annual basis, carry more than 730 million passengers.

With such a vital role in our economy, now is not the time to underfund our Nation's air traffic control system. I urge my colleagues to make a real investment in our Nation's transportation infrastructure by supporting this NextGen amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. WOLF. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we share the gentleman's support of the NextGen programs. However, fencing off this amount for NextGen could have the unintended consequences of forcing cuts to other priorities, such as to aviation safety research and programs to improve air traffic control in the near term, including programs to reduce noise and carbon emissions.

I, therefore, urge a “no” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS
(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)
(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)
(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

For liquidation of obligations incurred for grants-in-aid for airport planning and development, and noise compatibility planning and programs as authorized under subchapter I of chapter 471 and subchapter I of chapter 475 of title 49, United States Code, and under other law authorizing such obligations; for procurement, installation, and commissioning of runway incursion prevention devices and systems at airports of such title; for grants authorized under section 41743 of title 49, United States Code; and for inspection activities and administration of airport safety programs, including those related to airport operating certificates under section 44706 of title 49, United States Code, \$3,200,000,000 to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds under this heading shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the obligations for which are in excess of \$3,350,000,000 in fiscal year 2014, notwithstanding section 47117(g) of title 49, United States Code: *Provided further*, That none of the funds under this heading shall be available for the replacement of baggage conveyor systems, reconfiguration of terminal baggage areas, or other airport improvements that are necessary to install bulk explosive detection systems: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, of funds limited under this heading, not more than \$106,600,000 shall be obligated for administration, not less than \$15,000,000 shall be available for the Airport Cooperative Research Program, and not less than \$29,500,000 shall be available for Airport Technology Research.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FEDERAL
AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 110. None of the funds in this Act may be used to compensate in excess of 600 technical staff-years under the federally funded research and development center contract between the Federal Aviation Administration and the Center for Advanced Aviation Systems Development during fiscal year 2014.

SEC. 111. None of the funds in this Act shall be used to pursue or adopt guidelines or regulations requiring airport sponsors to provide to the Federal Aviation Administration without cost building construction, maintenance, utilities and expenses, or space in airport sponsor-owned buildings for services relating to air traffic control, air navigation, or weather reporting: *Provided*, That the prohibition of funds in this section does not apply to negotiations between the agency and airport sponsors to achieve agreement on “below-market” rates for these items or to grant assurances that require airport sponsors to provide land without cost to the FAA for air traffic control facilities.

SEC. 112. The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration may reimburse amounts made available to satisfy 49 U.S.C. 41742(a)(1) from fees credited under 49 U.S.C. 45303, and any amount remaining in such account at the close of that fiscal year may be made available to satisfy section 41742(a)(1) for the subsequent fiscal year.

SEC. 113. Amounts collected under section 40113(e) of title 49, United States Code, shall be credited to the appropriation current at the time of collection, to be merged with and available for the same purposes of such appropriation.

SEC. 114. None of the funds in this Act shall be available for paying premium pay under subsection 5546(a) of title 5, United States

Code, to any Federal Aviation Administration employee unless such employee actually performed work during the time corresponding to such premium pay.

SEC. 115. None of the funds in this Act may be obligated or expended for an employee of the Federal Aviation Administration to purchase a store gift card or gift certificate through use of a Government-issued credit card.

SEC. 116. None of the funds in this Act may be obligated or expended for retention bonuses for an employee of the Federal Aviation Administration without the prior written approval of the Assistant Secretary for Administration of the Department of Transportation.

SEC. 117. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds made available under this Act or any prior Act may be used to implement or to continue to implement any limitation on the ability of any owner or operator of a private aircraft to obtain, upon a request to the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, a blocking of that owner's or operator's aircraft registration number from any display of the Federal Aviation Administration's Aircraft Situational Display to Industry data that is made available to the public, except data made available to a Government agency, for the noncommercial flights of that owner or operator.

SEC. 118. None of the funds in this Act shall be available for salaries and expenses of more than 7 political and Presidential appointees in the Federal Aviation Administration.

SEC. 119. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to increase fees pursuant to section 44721 of title 49, United States Code, until the FAA conducts a public outreach that is designed to elicit feedback from aviation stakeholders, and until the FAA has reported the justification of its fees on paper and digital products to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 119A. None of the funds appropriated or limited by this Act may be used to change weight restrictions or prior permission rules at Teterboro airport in Teterboro, New Jersey.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Not to exceed \$417,000,000, together with advances and reimbursements received by the Federal Highway Administration, shall be paid in accordance with law from appropriations made available by this Act to the Federal Highway Administration for necessary expenses for administration and operation. In addition, not to exceed \$3,248,000 shall be paid from appropriations made available by this Act and transferred to the Appalachian Regional Commission in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 104.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS
(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Funds available for the implementation or execution of programs of Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs authorized under titles 23 and 49, United States Code, and the provisions of Public Law 112-141 shall not exceed total obligations of \$40,256,000,000 for fiscal year 2014: *Provided*, That the Secretary may collect and spend fees, as authorized by title 23, United States Code, to cover the costs of services of expert firms, including counsel, in the field of municipal and project finance to assist in the underwriting and servicing of Federal credit instruments and all or a portion of the

costs to the Federal Government of servicing such credit instruments: *Provided further*, That such fees are available until expended to pay for such costs: *Provided further*, That such amounts are in addition to administrative expenses that are also available for such purpose, and are not subject to any obligation limitation or the limitation on administrative expenses under 23 U.S.C. 608.

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For the payment of obligations incurred in carrying out Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs authorized under title 23, United States Code, \$40,995,000,000 derived from the Highway account of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account), to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FEDERAL
HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 120. (a) For fiscal year 2014, the Secretary of Transportation shall—

(1) not distribute from the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways—

(A) amounts authorized for administrative expenses and programs by section 104(a) of title 23, United States Code; and

(B) amounts authorized for the Bureau of Transportation Statistics;

(2) not distribute an amount from the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways that is equal to the unobligated balance of amounts—

(A) made available from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) for Federal-aid highway and highway safety construction programs for previous fiscal years the funds for which are allocated by the Secretary (or apportioned by the Secretary under sections 202 or 204 of title 23, United States Code); and

(B) for which obligation limitation was provided in a previous fiscal year;

(3) determine the proportion that—

(A) the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways, less the aggregate of amounts not distributed under paragraphs (1) and (2), bears to

(B) the total of the sums authorized to be appropriated for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs (other than sums authorized to be appropriated for provisions of law described in paragraphs (1) through (11) of subsection (b) and sums authorized to be appropriated for section 119 of title 23, United States Code, equal to the amount referred to in subsection (b)(12) for such fiscal year), less the aggregate of the amounts not distributed under paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection;

(4) distribute the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways, less the aggregate amounts not distributed under paragraphs (1) and (2), for each of the programs (other than programs to which paragraph (1) applies) that are allocated by the Secretary under the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act and title 23, United States Code, or apportioned by the Secretary under sections 202 or 204 of that title, by multiplying—

(A) the proportion determined under paragraph (3); by

(B) the amounts authorized to be appropriated for each such program for such fiscal year; and

(5) distribute the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways, less the aggregate amounts not distributed under paragraphs (1) and (2) and the amounts distributed under paragraph (4), for Federal-aid highway and highway safety construction programs that are apportioned by the Secretary under title 23, United States Code (other than the amounts apportioned for the national highway performance program in section 119 of

title 23, United States Code, that are exempt from the limitation under subsection (b)(12) and the amounts apportioned under sections 202 and 204 of that title) in the proportion that—

(A) amounts authorized to be appropriated for the programs that are apportioned under title 23, United States Code, to each State for such fiscal year; bears to

(B) the total of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for the programs that are apportioned under title 23, United States Code, to all States for such fiscal year.

(b) EXCEPTIONS FROM OBLIGATION LIMITATION.—The obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways shall not apply to obligations under or for—

(1) section 125 of title 23, United States Code;

(2) section 147 of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1978 (23 U.S.C. 144 note; 92 Stat. 2714);

(3) section 9 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1981 (95 Stat. 1701);

(4) subsections (b) and (j) of section 131 of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982 (96 Stat. 2119);

(5) subsections (b) and (c) of section 149 of the Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1987 (101 Stat. 198);

(6) sections 1103 through 1108 of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (105 Stat. 2027);

(7) section 157 of title 23, United States Code (as in effect on June 8, 1998);

(8) section 105 of title 23, United States Code (as in effect for fiscal years 1998 through 2004, but only in an amount equal to \$639,000,000 for each of those fiscal years);

(9) Federal-aid highway programs for which obligation authority was made available under the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (112 Stat. 107) or subsequent Acts for multiple years or to remain available until expended, but only to the extent that the obligation authority has not lapsed or been used;

(10) section 105 of title 23, United States Code (but, for each of fiscal years 2005 through 2012, only in an amount equal to \$639,000,000 for each of those fiscal years);

(11) section 1603 of SAFETEA-LU (23 U.S.C. 118 note; 119 Stat. 1248), to the extent that funds obligated in accordance with that section were not subject to a limitation on obligations at the time at which the funds were initially made available for obligation;

(12) section 119 of title 23, United States Code (but, for each of fiscal years 2013 and 2014, only in an amount equal to \$639,000,000 for each of those fiscal years).

(c) REDISTRIBUTION OF UNUSED OBLIGATION AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Secretary shall, after August 1 of such fiscal year—

(1) revise a distribution of the obligation limitation made available under subsection (a) if an amount distributed cannot be obligated during that fiscal year; and

(2) redistribute sufficient amounts to those States able to obligate amounts in addition to those previously distributed during that fiscal year, giving priority to those States having large unobligated balances of funds apportioned under sections 144 (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act) and 104 of title 23, United States Code.

(d) APPLICABILITY OF OBLIGATION LIMITATIONS TO TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways shall apply to contract authority for transportation research programs carried out under—

(A) chapter 5 of title 23, United States Code; and

(B) division E of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Obligation authority made available under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) remain available for a period of 4 fiscal years; and

(B) be in addition to the amount of any limitation imposed on obligations for Federal-aid highway and highway safety construction programs for future fiscal years.

(e) REDISTRIBUTION OF CERTAIN AUTHORIZED FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the distribution of obligation limitation under subsection (a), the Secretary shall distribute to the States any funds (excluding funds authorized for the program under section 202 of title 23, United States Code) that—

(A) are authorized to be appropriated for such fiscal year for Federal-aid highway programs; and

(B) the Secretary determines will not be allocated to the States (or will not be apportioned to the States under section 204 of title 23, United States Code), and will not be available for obligation, in such fiscal year due to the imposition of any obligation limitation for such fiscal year.

(2) RATIO.—Funds shall be distributed under paragraph (1) in the same ratio as the distribution of obligation authority under subsection (a)(5).

(3) AVAILABILITY.—Funds distributed to each State under paragraph (1) shall be available for any purpose described in section 133(b) of title 23, United States Code.

SEC. 121. Notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, funds received by the Bureau of Transportation Statistics from the sale of data products, for necessary expenses incurred pursuant to chapter 63 of title 49, United States Code, may be credited to the Federal-aid highways account for the purpose of reimbursing the Bureau for such expenses: *Provided*, That such funds shall be subject to the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs.

SEC. 122. Not less than 15 days prior to waiving, under his statutory authority, any Buy America requirement for Federal-aid highway projects, the Secretary of Transportation shall make an informal public notice and comment opportunity on the intent to issue such waiver and the reasons therefor: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall provide an annual report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on any waivers granted under the Buy America requirements.

SEC. 123. From the unobligated balances of funds apportioned among the States prior to October 1, 2012, under sections 104(b) and 144 of title 23, United States Code (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of Public Law 112-141), the amount of \$13,248,000 shall be made available in fiscal year 2014 for the administrative expenses of the Federal Highway Administration: *Provided*, That this provision shall not apply to funds distributed in accordance with section 104(b)(5) of title 23, United States Code (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of Public Law 112-141); section 133(d)(1) of such title (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of Public Law 109-59); and the first sentence of section 133(d)(3)(A) of such title (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of Public Law 112-141): *Provided further*, That such amount shall be derived on a proportional basis from the unobligated balances of apportioned funds to which this provision applies: *Provided further*, That the amount made available by this provision in fiscal year 2014 for the administrative expenses of the Federal Highway Administration shall be in addition to the amount made

available in fiscal year 2014 for such purposes under section 104(a) of title 23, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the amount made available by this provision in fiscal year 2014 for the administrative expenses of the Federal Highway Administration shall have the same period of availability and characteristics of the contract authority made available under section 104(a) of title 23, United States Code.

□ 1800

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WOLF

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 29, beginning on line 23, strike section 123.

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

Mr. WOLF. Per an agreement with the authorizing committee, this amendment strikes section 123 under the administrative provision of the Federal Highway Administration. This section made certain unobligated balances of contract authority available in 2014.

This amendment is noncontroversial and will have no budgetary scoring effect.

I respectfully ask for a “yes” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. The amendment strikes \$13.25 million in additional funds for the administrative expenses for the Federal Highway Administration.

While I will not object to my friend’s amendment, I do have concerns that the more we cut on the administrative expenses, the agency’s ability to do proper oversight will suffer.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 124. (a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), none of the funds made available, limited, or otherwise affected by this Act shall be used to approve or otherwise authorize the imposition of any toll on any segment of highway located on the Federal-aid system in the State of Texas that—(1) as of the date of enactment of this Act, is not tolled; (2) is constructed with Federal assistance provided under title 23, United States Code; and (3) is in actual operation as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—

(1) NUMBER OF TOLL LANES.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to any segment of highway on the Federal-aid system described in that subsection that, as of the date on which a toll is imposed on the segment, will have the same number of nontoll lanes as were in existence prior to that date.

(2) HIGH-OCCUPANCY VEHICLE LANES.—A high-occupancy vehicle lane that is converted to a toll lane shall not be subject to

this section, and shall not be considered to be a nontoll lane for purposes of determining whether a highway will have fewer nontoll lanes than prior to the date of imposition of the toll, if—(A) high-occupancy vehicles occupied by the number of passengers specified by the entity operating the toll lane may use the toll lane without paying a toll, unless otherwise specified by the appropriate county, town, municipal or other local government entity, or public toll road or transit authority; or (B) each high-occupancy vehicle lane that was converted to a toll lane was constructed as a temporary lane to be replaced by a toll lane under a plan approved by the appropriate county, town, municipal or other local government entity, or public toll road or transit authority.

FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY
ADMINISTRATION
MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY OPERATIONS AND
PROGRAMS
(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)
(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For payment of obligations incurred in the implementation, execution and administration of motor carrier safety operations and programs pursuant to section 31104(i) of title 49, United States Code, and sections 4127 and 4134 of Public Law 109-59, as amended by Public Law 112-141, \$259,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) together with advances and reimbursements received by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, the sum of which shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds available for implementation, execution, or administration of motor carrier safety operations and programs authorized under title 49, United States Code, shall not exceed total obligations of \$259,000,000 for “Motor Carrier Safety Operations and Programs” for fiscal year 2014, of which \$9,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2016, is for the Research and Technology program, and of which \$1,000,000 shall be available for commercial motor vehicle operator’s grants to carry out section 4134 of Public Law 109-59: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 4127(e) of Public Law 109-59, none of the funds under this heading for outreach and education shall be available for transfer.

MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY GRANTS
(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)
(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)
(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

For payment of obligations incurred in carrying out sections 31102, 31104(a), 31106, 31107, 31109, 31309, 31313 of title 49, United States Code, and sections 4126 and 4128 of Public Law 109-59, as amended by Public Law 112-41, \$313,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds available for the implementation or execution of motor carrier safety programs shall not exceed total obligations of \$313,000,000 in fiscal year 2014 for “Motor Carrier Safety Grants”; of which \$218,000,000 shall be available for the motor carrier safety assistance program, \$30,000,000 shall be available for the commercial driver’s license improvements program, \$32,000,000 shall be available for border enforcement grants, \$5,000,000 shall be available for the performance and registration information system management program, \$25,000,000 shall be available for the commercial vehicle information systems and networks deployment program, and \$3,000,000 shall be available for the safety data improvement program: *Provided further*, That,

of the funds made available herein for the motor carrier safety assistance program, \$32,000,000 shall be available for audits of new entrant motor carriers: *Provided further*, That \$95,956,883 in unobligated balances are permanently rescinded.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION—FEDERAL MOTOR
CARRIER SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 130. Funds appropriated or limited in this Act shall be subject to the terms and conditions stipulated in section 350 of Public Law 107-87 and section 6901 of Public Law 110-28.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY
ADMINISTRATION
OPERATIONS AND RESEARCH

For expenses necessary to discharge the functions of the Secretary, with respect to traffic and highway safety authorized under chapter 301 and part C of subtitle VI of title 49, United States Code, \$117,000,000, of which \$20,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015.

OPERATIONS AND RESEARCH
(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)
(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For payment of obligations incurred in carrying out the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 403, and chapter 303 of title 49, United States Code, \$139,175,088, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the total obligations for which, in fiscal year 2014, are in excess of \$139,175,088, of which \$133,801,093 shall be for programs authorized under 23 U.S.C. 403, and of which \$5,373,995 shall be for the National Driver Register authorized under chapter 303 of title 49, United States Code: *Provided further*, That within the \$133,801,093 obligation limitation for operations and research, \$20,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015 and shall be in addition to the amount of any limitation imposed on obligations for future years: *Provided further*, That \$20,675,088 of the total obligation limitation for operations and research in fiscal year 2014 shall be applied toward unobligated balances of contract authority provided in prior Acts for carrying out the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 403, and chapter 303 of title 49, United States Code.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY GRANTS
(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)
(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)
(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

For payment of obligations incurred in carrying out provisions of 23 U.S.C. 402 and 405, section 2009 of Public Law 109-59, as amended by Public Law 112-141, and section 31101(a)(6) of Public Law 112-141, to remain available until expended, \$561,500,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account): *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the total obligations for which, in fiscal year 2014, are in excess of \$561,500,000 for programs authorized under 23 U.S.C. 402 and 405, section 2009 of Public Law 109-59, as amended by Public Law 112-141, and section 31101(a)(6) of Public Law 112-141, of which \$235,000,000 shall be for “Highway Safety Programs” under 23 U.S.C. 402; \$272,000,000 shall be for “National Priority Safety Programs” under 23 U.S.C. 405; \$29,000,000 shall be for “High Visibility Enforcement Program” under section 2009 of Public Law 109-59, as amended by Public Law 112-141; \$25,500,000 shall be for “Administrative Expenses”

under section 31101(a)(6) of Public Law 112-141: *Provided further*, That none of these funds shall be used for construction, rehabilitation, or remodeling costs, or for office furnishings and fixtures for State, local or private buildings or structures: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$500,000 of the funds made available for “National Priority Safety Programs” under 23 U.S.C. 405 for “Impaired Driving Countermeasures” (as described in subsection (d) of that section) shall be available for technical assistance to the States: *Provided further*, That with respect to the “Transfers” provision under 23 U.S.C. 405(a)(1)(G), any amounts remaining available to carry out any activities described in subsection (b) through (g) to increase the amount made available under section 402, shall include the obligational authority for such amounts: *Provided further*, That of the prior year unobligated balances of contract authority for “Highway Traffic Safety Grants”, \$152,281,282 is rescinded.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—NATIONAL
HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 140. An additional \$130,000 shall be made available to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, out of the amount limited for section 402 of title 23, United States Code, to pay for travel and related expenses for State management reviews and to pay for core competency development training and related expenses for highway safety staff.

SEC. 141. The limitations on obligations for the programs of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration set in this Act shall not apply to obligations for which obligation authority was made available in previous public laws but only to the extent that the obligation authority has not lapsed or been used.

SEC. 142. None of the funds in this Act shall be used to implement section 404 of title 23, United States Code.

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION
SAFETY AND OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses of the Federal Railroad Administration, not otherwise provided for, \$184,500,000, of which \$12,400,000 shall remain available until expended.

RAILROAD RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses for railroad research and development, \$35,250,000, to remain available until expended.

RAILROAD REHABILITATION AND IMPROVEMENT
FINANCING PROGRAM

The Secretary of Transportation is authorized to issue direct loans and loan guarantees pursuant to sections 502 through 504 of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-210), as amended, such authority to exist as long as any such direct loan or loan guarantee is outstanding: *Provided*, That, pursuant to section 502 of such Act, as amended, no new direct loans or loan guarantee commitments shall be made using Federal funds for the credit risk premium during fiscal year 2014.

OPERATING GRANTS TO THE NATIONAL
RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION

To enable the Secretary of Transportation to make quarterly grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation for the operation of intercity passenger rail, as authorized by section 101 of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 (division B of Public Law 110-432), \$350,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amounts available under this paragraph shall be available for the Secretary to approve funding to cover operating losses for the Corporation only after receiving and reviewing a grant request for each specific train route: *Provided further*, That each such

grant request shall be accompanied by a detailed financial analysis, revenue projection, and capital expenditure projection justifying the Federal support to the Secretary's satisfaction: *Provided further*, That not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, the Corporation shall transmit, in electronic format, to the Secretary, the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation the annual budget and business plan and the 5-Year Financial Plan for fiscal year 2014 required under section 204 of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008: *Provided further*, That the budget, business plan, monthly performance reports, and the 5-Year Financial Plan shall also include a separate accounting of ridership, revenues, and capital and operating expenses for the Northeast Corridor; commuter service; long-distance Amtrak service; State-supported service; each intercity train route, including Autotrain; and commercial activities including contract operations: *Provided further*, That the budget, business plan and the 5-Year Financial Plan shall include a description of work to be funded, along with cost estimates and an estimated timetable for completion of the projects covered by these plans: *Provided further*, That the budget, business plan and the 5-Year Financial Plan shall include annual information on the maintenance, refurbishment, replacement, and expansion for all Amtrak rolling stock consistent with the comprehensive fleet plan: *Provided further*, That the Corporation shall provide semiannual reports in electronic format regarding the pending business plan, which shall describe the work completed to date, any changes to the business plan, and the reasons for such changes, and shall identify all sole-source contract awards which shall be accompanied by a justification as to why said contract was awarded on a sole-source basis, as well as progress against the milestones and target dates of the 2012 performance improvement plan: *Provided further*, That the Corporation's budget, business plan, 5-Year Financial Plan, semiannual reports, and all subsequent supplemental plans shall be displayed on the Corporation's Web site within a reasonable timeframe following their submission to the appropriate entities: *Provided further*, That these plans shall be accompanied by a comprehensive fleet plan for all Amtrak rolling stock which shall address the Corporation's detailed plans and timeframes for the maintenance, refurbishment, replacement, and expansion of the Amtrak fleet: *Provided further*, That said fleet plan shall establish year-specific goals and milestones and discuss potential, current, and preferred financing options for all such activities: *Provided further*, That none of the funds under this heading may be obligated or expended until the Corporation agrees to continue abiding by the provisions of paragraphs 1, 2, 5, 9, and 11 of the summary of conditions for the direct loan agreement of June 28, 2002, in the same manner as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this Act may be used to support any route on which Amtrak offers a discounted fare of more than 50 percent off the normal peak fare: *Provided further*, That the preceding proviso does not apply to routes where the operating loss as a result of the discount is covered by a State and the State participates in the setting of fares: *Provided further*, That the Corporation shall submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a budget request for fiscal year 2015 in similar format and substance to those submitted by executive agencies of the Federal Government.

CAPITAL AND DEBT SERVICE GRANTS TO THE NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION

To enable the Secretary of Transportation to make grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation for capital investments as authorized by section 101(c), 102, and 219(b) of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 (division B of Public Law 110-432), \$600,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That after an initial distribution of up to \$50,000,000, which shall be used by the Corporation as a working capital account, all remaining funds shall be provided to the Corporation only on a reimbursable basis: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may retain up to one-half of 1 percent of the funds provided under this heading to fund the costs of project management oversight of capital projects funded by grants provided under this heading, as authorized by subsection 101(d) of division B of Public Law 110-432: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall approve funding for capital expenditures, including advance purchase orders of materials, for the Corporation only after receiving and reviewing a grant request for each specific capital project justifying the Federal support to the Secretary's satisfaction: *Provided further*, That except as otherwise provided herein, none of the funds under this heading may be used to subsidize operating losses of the Corporation: *Provided further*, That none of the funds under this heading may be used for capital projects not approved by the Secretary of Transportation or on the Corporation's fiscal year 2014 business plan: *Provided further*, That in addition to the project management oversight funds authorized under section 101(d) of division B of Public Law 110-432, the Secretary may retain up to an additional \$3,000,000 of the funds provided under this heading to fund expenses associated with implementing section 212 of division B of Public Law 110-432, including the amendments made by section 212 to section 24905 of title 49, United States Code.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk. The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 43, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$600,000,000)".

Page 150, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$600,000,000)".

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would increase the appropriations for Amtrak's capital and debt service grants by \$600 million and increase the spending reduction amount by the same amount. It would have the effect of entirely defunding this account.

Amtrak was created by Congress in 1970 to provide nationwide passenger rail service. It currently operates more than 40 routes across the United States. Unfortunately, the majority of these routes operate at a huge loss to taxpayers. The committee report for the underlying bill details just how big that loss is. In fiscal year 2011, Amtrak's long-distance routes ran a deficit of \$554 million. By next year, that amount is projected to grow to \$610 million in losses.

Mr. Chairman, the committee also takes note of Amtrak's troubled food

and beverage service, which has lost a total of \$313 million just over the last 3 years. This year alone, Amtrak is projected to lose nearly \$75 million on its food and beverage service, reflecting just a return of only 64 percent on its expenses. Despite these losses, Amtrak pays the attendants who serve on board food and beverages between \$24 and \$27 per hour. The committee itself points out that this wage is more than 20 percent higher than that of flight attendants, and these employees' current labor agreement calls for another 3 percent increase each year for the next 2 years.

Mr. Chairman, this isn't the first time I've come to the floor to talk about Amtrak, and I can say with some confidence that this probably won't be the last.

We as a country are broke; yet we continue to offer hundreds of millions of taxpayers' dollars each year to a passenger rail line which refuses to make meaningful reforms. The waste here is rampant, and we just cannot afford it anywhere. Our Nation is broke. We've got to stop spending money we don't have. We have to live within our means.

I urge support of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LATHAM. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment as it would shut down Amtrak.

I can see that Amtrak could be more efficient. There is no doubt about that. However, it has made significant improvements in this area recently, and it is moving in the right direction.

The bill does not include arbitrary funding decisions. We held hearings and scrubbed each. This committee worked very hard to achieve a balanced bill within our limited funding.

I urge a "no" vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. This amendment is just another example of how the Republican majority is limiting transportation options for the American people.

Last year, more than 31 million Americans chose Amtrak as the means of transportation to get to business meetings, family gatherings, and vacations. They chose Amtrak to avoid crowded airplanes, congested highways, and for the opportunity to view the wonderful and majestic scenery of this great Nation. Americans deserve a passenger rail system that is safe and reliable.

This amendment also demonstrates how many Members on the other side of the aisle will blindly cut funding without any idea of the real ramifications. For instance, I sincerely doubt

that the gentlelady from Tennessee understands that in addition to handing out 20,000 pink slips, her amendment would cost the government \$4.5 billion over the next 5 years due to the violation of labor agreements.

This is a shortsighted amendment. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NEXT GENERATION HIGH-SPEED RAIL
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available for Next Generation High Speed Rail, as authorized by sections 1103 and 7201 of Public Law 105-178, \$1,973,000 are hereby permanently rescinded: *Provided*, That no amounts may be cancelled from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

NORTHEAST CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available for the Northeast Corridor Improvement Program, as authorized by Public Law 94-210, \$4,419,000 are hereby permanently rescinded: *Provided*, That no amounts may be cancelled from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FEDERAL
RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 150. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds provided in this Act for the National Railroad Passenger Corporation shall immediately cease to be available to said Corporation in the event that the Corporation contracts to have services provided at or from any location outside the United States. For purposes of this section, the word "services" shall mean any service that was, as of July 1, 2006, performed by a full-time or part-time Amtrak employee whose base of employment is located within the United States.

SEC. 151. The Secretary of Transportation may receive and expend cash, or receive and utilize spare parts and similar items, from non-United States Government sources to repair damages to or replace United States Government owned automated track inspection cars and equipment as a result of third-party liability for such damages, and any amounts collected under this section shall be credited directly to the Safety and Operations account of the Federal Railroad Administration, and shall remain available until expended for the repair, operation and maintenance of automated track inspection cars and equipment in connection with the automated track inspection program.

SEC. 152. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, rule or regulation, the Secretary of Transportation is authorized to allow the issuer of any preferred stock heretofore sold to the Department to redeem or repurchase such stock upon the payment to the Department of an amount determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 153. None of the funds provided to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation may be used to fund any overtime costs in

excess of \$35,000 for any individual employee: *Provided*, That the president of Amtrak may waive the cap set in the previous proviso for specific employees when the president of Amtrak determines such a cap poses a risk to the safety and operational efficiency of the system: *Provided further*, That Amtrak shall notify House and Senate Committees on Appropriations within 30 days of granting waivers and delineate the reasons for granting such waiver in the Corporation's monthly report: *Provided further*, That Amtrak shall submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on November 1, 2013, a summary of the total number of employees that received such waivers, the total overtime payments the Corporation paid to employees receiving waivers, the total the Corporation paid in overtime payments in the prior three fiscal years, and a description of the factors that contributed to an increase or decrease from the prior year.

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION
ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For necessary administrative expenses of the Federal Transit Administration's programs authorized by chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code, \$102,713,000, of which up to \$3,000,000 shall be available to carry out the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 5329 and not less than \$1,000,000 shall be available to carry out the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 5326: *Provided*, That none of the funds provided or limited in this Act may be used to create a permanent office of transit security under this heading: *Provided further*, That upon submission to the Congress of the fiscal year 2015 President's budget, the Secretary of Transportation shall transmit to Congress the annual report on New Starts, including proposed allocations for fiscal year 2015.

TRANSIT FORMULA GRANTS
(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORITY)
(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For payment of obligations incurred in the Federal Public Transportation Assistance Program in this account, and for payment of obligations incurred in carrying out the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 5305, 5307, 5310, 5311, 5318, 5322(d), 5329(e)(6), 5335, 5337, 5339, and 5340, as amended by Public Law 112-141; and section 20005(b) of Public Law 112-141, \$9,500,000,000, to be derived from the Mass Transit Account of the Highway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds available for the implementation or execution of programs authorized under 49 U.S.C. 5305, 5307, 5310, 5311, 5318, 5322(d), 5329(e)(6), 5335, 5337, 5339, and 5340, as amended by Public Law 112-141, and section 20005(b) of Public Law 112-141, shall not exceed total obligations of \$8,595,000,000 in fiscal year 2014.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, DEMONSTRATION,
AND DEPLOYMENT PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5312, \$20,000,000, to remain available until expended.

TRANSIT COOPERATIVE RESEARCH PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5313, \$4,000,000, to remain available until expended.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND STANDARDS
DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5314, \$4,000,000, to remain available until expended.

HUMAN RESOURCES AND TRAINING

For necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5322(a), (b), and (e), \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CAPITAL INVESTMENT GRANTS

For necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5309, \$1,815,655,000, to remain available until expended.

□ 1815

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 49, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$127,283,000)".

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to increase transit funding for Capital Investment Grants, also known as the New Starts program, by \$127 million, which would bring it to the same level as the bill currently being considered in the Senate.

Earlier this year, almost 100 Members joined me in sending a letter to the Appropriations Committee requesting funding for transit, at a minimum, at the levels authorized in MAP-21 and in the President's request. In one of the few bright spots in this bill, transit formula grants are funded at the MAP-21 authorized level, in large part because the formula grants are funded out of the mass transit account of the highway trust fund. Unfortunately, the New Starts and Small Starts program, which comes out of general revenue and funds the construction of new fixed guideway systems, such as new subway lines, bus rapid transit, and light rail is cut 7 percent below the enacted level and 8 percent below the President's request. This shows how important it is that the provision in last year's Republican bill that would have cut regular mass transit funds out of the highway trust fund and subject it to appropriations was defeated because otherwise we would have a drastic cut there, too.

This bill is out of step with the demands of the American people. According to the American Public Transportation Association, a record 10.5 billion trips were taken last year, the second highest annual ridership since 1957. This increase in ridership is occurring all over the country, in places like Michigan, Ohio, South Carolina, Texas, Tennessee, Florida, Arizona, and Utah, to name just a few. Despite the increase in ridership, Federal transportation funding is not keeping up with demand. Public transportation agencies all across the country are facing possible job cuts, maintenance backlogs, service reductions, and fare hikes.

The funding levels in this bill provide barely enough to meet our existing commitments to projects currently under construction, and there is a small amount of money for only a few new Small Starts. The funding level is too low to adequately finance planning and development of additional transit projects. The policy framework in this bill is one of attrition and contraction:

to provide just enough money to close out the old projects, with no plans to invest in major new transit systems in any meaningful way in the future. We are not adequately investing in building new capacity and expanding transit service around this country, but I suppose that is the point—to slowly starve these programs to the point that they cease to be effective and then argue that they are not necessary.

But I am optimistic that we will ultimately provide greater funding for transit. This is an issue that historically has had bipartisan support. Many of my Republican friends joined me in protecting the transit funding guarantees during consideration of surface transportation legislation last year and in defeating the leadership's attempt to eliminate it. The business community and the real estate industry support funding for public transportation, along with a wide range of labor, civil rights, environmental, and civic organizations. Public transportation has broad support all over the country because people understand that investing in transit is one of the smartest things we can do to create jobs right here in America, reduce congestion and dependence on foreign oil, and spur economic growth.

My amendment would increase the New Starts program by \$127 million, which is a modest amount considering how much we should be investing in our infrastructure, but at least it would put the House bill on equal footing with the Senate. Unfortunately, there is no account to use as an offset that wouldn't cause significant harm to other important programs, and, therefore, I have offered none. I understand the chairman may insist upon raising a point of order, and this just shows the limitations under which we are working in this impossible bill in which there is grossly inadequate funding all around so that you can't responsibly ask for an offset without destroying mass transit or something else that is of great import in order to support adequate expenditures.

I urge my colleagues to support increasing transit funding in whatever final product for FY14 appropriations becomes law.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. The amendment is not in order in order under section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5, 113th Congress, which states:

It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in the budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2 (f) of rule XXI.

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill

in violation of such section. It would increase budget authority by \$127,383,000.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair will rule.

The gentleman from Iowa makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York violates section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5.

Section 3(d)(3) establishes a point of order against an amendment proposing a net increase in budget authority in the pending bill.

As persuasively asserted by the gentleman from Iowa, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GRANTS TO THE WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY

For grants to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority as authorized under section 601 of division B of Public Law 110-432, \$125,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall approve grants for capital and preventive maintenance expenditures for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority only after receiving and reviewing a request for each specific project: *Provided further*, That prior to approving such grants, the Secretary shall determine that the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority has placed the highest priority on those investments that will improve the safety of the system: *Provided further*, That the Secretary, in order to ensure safety throughout the rail system, may waive the requirements of section 601(e)(1) of title VI of Public Law 110-432 (112 Stat. 4968).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 49, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert (reduced by \$125,000,000).

Page 150, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert (increased by \$125,000,000).

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

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, it was my impression that this House had put an end to earmarks, and yet the Transportation-HUD appropriations bill contains \$125 million solely for the benefit of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, also known as WMATA.

This is just a fraction, mind you, of the \$1.5 billion that Congress intends to give the D.C. Metro system over a 10-year period. This is not just your everyday average earmark. The Heritage Foundation has dubbed this subsidy "the largest earmark in American history."

So I have an amendment here at the desk, and it is very simple. It simply eliminates this earmark that has received subsidies since 2008.

At a time of record budget deficits and debt, the American people cannot afford to provide yet again another earmark, another special subsidy, especially when you take into consideration the fact that the D.C. Metro already receives funds from a variety of other Federal sources, from other Federal Transit Administration grants and programs.

Also, you add to that, given the performance of this agency, I find it absolutely astounding that the American people should want to give even more of their hard-earned cash to this agency. In addition to daily service interruptions, lax management, and poor general performance, Metro has a significant record of wasting money. Right here in The Washington Post, it was reported that Metro spent \$382 million to rebuild cars, only to have them break down even more often than the cars that they didn't overhaul. The Post also pointed out that when senior agency attorneys wanted new offices for themselves, they spent over a quarter of a million dollars to accommodate them. And why not? It's simply our money, taxpayer money being used.

Last year, it was reported that the Office of Inspector General uncovered several personal and unwarranted expenses on Metro's credit cards, such as \$2,000 worth of gift cards, things like camcorders valued at \$730, and even \$180 for headphones. So even when they spend this money on things it should be spending on, the facts are really disturbing. The Federal Government pays, mind you, over half—specifically, 56 percent—of their capital costs already.

Now, I understand that we'll hear others who say, D.C., the Nation's Capital, it's a tourist destination and it has a large population that utilizes it as transportation to get to work, but this is nothing unique. The same can be said for cities back in my neck of the woods like New York City or over in Chicago or Philadelphia, Boston, and Los Angeles. Should they get the same earmarks as well? What is it that is unique about Washington, D.C., that they are the only ones that get this type of earmark?

Congress should not be forced to make the taxpayers use their hard-earned money to subsidize a transportation system that has failed over the years to get its fiscal house in order. We owe it to the American people to be better than that.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LATHAM. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I understand our friend from New Jersey

apparently doesn't like Metro or the clientele it serves. So much of what he said I think is, in fact, distorted.

The Metro system in metropolitan Washington is one of the great success stories of regional cooperation in the United States of America. In less than 40 years, this system has created the second highest transit utilization in the United States. New York's is well over 120 years old; we're less than 40.

In addition, my friend talked about taxpayer money. Not a dime of Federal money sustains or subsidizes Metro's operating costs. That's a problem because 40 percent of the Federal workforce uses Metro every day; and it is subsidized not by the Federal Government, I say to my friend from New Jersey, but by local governments in the metropolitan area. And I know because I was chairman of one of them, and I had to write that check every year for the subsidy for Metro—not the Federal Government, the government of Fairfax County. And we were happy to write the check because we saw the value in Metro.

Metro also has the highest fare box recovery rate in the United States of any transit system. Subsidies, we recover 80 percent through the fare box. It's the most efficient recovery in the United States. It lacks a dedicated source of revenue. It's the only major transit system in the United States that lacks a dedicated source of revenue.

That's why I say to my friend from New Jersey, my Republican predecessor introduced this legislation you want to cut. Tom Davis was the chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. He was a Republican Congressman from Virginia, from the 11th District of Virginia I now am privileged to represent, and he and I saw eye to eye on this subject. We needed Federal help, and the Federal Government has a special responsibility because this is the Nation's Capital.

Twelve million visitors use that Metro system at some point or another during the course of a year, unsubsidized by the Federal Government. In fact, the only subsidy we ever get is every 4 years when there's an inauguration, there's some consideration made. Other than that, we're kind of on our own.

And so Tom Davis, my Republican predecessor felt, as did all of us in the region, that there was a special obligation to at least help on capital improvements because it's an aging system. And with that aging system, elevators need to be replaced, escalators need to be improved, canopies need to be replaced.

□ 1830

And so we came up with a capital improvement idea. The deal was this: in a Republican Congress, that if the local governments would come up with a match, dollar for dollar, we, the Federal Government, would provide \$150

million a year for that capital improvement, to get new cars that are safer so we can avoid the kind of tragedy that occurred a few years ago in the system, because we have original cars still in the system from almost 40 years ago.

So the local governments came up with that match, \$150 million, 50 for Maryland, 50 for D.C., 50 for Virginia, and we amended the compact, the contract that created Metro, to put Federal representatives on the board for the first time with voting privileges.

If we adopt this amendment today, we turn our back on that Republican idea, that Republican legislation, and we turn our back on the faith that the local jurisdictions have expressed in keeping their commitment as part of this bargain.

Metro is a very important part of our Nation's Capital, and it is wrong to disinvest in it, and it's even wronger to break a contract, a commitment we made several years ago when my Republican predecessor introduced this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my friend from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman first begins his comments by attacking my motives in this matter, saying that—what did he say? I do not care about lines such as Metro or the people it serves.

I would ask the gentleman, who's not paying any attention to me, exactly what is it in my statement would say that I do not care about the people that it serves? Because I do care about them, as much as I care about the subway system or the metro system in my metro area, such as New York City or in my metro area, such as down in Newark, New Jersey. I care about them as well.

But you know, when I go back and I talk to those people who use those services, whether they be residents of New Jersey or residents of New York, or maybe they're residents from Virginia, from your neck of the woods up here, who come to visit the financial capital of the world, New York City, or the Garden State of New Jersey, who want to use our metro systems, they ask me why it is that D.C. gets a special deal, why D.C. gets \$1.5 billion over 10 years for their system.

Let's get the facts straight as far as the subsidy for the capital cost of 65 percent, and why our cities in our area, what is it that's so unique and special about this area and not about Chicago or Philadelphia or the other areas.

So I go to my first question. What is it in my statement that you said, you could slander me, sir, by saying that I do not care about the people who ride on these systems?

Mr. CONNOLLY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I would say to my friend from New Jersey, I do not question his motivation; I question his action. His action suggests, just as he just said, we're no different than any other transit system.

Well, we are different. This is the Nation's Capital, and we bear the full responsibility of moving the Federal workforce, the bulk of the Federal workforce to work every single day. That is not a responsibility the New York subway system bears. It's not the responsibility Boston bears, or the BART system in San Francisco bears. It is unique.

And we bear the responsibility in this region of welcoming 10 to 12 million fellow Americans every year to visit the Nation's Capital, many of whom use that Metro system, again, something that is subsidized on an operating basis, by the local taxpayer. That is unique to this area.

Mr. GARRETT. If I had some of the charts showing where some of the wealthiest districts are in the Nation, where, despite the turmoil of '08 and the financial crisis, where prices of real estate continue to rise, where revenues continue to go up, it would be in this section of the country, not in Boston, not in Philly, not in New York or Newark. But this is one of the wealthiest portions of the country.

And you're right, sir. If this is an area that should look for subsidies, it should look for subsidies from some of the wealthiest people in America that live right here, not under the underlying bill.

It's not asking for people from your district to pay their fair share, or the people from Maryland or Virginia to pay their fair share. It's asking for people from all across the country to chip in to pay for here, when you're not allowing the people from New York, Newark, Philadelphia, Chicago, out in California—those other areas have subway systems and metro systems. You're not willing to help them out.

But, Mr. Speaker, you want everyone else in America to help the residents who live here and subsidize their costs, but you're not willing to help out the people who live in my neck of the woods.

And that, sir, is unfair to my constituents. That's unfair to all the constituents in all those cities that are looking for a fair deal and for efficiency and economy from our government, and not for special deals.

I'll end where I began. I thought Washington had done away with earmarks but, obviously, with this legislation and the special interests that are being catered to here, we have not done so.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on

which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment by Mr. GALLEGO of Texas.

Amendment by Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

Amendment by Mr. GRAYSON of Florida.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

Amendment by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

Amendment by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

Amendment by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GALLEGO

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 317, noes 92, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 419]

AYES—317

Aderholt	Cleaver	Frankel (FL)
Alexander	Clyburn	Fudge
Amodei	Cohen	Gabbard
Andrews	Collins (GA)	Gallego
Bachus	Collins (NY)	Garamendi
Barber	Connolly	Garcia
Barletta	Conyers	Gerlach
Barrow (GA)	Cook	Gibbs
Barton	Cooper	Gibson
Bass	Costa	Gohmert
Beatty	Cotton	Gowdy
Becerra	Courtney	Grayson
Benishek	Crawford	Green, Al
Bentivolio	Crenshaw	Green, Gene
Bera (CA)	Crowley	Griffin (AR)
Bilirakis	Cuellar	Grijalva
Bishop (GA)	Culberson	Grimm
Bishop (NY)	Cummings	Guthrie
Blumenauer	Daines	Hahn
Bonamici	Davis (CA)	Hanna
Bonner	Davis, Danny	Hartzler
Boustany	Davis, Rodney	Hastings (WA)
Brady (PA)	DeFazio	Heck (NV)
Braley (IA)	DeGette	Heck (WA)
Brooks (AL)	Delaney	Higgins
Brooks (IN)	DeLauro	Himes
Brown (FL)	DelBene	Honda
Brownley (CA)	Denham	Hoyer
Buchanan	Dent	Huffman
Bustos	DeSantis	Hunter
Butterfield	Deuth	Israel
Calvert	Diaz-Balart	Jackson Lee
Camp	Doggett	Jeffries
Capito	Doyle	Johnson (GA)
Capps	Duckworth	Johnson (OH)
Capuano	Edwards	Johnson, E. B.
Cárdenas	Ellison	Jordan
Carney	Engel	Joyce
Carson (IN)	Enyart	Kaptur
Carter	Eshoo	Keating
Cartwright	Esty	Kelly (IL)
Cassidy	Farenthold	Kelly (PA)
Castor (FL)	Fattah	Kennedy
Castro (TX)	Fitzpatrick	Kildee
Chaffetz	Forbes	Kilmer
Chu	Fortenberry	Kind
Cicilline	Foster	King (IA)
Clay	Fox	King (NY)

Kinzinger (IL)	Nunes	Sewell (AL)
Kirkpatrick	Nunnelee	Shea-Porter
Kline	O'Rourke	Sherman
Kuster	Owens	Shimkus
Lamborn	Pascrell	Shuster
Lance	Pastor (AZ)	Simpson
Langevin	Paulsen	Sinema
Lankford	Payne	Sires
Larsen (WA)	Pearce	Slaughter
Larson (CT)	Pelosi	Smith (NE)
Latham	Perlmutter	Smith (NJ)
Lee (CA)	Peters (CA)	Smith (TX)
Levin	Peters (MI)	Smith (WA)
Lewis	Peterson	Speier
Lipinski	Petri	Stewart
LoBiondo	Pocan	Stivers
Loeb	Poe (TX)	Swalwell (CA)
Loeb	Polis	Takano
Lofgren	Pompeo	Terry
Lowenthal	Posey	Thompson (CA)
Lowey	Price (GA)	Thompson (MS)
Luetkemeyer	Price (NC)	Thompson (PA)
Lujan Grisham (NM)	Quigley	Thornberry
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Rahall	Tiberi
Lynch	Reed	Tierney
Maffei	Reichert	Tipton
Maloney	Renacci	Titus
Maloney, Carolyn	Rice (SC)	Tonko
Maloney, Sean	Richmond	Tsongas
Marino	Rigell	Turner
Matheson	Roby	Upton
Matsui	Roe (TN)	Valadao
McCarthy (CA)	Rogers (AL)	Van Hollen
McCaul	Rogers (KY)	Vargas
McCullum	Rogers (MI)	Veasey
McDermott	Rooney	Vela
McGovern	Ros-Lehtinen	Velázquez
McHenry	Roskam	Visclosky
McIntyre	Ross	Walberg
McKeon	Rothfus	Walden
McKinley	Roybal-Allard	Walorski
McMorris	Ruiz	Walz
Rodgers	Ruppersberger	Wasserman
McNerney	Rush	Schultz
Meehan	Ryan (OH)	Waters
Meeks	Ryan (WI)	Watt
Meng	Sánchez, Linda T.	Waxman
Messer	Sanchez, Loretta	Webster (FL)
Michaud	Sarbanes	Welch
Miller, George	Schakowsky	Wenstrup
Moore	Schiff	Williams
Moran	Schneider	Wittman
Mullin	Schock	Wolf
Murphy (FL)	Schwartz	Womack
Nadler	Scott (VA)	Yarmuth
Napolitano	Scott, David	Yoder
Neal	Sensenbrenner	Yoho
Negrete McLeod	Serrano	Young (AK)
Nolan	Sessions	Young (IN)

NOES—92

Amash	Goodlatte	Mulvaney
Bachmann	Gosar	Murphy (PA)
Barr	Granger	Neugebauer
Bishop (UT)	Graves (GA)	Noem
Black	Griffith (VA)	Nugent
Blackburn	Hall	Olson
Brady (TX)	Harper	Palazzo
Bridenstine	Harris	Perry
Broun (GA)	Hensarling	Pittenger
Bucshon	Holding	Radel
Burgess	Hudson	Ribble
Cantor	Huelskamp	Rohrabacher
Chabot	Huizenga (MI)	Rokita
Coble	Hultgren	Royce
Coffman	Hurt	Runyan
Cole	Issa	Salmon
Conaway	Jenkins	Sanford
DesJarlais	Johnson, Sam	Scalise
Duffy	Jones	Schweikert
Duncan (SC)	Kingston	Scott, Austin
Duncan (TN)	LaMalfa	Smith (MO)
Ellmers	Latta	Southerland
Fincher	Long	Stockman
Fleischmann	Lucas	Stutzman
Fleming	Lummis	Wagner
Flores	Marchant	Weber (TX)
Franks (AZ)	Massie	Westmoreland
Frelinghuysen	McClintock	Whitfield
Gardner	Mica	Wilson (SC)
Garrett	Miller (FL)	Woodall
Gingrey (GA)	Miller (MI)	

NOT VOTING—24

Campbell	Farr	Hastings (FL)
Clarke	Graves (MO)	Herrera Beutler
Cramer	Gutiérrez	Hinojosa
Dingell	Hanabusa	Holt

Horsford	Miller, Gary	Rangel
Labrador	Pallone	Schrader
McCarthy (NY)	Pingree (ME)	Wilson (FL)
Meadows	Pitts	Young (FL)

□ 1901

Messrs. COFFMAN, AMASH, ROKITA, SMITH of Missouri, STOCKMAN, FRANKS of Arizona, BURGESS, and HALL changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. CICILLINE, MCKINLEY, RYAN of Wisconsin, BENTIVOLIO, LEVIN, SHUSTER, RICE of South Carolina, VALADAO, TERRY, MAF-FEI, RUSH and RUPPERSBERGER, and Ms. BROWN of Florida and Mrs. ROBY changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 175, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 420]

AYES—239

Aderholt	Cohen	Gibson
Amodei	Cole	Goodlatte
Andrews	Conyers	Green, Al
Bachus	Cook	Green, Gene
Barletta	Cooper	Grijalva
Bass	Costa	Guthrie
Beatty	Courtney	Hahn
Becerra	Cramer	Hall
Benishek	Crenshaw	Hanna
Bera (CA)	Crowley	Harper
Bishop (GA)	Culberson	Hartzler
Bishop (NY)	Davis (CA)	Hastings (FL)
Bishop (UT)	Davis, Danny	Hastings (WA)
Blumenauer	Davis, Rodney	Heck (WA)
Bonamici	DeFazio	Higgins
Bonner	DeGette	Honda
Brady (PA)	Delaney	Hoyer
Brady (TX)	DeLauro	Huffman
Braley (IA)	DelBene	Hultgren
Brown (FL)	Denham	Jackson Lee
Brownley (CA)	Dent	Johnson (GA)
Bustos	Deuth	Johnson (OH)
Butterfield	Diaz-Balart	Johnson, E. B.
Calvert	Doyle	Jones
Capito	Duckworth	Jordan
Capps	Edwards	Joyce
Capuano	Ellison	Kaptur
Cárdenas	Ellmers	Keating
Carney	Engel	Kelly (IL)
Carson (IN)	Enyart	Kelly (PA)
Carter	Eshoo	Kennedy
Cartwright	Castor (FL)	Kildee
Cassidy	Castro (TX)	Kilmer
Castor (FL)	Chu	Kind
Castro (TX)	Cicilline	King (IA)
Chaffetz	Clarke	King (NY)
Chu	Clay	Kinzinger (IL)
Cicilline	Cleaver	Kirkpatrick
Clay	Clyburn	Kline
	Coble	Langewiesche

NOES—258

Alexander Griffith (VA)
 Amash Grimm
 Amodei Guthrie
 Bachmann Hall
 Bachus Hanna
 Barber Harper
 Barletta Harris
 Barr Hartzler
 Benishek Hastings (WA)
 Bentivolio Heck (NV)
 Bilirakis Hensarling
 Bishop (UT) Holding
 Black Hoyer
 Blackburn Hudson
 Bonner Huelskamp
 Boustany Huizenga (MI)
 Brady (TX) Hultgren
 Bridenstine Hunter
 Brooks (AL) Hurt
 Brooks (IN) Israel
 Broun (GA) Issa
 Brownley (CA) Jenkins
 Bucshon Johnson (OH)
 Burgess Johnson, Sam
 Calvert Jones
 Camp Jordan
 Cantor Joyce
 Capito Kaptur
 Capps Kelly (PA)
 Capuano Kildee
 Cárdenas Kind
 Carney King (IA)
 Carson (IN) Kingston
 Carter Kinzinger (IL)
 Cassidy Kirkpatrick
 Chabot Kline
 Chaffetz LaMalfa
 Cicilline Lamborn
 Coble Lance
 Coffman Langevin
 Cole Lankford
 Collins (GA) Latham
 Collins (NY) Latta
 Conaway Levin
 Conyers Long
 Cook Lowey
 Costa Lucas
 Cotton Luetkemeyer
 Crawford Lummis
 Crenshaw Marchant
 Cuellar Marino
 Culberson Massie
 Daines McCarthy (CA)
 Denham McCaul
 Dent McClintock
 DeSantis McCollum
 DesJarlais McHenry
 Diaz-Balart McIntyre
 Duffy McKeon
 Duncan (SC) McKinley
 Duncan (TN) McMorris
 Ellmers Rodgers
 Farenthold Meehan
 Fincher Messer
 Fleischmann Mica
 Fleming Miller (FL)
 Flores Miller (MI)
 Forbes Mullin
 Fortenberry Mulvaney
 Foxx Murphy (PA)
 Franks (AZ) Negrete McLeod
 Frelinghuysen Neugebauer
 Gabbard Noem
 Gallego Nugent
 Gardner Nunes
 Garrett Nunnelee
 Gerlach O'Rourke
 Gibbs Olson
 Gingrey (GA) Palazzo
 Gohmert Pascrell
 Goodlatte Pastor (AZ)
 Gosar Paulsen
 Gowdy Pearce
 Granger Pelosi
 Graves (GA) Perry
 Green, Gene Petri
 Griffin (AR) Pittenger

NOT VOTING—21

Aderholt Herrera Beutler
 Campbell Hinojosa
 Cramer Holt
 Dingell Horsford
 Graves (MO) Labrador
 Gutiérrez McCarthy (NY)
 Hanabusa Meadows

Poe (TX)
 Pompeo
 Price (GA)
 Price (NC)
 Radel
 Rahall
 Reed
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rice (SC)
 Rigell
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Royce
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Ryan (WI)
 Salmon
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanford
 Sarbanes
 Scalise
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schock
 Schrader
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Sinema
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Southerland
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Stockman
 Stutzman
 Terry
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Van Hollen
 Vargas
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walorski
 Walz
 Waxman
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yarmuth
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IN)

Miller, Gary
 Pallone
 Pingree (ME)
 Pitts
 Rangel
 Simpson
 Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
 The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1917

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF
 FLORIDA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 109, noes 300,
 not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 424]

AYES—109

Andrews
 Bass
 Beatty
 Becerra
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (NY)
 Brady (PA)
 Hastings (FL)
 Higgins
 Himes
 Brown (FL)
 Buchanan
 Bustos
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Castro (TX)
 Clarke
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Connolly
 Cooper
 Courtney
 Crowley
 Davis, Danny
 Davis, Rodney
 DeGette
 Delaney
 Walden
 DeLauro
 Deutch
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Fattah
 Frankel (FL)
 Fudge

NOES—300

Blumenauer
 Bonamici
 Bonner
 Boustany
 Brady (TX)
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Broun (GA)
 Brownley (CA)
 Buchson
 Burgess
 Butterfield
 Bera (CA)
 Calvert
 Camp
 Cantor
 Capito
 Capps

Cotton
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Cuellar
 Culberson
 Cummings
 Daines
 Davis (CA)
 DeFazio
 DelBene
 Denham
 Dent
 DeSantis
 DesJarlais
 Doggett
 Doyle
 Duckworth
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Ellmers
 Enyart
 Farenthold
 Farr
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foster
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gabbard
 Garcia
 Gardner
 Gibbs
 Gingrey (GA)
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Griffin (AR)
 Griffith (VA)
 Guthrie
 Hahn
 Hanna
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hastings (WA)
 Heck (NV)
 Heck (WA)
 Hensarling
 Holding
 Hudson
 Huelskamp
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurt
 Israel
 Issa
 Jackson Lee
 Jenkins
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Jordan
 Joyce
 Kelly (PA)
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 King (IA)
 Kingston
 Kinzinger (IL)

NOT VOTING—24

Hanabusa
 Herrera Beutler
 Hinojosa
 Holt
 Horsford
 Graves (MO)
 Gutiérrez
 Labrador
 Labradore
 Hall

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
 The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

Rigell
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Roybal-Allard
 Royce
 Lujan Grisham
 (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray
 (NM)
 Lummis
 Maloney,
 Carolyn
 Marchant
 Marino
 Massie
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCollum
 McHenry
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McNeerney
 Garrett
 Meng
 Messer
 Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller, George
 Moran
 Mullin
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (PA)
 Napolitano
 Negrete McLeod
 Neugebauer
 Noem
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Nunnelee
 O'Rourke
 Olson
 Owens
 Palazzo
 Pascrell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Paulsen
 Pearce
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Perry
 Peters (CA)
 Peters (MI)
 Peterson
 Petri
 Pittenger
 Poe (TX)
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yarmuth
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IN)

Meadows
 Miller, Gary
 Pallone
 Pingree (ME)
 Pitts
 Rangel
 Waters
 Young (FL)

□ 1920

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CRENSHAW was allowed to speak out of order.)

THE CONGRESSIONAL CHALLENGE CUP

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I think most Members of this body know that every year for the past 12 years there has been a golf match between the House Republicans and the House Democrats. It has become known as The First Tee Challenge, because the money that is raised from this event goes to help The First Tee, as they reach nearly hundreds of thousands of young people across this country using the game of golf to talk about honesty, integrity, hard work, and discipline. It is patterned after the Ryder Cup.

This year's competition took place last Monday. After the matches were over, the score was tied—10 points for the Republicans and 10 points for the Democrats. That is the ultimate in bipartisanship.

But the rules of The First Tee Challenge Cup provide, just like the Ryder Cup, that the team that is in possession of the coveted Roll Call Cup, which I have right here in my hand, the team that is in possession of the cup must be defeated for the cup to change hands. So, therefore, the fact that the match was a tie this year, the coveted Roll Call Cup will stay in possession of the Republican team for 1 more year.

I just want to thank all the members of the team for their hard work, their dedication, their fine play, and congratulate The First Tee for all the work that they do. And a special word of thanks to the sponsors, who have raised over \$2 million over these years to help support The First Tee.

I would like to yield to my Democratic counterpart, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend from Florida for his kind remarks.

It was a wonderful competition. I would like to blame redistricting on the reversal of fortune that we've had over the last 2 years; but I can say in all honesty that it was a phenomenal competition and, more importantly, it was a very civil and friendly competition with a great deal of mutual respect and a great deal of humor and fun in a day that was documented last night on Golf Central on the Golf Channel. As my friend said, the most important thing is that we are raising money for a very important charity that has done phenomenal work throughout the country.

I want to congratulate the Republicans for retaining the cup and congratulate my own team for a valiant effort. I must remind everyone that we didn't lose, we tied, and that we will get back at it next year and try to steal that cup from the Republicans where it rightfully belongs.

Once again, thank you very much to the Republican team. Thanks also to the sponsors, and primarily to The First Tee for the great work that they do.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, 2-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 116, noes 295, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 425]

AYES—116

Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Fattah

Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Grimm
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kilmer
King (NY)
Kuster
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks

Michaud
Moore
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Payne
Pocan
Posey
Quigley
Richmond
Runyan
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Welch
Wilson (FL)

NOES—295

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barnett
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishak

Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)

Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas

Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Farr
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones

Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lofgren
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci

Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci

NOT VOTING—22

Campbell
Carney
Cramer
Dingell
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa

Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Labrador
McCarthy (NY)
McIntyre
Meadows

Miller, Gary
Pallone
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Rangel
Young (FL)

□ 1929

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

CONTINUATION OF AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WOODALL). The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to thank my close friend from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), who not only called the House to order but who has been an extraordinary champion of transit systems for years, especially of Washington's metropolitan transit system, because he gets it. He understands how important this transit system is.

There was a previous discussion, a dialogue, between Mr. CONNOLLY and Mr. GARRETT. The outcome of it was a suggestion that Washington's Metro system is somehow extraordinarily subsidized. The fact is that it's subsidized but that it's subsidized primarily by local governments. We have been trying on our side to provide subsidies to transit systems all over the country, including in the New York-New Jersey area—apparently, given the results of some of the votes, without much success on this bill.

The point I want to make, Mr. Chairman, is that Metro is our Nation's transit system. It was created largely to serve the needs of the Federal Government. Forty percent of Metro's peak ridership are Federal employees, so a Federal role is both necessary and appropriate. WMATA is also the primary means of transportation for visitors to our Nation's Capital. Whether they come to experience our historical legacy, to participate in rallies on The Mall or to meet with their Members of Congress, they use our Nation's Metro system.

Now, in recognition of this special relationship and of WMATA's urgent need for additional capital funds, the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 authorized \$1.5 billion over 10 years for WMATA's capital and preventative maintenance projects. It was bipartisan. As Mr. CONNOLLY suggested, his predecessor, Mr. DAVIS, largely led much of the effort, and it was to be matched dollar for dollar by the jurisdictions that WMATA serves—the District of Columbia, the State of Maryland and the Commonwealth of Virginia.

That bill represented a compact between WMATA and the Federal Government, which was granted representation on the WMATA board. That was part of the legislation, that you've got to put Federal representation on the board in return for the funding. Up to this point, the Federal Government has upheld its end of this compact. That's why we object so strongly to the Garrett amendment. Currently, this appropriations bill on the floor today provides \$125 million, which is consistent

with this compact in its funding for the Metro system. It's a 16 percent cut already below the authorized level, which, in fact, has been fully funded in previous fiscal years, but Mr. GARRETT's amendment would eliminate even that reduced funding level.

The elimination of WMATA funding would be deeply detrimental to the system and would diminish the ability of thousands of employees to get to work—two-fifths of them Federal employees. Critically, the further cuts mandated by Mr. GARRETT's amendment would limit WMATA's ability to continue improving the safety of the system and fully implement the recommendations of the National Transportation Safety Board that resulted from the 2009 Red Line crash. That's what we need to implement. We wouldn't be able to do it with this amendment. Eliminating Federal funding would also jeopardize State capital funding for the Metro system by breaking the matching compact that has been agreed to by all the parties.

So, Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to reject this unnecessary amendment, which would irreparably harm America's most critical transit system.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

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

Mr. WOLF. I just want to speak briefly in support of what Mr. MORAN said.

Mr. Chairman, this law that we are drastically changing was really the result of a bipartisan agreement with regard to the Congress, and it was authored by former Congressman Tom Davis from northern Virginia. We voted on this one other time. A similar amendment was offered by Mr. GARRETT last year. It failed by a vote of 160–243.

In 2008, the Congress made a 10-year commitment as the Federal partner to provide capital funds for the needs of the Metro system. It was a commitment. It's in the law. We voted on it. We worked on it. It was bipartisan. Now we come up with the Garrett amendment. These funds are matched, as said by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), by WMATA's regional partners—Virginia, Maryland and Washington, D.C. Again, it was voted on before, in the last Congress, and it failed overwhelmingly by a vote of 160–243.

Eliminating this funding means that Congress would be choosing to go back on its commitment to provide the money needed to maintain a safe and reliable system used by many of your constituents—the people who visit. Metro is currently using Federal funds to improve a 30-year-old system to address the critical safety recommenda-

tions made by the National Transportation Safety Board. People died on the Metro. This money is being used to make the Metro safe. As the other Member said, many Members have constituents who come from all over the country to use it. More than half of the Metro rail system serves Federal facilities like the Pentagon, the Department of Homeland Security and many others.

I would ask Members to keep the commitment that was made in a bipartisan way and to vote down the Garrett amendment.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding.

He and I spent literally a decade working together, shoulder to shoulder, in a bipartisan way because this is America's subway. This is a subway that is used by almost all of the visitors who come to visit their capital. It is for that reason that the Federal Government has participated in building this extraordinary system.

The gentleman is correct. We have an agreement. There is a compact that has been signed by Republican Governors and Democratic Governors, by Republican Members of the House and Democratic Members of the House, by Republican members of the Senate and Democratic members of the Senate. I would hope that the House would reject this amendment.

I adopt the remarks of the gentlemen from Virginia. My colleagues Mr. MORAN and Mr. WOLF, I think, speak for all of us, and, of course, Mr. CONNOLLY has spoken very strongly for himself, but I would hope that the House would continue to keep the faith with the agreement that has been made for what is America's subway, used by all of our people when they come here to their Nation's Capital.

I want to thank the chairman, and I want to thank the ranking member for their efforts on behalf of the Metro as well as for keeping the faith of the agreement that we have reached. I thank the gentleman for his leadership and his remarks.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman.

I also want to thank Mr. LATHAM and Mr. PASTOR for their opposition to this amendment.

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

THUD APPROPRIATIONS

In 2008, the Congress made a 10-year commitment, as the federal partner, to provide capital funds for the needs of the Metro system.

These funds are matched by WMATA's regional partners, Virginia, Maryland and Washington, D.C.

This amendment would eliminate \$125 million in capital funds for Metro, which has already been cut from \$150 million last year.

A similar amendment offered to last year's THUD bill failed by a vote of 160–243.

Eliminating this funding means Congress is choosing to go back on its commitment to provide money needed to maintain a safe and reliable system used by many of your constituents.

Metro is currently using federal funds to improve its 30-year-old system to address the critical safety recommendations made by the National Transportation Safety Board, which Metro has made its highest priority.

WMATA operates the second largest rail system and sixth largest bus system in the U.S.

It provides 1.3 million trips a day—many of these trips carry employees to and from work every day.

More than half of the Metrorail stations serve federal facilities, like the Pentagon and the Department of Homeland Security.

Metro is critical to the economic growth of this region.

It has spurred \$37 billion in economic development at or near to Metro's property.

I represent the Dulles airport and Loudoun County and since 1999, I have supported extending metro rail to Dulles.

The funding provided in this bill for Metro is critical to the success and safety of the rail project along the Dulles Corridor, which is the single greatest economic engine for Northern Virginia.

Congress must continue to uphold its commitment to provide a safe and reliable metro experience for the American people that we serve.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I would hope that we may take advantage of revisiting this yet again to have a teachable moment here.

My good friend from New Jersey talked about some of the problems of the Metro system. As a practical matter, many of those problems are the result of 40 years of an accumulated maintenance deficit and a lack of a long-term, reliable partnership with the Federal Government, exemplified by the irresponsibility of this amendment that is being proposed.

The Federal Government is the primary beneficiary of Metro. Bear in mind these 68 square miles that represent the District of Columbia: 21 percent of the land is owned by the Federal Government, and a much larger percentage of the valuable land is tax-exempt; 30 percent of the jobs are Federal jobs even in these difficult times, and they're not paying taxes to the District of Columbia or to Metro; 40 percent of the rush-hour traffic is of Federal employees, and we suffer some of the worst traffic congestion in the United States in this region.

We have a serious accumulated deficit for maintenance, and this was part of a bipartisan, long-term agreement to solve this problem and improve service and meet the Federal responsibilities. I appreciate the advocacy and the eloquence of my friends from Virginia and Maryland who have come to the floor and pointed out this responsibility. I

speak as somebody who represents a district 2,300 miles away, but I, too, have an interest in the Federal Government's being a responsible partner in helping Metro function properly.

Many of us were on the floor of the House during 9/11. That was a horrible week in our Nation's Capital. But for the Metro system, the area would have been paralyzed.

□ 1945

I suggest that this is, I hope, well intentioned; but I think it's shortsighted, and it underscores the problems we have had in the district to deal with long-term capital investments. As has been pointed out, the local governments surrounding are part of the partnership and are contributing money.

I would hope that the Federal Government understands its responsibility and not only do we reject this misguided amendment, but hopefully we can use this as an opportunity to reaffirm the partnership, the role that the Federal Government plays, the benefit that the Federal Government obtains for our employees, for our visitors, for the land that is located here that occupies Federal activities.

Mr. Chairman, these are tea leaves that people read. I am sad that this bill underfunds infrastructure across the country on the very day that the American Society of Civil Engineers puts out their report that gives us a D-plus rating for infrastructure in this country, that we need increased private investment, local government funding. We have \$2.2 trillion over the next 10 years. It will be necessary just to bring our infrastructure up to standard. And this will be the quickest way to put Americans to work at family-wage jobs from coast to coast. I would hope at some point we get back to our responsibilities overall for infrastructure, but in the meantime we should reject this effort to undermine the partnership and the Federal responsibility.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, when we're in session, I have the opportunity—and I take it—to ride the metro. That's the way I get around in this great city. I have to tell you that in the late sixties, early seventies when I first came to Washington on other business, I saw where Connecticut Avenue was being dug up, the beginning of the Red Line. So I can attest, Mr. Chairman, that every morning at the South Capitol stop, people who work in this complex on Capitol Hill, that there are lines of workers that are coming into work.

So when the proposition came before the House, the compact that the Federal Government agreed with Maryland, Virginia, and the District, to maintain the metro and the particular States and District had the matching

funds, I was very supportive because I knew of the benefit that Metro brought to our employees here on Capitol Hill, as well as to the Federal employees throughout this metro area. So I have to tell you that I support the Metro system, and I oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, this appropriations measure fails at every level to meet our Nation's transportation infrastructure needs, support our States' housing initiatives, or further our community development goals.

I would like to take a moment to highlight a few of the most egregious cuts in the Transportation-Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill before us today because it's important for my constituents in Rhode Island to hear exactly what's being proposed here today.

We all recognize clearly that some cuts in Federal spending are unavoidable. In certain cases, they're even desirable in the current budgetary environment. But this bill goes far beyond what's reasonable by reneging on the spirit of the agreed-to spending levels in the Budget Control Act. The cuts in this bill to the Community Development Block Grant program, the HOME grant, and transportation investments endanger the well-being of America's cities and towns, as well as our residents.

Expanding economic opportunities and creating jobs continue to be my top priorities in Congress. It's exactly what this Nation needs right now. It's certainly what we need in Rhode Island, given the fact we have the fourth highest unemployment rate in the Nation. Regrettably, this bill achieves neither of these goals. The Congressional Budget Office estimated just last week the sequestration would result in 1.6 million fewer American jobs by the end of September 2014. Yet my Republican colleagues have decided to double down on this reckless policy by crafting the T-HUD bill with the assumption that sequestration remains in effect.

These cuts translate into real jobs and real benefits to our communities. Just 2 weeks ago, I celebrated a \$10

million Federal TIGER grant award that will be used to help Rhode Island replace the aging Providence Viaduct. It's part of the I-95 corridor that goes right through the center of Providence. This bill eliminates the TIGER grant program.

In April, our State Department of Transportation unveiled plans to improve the Providence Amtrak station. The station serves over 1 million Amtrak and commuter rail passengers each year, benefiting our entire State, as well as neighboring ones with multimodal connections from Providence to the Boston metropolitan area. This bill cuts Amtrak funding by 33 percent, endangering further improvements to important interstate transportation infrastructure.

In June, Rhode Islanders celebrated the 100th anniversary of the Amalgamated Transit Union Local 618. Their 1,000 members take us to school, work, to the doctor, and to the grocery store quickly and safely every day. Public transportation decreases congestion, pollution, and individual fuel costs; it connects us to recreation, family, and community; and it creates jobs in the short term, while supporting careers over the long term. This bill cuts transit funding by 17 percent from last year.

It also delivers a 25 percent cut to the Housing Counseling Assistance Fund, which helped over 2,000 Rhode Island families last year stay in their homes, avoid foreclosure, or refinance their mortgage. This bill would cut the HOME program by \$300 million, a 30 percent reduction from pre-sequestration levels. HOME is a critical resource that's used to develop affordable housing for those who need it most. It has resulted in over 4,200 units in Rhode Island alone being created.

Meanwhile, homeless families, the most vulnerable among us, once again will feel the full brunt of the majority's misplaced priorities. In 2012, over 4,800 Rhode Islanders found themselves homeless, one-quarter of them children. The State homeless assistance programs depend on Federal support to operate shelters to help move people to a permanent housing solution; yet H.R. 2610 does not come close to adequately funding these programs, placing thousands of Rhode Island families in even further jeopardy.

By cutting the administrative fund for section 8, this bill seeks to undermine the very integrity of that program. Those seeking housing assistance vouchers will find agencies understaffed, underfunded, and unable to serve the millions who depend on section 8 to stay in affordable housing. This is outrageous.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, this bill cuts the CDBG program by almost 50 percent, an unacceptable and draconian move that will cripple the neighborhoods that need the most help. These grants are the cornerstone of local investment opportunities. For every dollar spent on CDBG grants, \$3 is lever-

aged from private, nonprofit, and other non-Federal funding sources. The organizations working with CDBG funds use them for employment services, homeless assistance, child care, senior care, mental health outreach, and countless other services. I'm sad to see that the committee has decided that this is not worth the investment.

This bill is misguided, and I hope we will rethink this. I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to. Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. WOODALL, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2610) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON H.R. 2855, STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

Ms. GRANGER, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-185) on the bill making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 693

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 693.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

SCHOOL ACCESS TO EMERGENCY EPINEPHRINE ACT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2094) to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the preference given, in awarding certain asthma-related grants, to certain States (those allowing trained school personnel to administer epinephrine and meeting other related requirements).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2094

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "School Access to Emergency Epinephrine Act".

SEC. 2. ADDITIONAL PREFERENCE TO CERTAIN STATES THAT ALLOW TRAINED SCHOOL PERSONNEL TO ADMINISTER EPINEPHRINE.

Section 399L(d) of part P of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following:

“(F) SCHOOL PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION OF EPINEPHRINE.—In determining the preference (if any) to be given to a State under this subsection, the Secretary shall give additional preference to a State that provides to the Secretary the certification described in subparagraph (G) and that requires that each public elementary school and secondary school in the State—

“(i) permits trained personnel of the school to administer epinephrine to any student of the school reasonably believed to be having an anaphylactic reaction;

“(ii) maintains a supply of epinephrine in a secure location that is easily accessible to trained personnel of the school for the purpose of administration to any student of the school reasonably believed to be having an anaphylactic reaction; and

“(iii) has in place a plan for having on the premises of the school during all operating hours of the school one or more individuals who are trained personnel of the school.

“(G) CIVIL LIABILITY PROTECTION LAW.—The certification required in subparagraph (F) shall be a certification made by the State attorney general that the State has reviewed any applicable civil liability protection law to determine the application of such law with regard to elementary and secondary school trained personnel who may administer epinephrine to a student reasonably believed to be having an anaphylactic reaction and has concluded that such law provides adequate civil liability protection applicable to such trained personnel. For purposes of the previous sentence, the term ‘civil liability protection law’ means a State law offering legal protection to individuals who give aid on a voluntary basis in an emergency to an individual who is ill, in peril, or otherwise incapacitated.”; and

(2) in paragraph (3), by adding at the end the following:

“(E) The term ‘trained personnel’ means, with respect to an elementary or secondary school, an individual—

“(i) who has been designated by the principal (or other appropriate administrative staff) of the school to administer epinephrine on a voluntary basis outside their scope of employment;

“(ii) who has received training in the administration of epinephrine; and

“(iii) whose training in the administration of epinephrine meets appropriate medical

standards and has been documented by appropriate administrative staff of the school.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in support and urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 2094, the School Access to Emergency Epinephrine Act.

Mr. Speaker, according to the CDC, one out of every 13 children has a food allergy and that rate is rising. Some of these children can experience a severe allergic reaction known as anaphylaxis that can be deadly unless a medication called “epinephrine” is promptly administered. Studies also show that 16 percent to 18 percent of children with food allergies have had allergic reactions while in school. If those reactions are severe, school personnel should be ready to effectively manage students with known allergies and to be prepared for emergencies.

In 2004, Congress passed legislation to encourage States to allow children with known food allergies to bring their medication to school; however, there are many children who do not know that they have a serious food allergy, and they continue to be at risk.

Currently, less than half of the States have legislation concerning the stocking of epinephrine in schools. Even in these States with legislation, there is a broad range of different provisions about who can administer the epinephrine. Keeping a stock of nonstudent-specific epinephrine in schools is a lifesaving measure and should be implemented nationwide. H.R. 2094, the School Access to Emergency Epinephrine Act, is an important step to protect children who do not know that they are at risk for anaphylaxis. The bill would amend the Public Health Service Act to allow a preference in awarding asthma grants to States that prevent school personnel to administer epinephrine to a student in an emergency.

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

□ 2000

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

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in support of H.R. 2094, the School Access to Emergency Epinephrine Act. I am a cosponsor of this bill and urge its passage in the House.

Mr. Speaker, this bill provides incentives for schools to stock the lifesaving medicine that is critical for students and school staff who experience an anaphylactic emergency. Anaphylaxis is serious and life threatening. It is often caused by bee stings, bug bites, latex, and some medications, and can take just a few minutes to cause serious harm and even death.

Epinephrine is used to treat the symptoms of anaphylaxis and comes in the form of an EpiPen that is injected into the body and provides almost instant relief. Nearly 30 States across the country are working on legislation that would permit schools to keep a stock of EpiPens that aren't designated for particular individuals but, rather, available to students and staff who experience an allergic reaction that can be treated with epinephrine. H.R. 2094 that we are considering tonight would encourage the remaining States to work on enacting similar legislation.

This bill creates a preference in the existing Children's Asthma Treatment Grants Program, administered by the Department of Health and Human Services, for States that meet certain requirements that are enumerated in the bill.

Food allergies affect 5.9 million children. That's one in 13. This legislation is especially important because about 25 percent of individuals who are injected with an EpiPen for the first time don't know they have allergies that warrant the use of epinephrine. No student experiencing a severe allergic reaction at school should lose their life because there was no medicine prescribed to them.

Mr. Speaker, simply put, the passage and enactment of this bill will save the lives of countless students across our country who live with severe allergies. So I want to take a moment to commend the bill's author, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who has worked on this legislation for at least 3 years, and also Congressman PHIL ROE, for their bipartisan work on behalf of all Americans with allergies.

At this time, I yield such time as he may consume to the Democratic whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Dr. BURGESS and Mr. BUTTERFIELD for their leadership on this bill, but I certainly want to thank my friend, Dr. PHIL ROE, who has been a delight to work with. It has taken us a little bit of time, but we stayed after it. We stayed after it because, as Dr. BURGESS and Judge BUTTERFIELD have observed, this will save lives. This will save the lives of children. This will save the lives of children who do not

know that they have an allergy which is life threatening.

I'm the grandfather of an 11-year-old little girl. I've been with her twice in the emergency room when she was but an infant and when she was slightly older than an infant. I want to tell my colleagues a story about my daughter who took Alexa to Disney World.

They were walking down the pathway, one of the walkways at Disney World, and all of a sudden my granddaughter started wheezing heavily and stated having an allergic reaction. She is extraordinarily allergic to peanut butter and peanuts. But she'd had no peanut butter and she'd had no peanuts. As a matter of fact, this little girl is extraordinarily careful about what she eats. She comes to my house, she makes sure that I read the labels and she reads the labels. She brings with her her EpiPen in the little case that is always with her.

But as they were walking down that pathway, she started to wheeze heavily, and they had no idea why. My daughter turned around and retraced a few of their steps, and they saw popcorn being made—popcorn being made with peanut oil. And the mere breathing in of that peanut oil air caused her to start wheezing heavily. Now, she didn't have anaphylactic shock at that point in time, and she did not need to go to an emergency room at that time, but it shows how extraordinarily vulnerable people can be to these food allergies.

So I'm very pleased to stand here in support of this bill. I'm very pleased to stand here as a cosponsor of this legislation with my friend, Dr. ROE from Tennessee, and I want to thank him. I want to thank him for his work. I want to thank him as a doctor and as a Member of Congress and as a parent. He shared my concern and we worked together.

There were some difficulties to overcome, but he and I together, working together with FRED UPTON—and I want to thank FRED UPTON and HENRY WAXMAN, the chair and ranking member of the committee, as well as Dr. BURGESS and Mr. BUTTERFIELD for their help. They have both said, and I'm sure Dr. ROE will say, this will save lives. It is not a mandate, but it is a suggestion. It is an urging to make sure that, given the fact that we have this lifesaving capability, that that capability be deployed and be present so that no child will have to die because of a reaction to one of these allergies.

So I thank them again and thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. I thank the gentleman for those words, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee, Dr. PHIL ROE.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank Dr. BURGESS, and, Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to support the School Access to Emergency Epinephrine Act.

This bill will encourage States and schools to take small but meaningful steps to protect schoolchildren from anaphylaxis, a severe and potentially fatal allergic reaction that can be triggered by a food allergy, or even an insect sting. According to Food Allergy Research and Education, one in 13 children has a food allergy—roughly two in every classroom.

The bipartisan bill I introduced with Congressman HOYER—and I want to thank Congressman HOYER profusely today. His staff and my staff worked diligently on this bill to bring it to the floor. This bill provides a preference for asthma-related grants to States that adopt laws to permit properly trained school personnel to administer epinephrine to a student reasonably believed to have an anaphylactic reaction. To obtain preference, schools would have to maintain a supply of epinephrine and ensure trained personnel are present to administer.

This legislation has been scored by the Congressional Budget Office at no cost to the taxpayer. Our bill simply builds on an existing preference system signed into law in 2004 that helped make student self-administration of epinephrine a reality in 49 States.

Anaphylaxis, however, is not always predictable. An individual—adult or child—could have a severe allergic reaction even with no prior history of a food allergy, and I've seen this many times in my practice. Because anaphylaxis can cause deaths in just minutes, it is essential that epinephrine, the best treatment for anaphylaxis, be readily available for treatment. In most States, however, schools are not required to keep epinephrine stocked in case of emergencies. The result is needless tragedies, like that of Amarria Johnson.

Amarria was a 7-year-old girl—the same age of my granddaughter—who lived in Chesterfield County, Virginia. On January 2, 2012, she died from cardiac arrest and anaphylaxis as a result of eating a peanut. I had an opportunity to meet Amarria's mother, Laura Pendleton, at a briefing that Mr. HOYER and I hosted on our bill. Her story is absolutely heartbreaking.

As a father and a grandfather, I can't begin to imagine what she had to go through. In response to her death, the Virginia Legislature passed what has become known as "Amarria's law," which required public schools in the State to keep epinephrine on hand. But while 28 States have laws allowing schools to stock epinephrine, the States requiring the same remain in the minority.

A set of two epinephrine autoinjectors costs about \$150 and are good for a year. With new competition in the marketplace to produce what are commonly known as EpiPens, I'm confident the price will come down even further. The training required to use an EpiPen is minimal. School personnel could be trained by an EMT or a school nurse in a brief session. The

autoinjectors themselves are safe and very easy to use. The needle is covered by a protective sheath and only comes out when the EpiPen is pressed against the leg.

To make sure that teachers and other adults working at the school don't have to worry about a lawsuit for doing the right thing, our bill requires, as a condition of receiving preference for asthma-related grants, that the State attorney general reviews existing civil liability protection laws and certifies that they provide adequate protection to the trained school personnel.

I thank the minority whip, Mr. HOYER, who worked tirelessly on this, for being an outstanding partner in this process. His story with his granddaughter is a compelling one. This has become a bipartisan process every step of the way.

I would also like to thank Chairman UPTON and Mr. WAXMAN and his staff for helping advance this proposal. My hope is that this bill gives the States a little encouragement to ensure that what happened to Amarria doesn't ever happen to another child.

I thank Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and I thank Dr. BURGESS for allowing me to be here this evening, and I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I don't have any other speakers, and with that I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, as a physician, a parent and grandparent, I share the same fears that we have heard discussed this evening. I am worried that schools may not be prepared to act quickly in an emergency. I am pleased to support this legislation. I urge everyone on the floor to vote in favor of H.R. 2094.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2094.

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.

COLLECTIBLE COIN PROTECTION ACT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2754) to amend the Hobby Protection Act to make unlawful the provision of assistance or support in violation of that Act, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2754

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Collectible Coin Protection Act".

SEC. 2. PROVISION OF ASSISTANCE OR SUPPORT.

The Hobby Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 2101 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 2—

(A) in subsection (b), by inserting " , or the sale in commerce" after "distribution in commerce";

(B) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e) and inserting after subsection (c) the following:

"(d) PROVISION OF ASSISTANCE OR SUPPORT.—It shall be a violation of subsection (a) or (b) for a person to provide substantial assistance or support to any manufacturer, importer, or seller if that person knows or should have known that the manufacturer, importer, or seller is engaged in any act or practice that violates subsection (a) or (b).";

(C) in subsection (e) (as so redesignated), by striking "and (b)" and inserting "(b), and (d)";

(2) in section 3—

(A) by striking "If any person" and inserting "(a) IN GENERAL.—If any person";

(B) by striking "or has an agent" and inserting " , has an agent, transacts business, or wherever venue is proper under section 1391 of title 28, United States Code"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(b) TRADEMARK VIOLATIONS.—If the violation of section 2 (a) or (b) or a rule under section 2(c) also involves unauthorized use of registered trademarks belonging to a collectibles certification service, the owner of such trademarks shall have, in addition to the remedies provided in subsection (a), all rights provided under sections 34, 35, and 36 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1116, 1117, and 1118) for violations of such Act."; and

(3) in section 7, by adding at the end the following:

"(8) The term 'collectibles certification service' means a person recognized by collectors for providing independent certification that collectible items are genuine.

"(9) The term 'Trademark Act of 1946' means the Act entitled 'An Act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes', approved July 5, 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1051 et seq.)."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2754, the Collectible Coin Protection Act, is a simple bill with a simple purpose: to equip honest merchants and collectors as well as the Federal Government with the tools needed to fight a new wave of counterfeit coins and currency.

In recent years, the United States Government has taken extraordinary steps to make it difficult to counterfeit

U.S. currency. Think how the \$20 bill and other denominations have been redesigned over the last decade. As new bills become more difficult to counterfeit, some criminals have turned to counterfeiting rare specimens of older currency, which have none of the security features that we now recognize. Others have invested in counterfeiting rare coins. Some people have gone to great lengths to create realistic fakes—using modern design software and 3-D laser printers to make extremely close replicas, and even purchasing the old equipment used by the mint to strike the original coins.

As you might have guessed, most of the counterfeits are coming from China—where else?

The criminals have also cleverly taken advantage of the certification system used by collectors to assure authenticity, and they've turned it on its head.

Grading services, also called collectibles certification services, evaluate the authenticity and condition of a rare coin and then put it into a special holder called a slab, encapsulating it together with a description of the coin and its condition. The slab is designed to protect the coin, but it also protects the integrity of the grading. If the slab is tampered with, the grading is voided.

Some counterfeiters have now realized they can counterfeit the slab and the certificate as well. This has the advantage of making it harder to examine the coin since dealers are reluctant to break open the slab to examine the coin more closely unless they are absolutely certain that it is a fake.

□ 2015

H.R. 2754, the Collectible Coin Protection Act, amends the Hobby Protection Act to deal with these new problems. Under existing law, it is unlawful to make in the United States or to import into the United States an imitation coin or other numismatic item unless it is plainly and permanently marked with the word "copy."

The Federal Trade Commission has the authority to enforce the Act, and there is also a provision allowing private individuals to enjoin violations or to recover damages for violations that affect them.

H.R. 2754 extends the current law in three ways. It makes it unlawful to sell, as well as manufacture or import, the counterfeit coin that is not marked with the word "copy."

Second, the bill makes it unlawful to provide substantial support or assistance to a manufacturer, importer or seller if the person providing assistance knows or should have known that the manufacturer, importer or seller is engaged in any act or practice that violates the Hobby Protection Act.

Third, the bill provides additional remedies for violations that involve unauthorized use of registered trademarks belonging to a grading service. The additional remedies are the same that are usually provided for under the Trademark Act.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has no cost to the taxpayer. It should deter some of the counterfeiting practices that are now rampant in the marketplace and provide additional tools to deal with unrepentant dealers who go ahead with their schemes to defraud consumers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in support of H.R. 2754, the Collectible Coin Protection Act. I introduced this bill with the bipartisan support of Energy and Commerce full committee Ranking Member Mr. HENRY WAXMAN and Commerce, Manufacturing and Trade Subcommittee Chairman Mr. LEE TERRY, as well as three other colleagues, because the manufacture and sale of counterfeit coins is rapidly increasing across the country.

Manufacturing and selling imitation coins is a little-known black market industry here in the United States. With the invention of 3-D printers, anyone with a computer can now create a fake coin with relative ease that, for all intents and purposes, appears genuine in size and in color and in weight.

Unloading these imitation coins off on unsuspecting collectors has become big business and cuts to the very core of our ability to control and regulate the currency. By the time the collector realizes that he has been scammed, it is absolutely too late.

Current law, Mr. Speaker, makes it illegal to manufacture or import imitation coins meant for sale unless that coin is plainly and permanently marked with the word "copy." Mr. BURGESS made reference to that a moment ago.

My bill would extend current law and make it illegal to sell an imitation coin that is not conspicuously marked with the word "copy."

My bill would also make it unlawful for an individual to provide substantial support or assistance to anyone who manufactures or imports or sells counterfeit imitation coins in violation of the law.

And this bill would also extend trademark infringement protections available under the Trademark Act of 1946 for unauthorized use of a registered trademark in connection with an unlawful sale or other violation involving an imitation coin.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents in North Carolina and Americans across the country deserve to have the peace of mind to know that they will receive what they believe they are purchasing.

Individuals who sell fake products have a real and significant impact on our economy. The manufacture and sale of counterfeit imitation currency cannot be permitted to continue.

I'm confident my bill will provide greater protection for our Nation's currency and for those who collect it.

And so I thank Mr. BURGESS, and I thank all of my colleagues. I ask my colleagues to support this piece of legislation and vote "aye."

Again, I ask my colleagues to look at this and work with us, and let's get it passed and let's stop this black market that's emerging in our country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "aye" on H.R. 2754.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2754.

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.

REAUTHORIZATION OF NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM PROGRAMS

Mr. RUNYAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1300) to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to reauthorize the volunteer programs and community partnerships for the benefit of national wildlife refuges, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1300

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

SECTION 1. REAUTHORIZATION OF NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM VOLUNTEER, COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP, AND EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

Section 7(g) of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (16 U.S.C. 742f(g)) is amended by striking "2011 through 2014" and inserting "2015 through 2017".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RUNYAN) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RUNYAN. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the legislation that I have, H.R. 1300, which would reauthorize the volunteer programs and community partnerships at National Wildlife Refuges from FY15 to FY17.

Volunteers are the backbone of our National Wildlife Refuge system. In

fact, in FY12, volunteers contributed 1,594,246 hours of work at the wildlife refuges across the country. The value of this work, estimated at \$21.79 per hour, has an overall value contribution to FY12 estimated to be over \$34 million.

With this annual authorized appropriation of just \$2 million, we have received a value of return on investment of over 17 times. This kind of return on investment sets an example of how to effectively leverage a limited government investment.

The simple fact of the matter is that refuges cannot remain open without the contribution of volunteers and community groups. Volunteers currently contribute more than 20 percent of all refuge work, an equivalent to 766 full-time employees.

Volunteers have also allowed visitors centers to remain open during sequestration. As a result of volunteer work, the Fish and Wildlife Service has recently stated, "There are no immediate plans to close volunteer and education centers for sustained periods of time because of sequestration."

My home district in New Jersey is home to the Edwin B. Forsythe National Wildlife Refuge, which benefits from one of the best community volunteer programs in the country, The Friends of Forsythe. I have seen firsthand the invaluable contribution these volunteers make at Forsythe, and know that the refuge cannot continue to operate without the contributions of these volunteers.

I urge passage of H.R. 1300.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to join Mr. RUNYAN in support of H.R. 1300, a bill that will reauthorize volunteer and community partnerships for the National Wildlife Refuge System.

The National Wildlife Refuge System is an incredible asset to our country. In addition to protecting habitat that is essential to the survival of many bird and mammal and fish species, the system provides recreational opportunities that translate into jobs for Americans.

The 45 million people who visit a wildlife refuge each year to hunt and to fish and paddle, or simply watch wildlife, generate \$1.7 billion in sales for local economies. They support more than 34,000 jobs and contribute \$185 million in much-needed tax revenue.

My State of North Carolina has 10 National Wildlife Refuges, and there are 516 of them across the country.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1300 would reauthorize valuable volunteer and community partnership programs that benefit the refuge system.

Sequestration has tightened even more the scarce resources we have to

keep the National Wildlife Refuge System open and operational. The system depends on refuge volunteers, and we thank those volunteers, 56,000 of them, in fact, who contributed more than 2.15 million hours, valued at almost \$47 million in just 2012 alone. Generations of Americans would not be able to enjoy these national treasures if not for gracious volunteers.

Therefore, I commend my colleague, Mr. RUNYAN of New Jersey, for his work on this bill. I thank him for his work on the Natural Resources Committee, even thank him for his work on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, and for all that he does in introducing H.R. 1300, along with Natural Resources Committee Ranking Member SABLAN.

I strongly support this legislation and urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RUNYAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RUNYAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1300, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014—Continued

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). Pursuant to House Resolution 312 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2610.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) kindly resume the chair.

□ 2028

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2610) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, with Mr. WOODALL (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on an amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) had been postponed, and the bill had been read through page 50, line 6.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION (INCLUDING RESCISSION)

SEC. 160. The limitations on obligations for the programs of the Federal Transit Administration shall not apply to any authority under 49 U.S.C. 5338, previously made available for obligation, or to any other authority previously made available for obligation.

SEC. 161. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated or limited by this Act under the Federal Transit Administration's discretionary program appropriations headings for projects specified in this Act or identified in reports accompanying this Act not obligated by September 30, 2015, and other recoveries, shall be directed to projects eligible to use the funds for the purposes for which they were originally provided.

SEC. 162. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any funds appropriated before October 1, 2012, under any section of chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code, that remain available for expenditure, may be transferred to and administered under the most recent appropriation heading for any such section.

SEC. 163. Of the funds made available for the discretionary bus and bus facilities program under 49 U.S.C. 5309 in fiscal years 1999 through 2007, 2009 and 2010, \$88,047,709 shall be rescinded: *Provided*, That of the funds made available to carry out new fixed guideways and extensions to existing fixed guideways under 49 U.S.C. 5309 in fiscal years 1998 through 2000 and 2005 through 2006, \$38,290,300 shall be rescinded: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available for the alternatives analysis program under 49 U.S.C. 5339 in fiscal year 2012, \$25,000,000 shall be rescinded.

SEC. 164. For purposes of applying the project justification and local financial commitment criteria of 49 U.S.C. 5309(d) to a New Starts project, the Secretary may consider the costs and ridership of any connected project in an instance in which private parties are making significant financial contributions to the construction of the connected project; additionally, the Secretary may consider the significant financial contributions of private parties to the connected project in calculating the non-Federal share of net capital project costs for the New Starts project.

SEC. 165. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds made available in this Act shall be used to enter into a full funding grant agreement for a project with a New Starts share greater than 50 percent.

SEC. 166. None of the funds in this Act may be available to advance in any way a new fixed guideway capital project towards a full funding grant agreement as defined by 49 U.S.C. 5309 for the Metropolitan Transit Authority of Harris County, Texas if the proposed capital project is constructed on or planned to be constructed on Richmond Avenue west of South Shepherd Drive or on Post Oak Boulevard north of Richmond Avenue in Houston, Texas.

□ 2030

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. POE of Texas. I wish to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

Houston is the fourth most populous city in the country; but unlike other large cities, we have struggled to have an effective mass transit system. Ten

years ago, Houston had only buses. Wider highways were always the solution for transportation.

Over the past decade, Houston has but one light rail that averages 36,000 weekly boardings. I have never been a strong champion of light rail; but my congressional district includes a significant portion of the proposed rail line in section 166, the University rail line, which would go from downtown Houston toward the Hillcroft Transit Center.

A majority of my constituents in the affected area that would be served support the light rail. I am concerned about section 166 of the bill that would prohibit Federal funds from going toward a part of the University line that falls in the neighboring 7th Congressional District, Mr. CULBERSON's district. This language, although affecting his district primarily, indirectly affects my constituents because it has the effect of killing the whole project. Federal funds are needed to build the University line in Houston.

To be clear, section 166 really doesn't save any Federal money. It just sends those funds somewhere else—maybe to New York City. If we're going to spend the money, let's keep the money in Texas and put Texans to work.

I've recently surveyed the constituents who live in the affected area in my congressional district. My office went door-to-door meeting with local businesses over the last few days, speaking with organizations and talking to constituents. Those in the affected area want light rail. On Facebook alone in the last 2 days, 604 people supported light rail and 340 opposed it.

One Houstonian commented:

Houston needs a viable east-west transit corridor to connect to the Main Street line. As a 23-year-old young Houstonian, I strongly support the Richmond rail and project for Houston's future.

At least 26 community and civic organizations support the University line.

At this time I will yield to the gentleman sponsoring section 166 in the bill, Mr. CULBERSON, for a colloquy.

Mr. CULBERSON. Thank you, Judge POE.

Of course, I will continue to work with you and the committee, as I always have. I'll continue to support the will of the voters, as I have always supported Federal funding for those rail lines. It's been approved by the voters. And I look forward to continuing to work with you and my colleagues with the eastern area, as I have with Congressmen GENE GREEN and SHEILA JACKSON LEE, to support those lines in their districts that were on the ballot and were approved by voters.

Mr. POE of Texas. I understand the gentleman's position and the concerns from my colleague and his constituents who really don't want the rail in your congressional district. I respect that representation. The gentleman understands that we have a disagreement as to what constituents want in the af-

ected area. Your constituents don't want the rail. That small section in mine do want the rail. I hope we can work together with Metro productively to get something built that is in the interest of all concerned.

I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. CULBERSON. Thank you. I look forward to working with the gentleman.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman for his offer to work together. I certainly respect his position. It's my hope we can move forward and work productively and not block Federal funds that are coming to the Houston area that would go somewhere else. Let's work together with Metro, the City of Houston, the mayor's office, and the residents along the entire proposed line and see if we can find a solution that we all agree on, and hopefully we can keep this money in Texas.

I yield back the balance of my time.

SUPPORT FOR UNIVERSITY RAIL LINE

Greater Houston Partnership; Houston Citizen's Transportation Coalition; Houston Tomorrow; Richmond Rail.org; Montrose Management District; Claude Wynn Interests; Museum District Business Alliance; Neartown/Montrose Super Neighborhood; East Montrose Civic Association; Cherryhurst Civic Association; Board of Directors of the University Place Association; University Place Super Neighborhood Council; and Boulevard Oaks Civic Association.

Morningside Civic Association; Old Braeswood Property Owners Associations; Southgate Civic Club; Southampton Civic Club; Museum Area Municipal Association; Rice Village Alliance; Brays Bayou Association; Greater Houston Preservation Alliance; Uptown Management District; Menil Foundation; Museum of Fine Arts Houston; Friends of Mandell Park; and Former City Councilman Peter Brown, Director of BetterHouston.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to the Corporation, and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the Corporation's budget for the current fiscal year.

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE (HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND)

For necessary expenses to conduct the operations, maintenance, and capital asset renewal activities of those portions of the St. Lawrence Seaway owned, operated, and maintained by the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, \$30,582,000, to be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, pursuant to Public Law 99-662.

MARITIME ADMINISTRATION MARITIME SECURITY PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to maintain and preserve a U.S.-flag merchant fleet to serve the national security needs of the United States, \$174,000,000, to remain available until expended.

OPERATIONS AND TRAINING

For necessary expenses of operations and training activities authorized by law,

\$143,768,000, of which \$11,500,000 shall remain available until expended for maintenance and repair of training ships at State Maritime Academies, and of which \$2,400,000 shall remain available through September 30, 2015 for Student Incentive Program payments at State Maritime Academies, and of which \$10,000,000 shall remain available until expended for facilities maintenance and repair, equipment, and capital improvements at the United States Merchant Marine Academy: *Provided*, That amounts apportioned for the United States Merchant Marine Academy shall be available only upon allotments made personally by the Secretary of Transportation or the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs: *Provided further*, That the Superintendent, Deputy Superintendent and the Director of the Office of Resource Management of the United States Merchant Marine Academy may not be allotment holders for the United States Merchant Marine Academy, and the Administrator of the Maritime Administration shall hold all allotments made by the Secretary of Transportation or the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs under the previous proviso: *Provided further*, That 50 percent of the funding made available for the United States Merchant Marine Academy under this heading shall be available only after the Secretary, in consultation with the Superintendent and the Maritime Administrator, completes a plan detailing by program or activity how such funding will be expended at the Academy, and this plan is submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

SHIP DISPOSAL

For necessary expenses related to the disposal of obsolete vessels in the National Defense Reserve Fleet of the Maritime Administration, \$4,000,000, to remain available until expended.

MARITIME GUARANTEED LOAN (TITLE XI) PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary administrative expenses of the maritime guaranteed loan program, \$2,655,000 shall be paid to the appropriation for "Operations and Training", Maritime Administration.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 170. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Maritime Administration is authorized to furnish utilities and services and make necessary repairs in connection with any lease, contract, or occupancy involving Government property under control of the Maritime Administration: *Provided*, That payments received therefor shall be credited to the appropriation charged with the cost thereof and shall be available until expended: *Provided further*, That rental payments under any such lease, contract, or occupancy for items other than such utilities, services, or repairs shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 171. None of the funds available or appropriated in this Act shall be used by the United States Department of Transportation or the United States Maritime Administration to negotiate or otherwise execute, enter into, facilitate or perform fee-for-service contracts for vessel disposal, scrapping or recycling, unless there is no qualified domestic ship recycler that will pay any sum of money to purchase and scrap or recycle a vessel owned, operated or managed by the Maritime Administration or that is part of the National Defense Reserve Fleet. Such sales of vessels must be consistent with the solicitation and provide that the work will be performed in a timely manner at a facility qualified within the meaning of section 3502 of Public

Law 106-398. Nothing contained herein shall affect the Maritime Administration's authority to award contracts at least cost to the Federal Government and consistent with the requirements of 16 U.S.C. 5405(c), section 3502, or otherwise authorized under the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

PIPELINE AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SAFETY
ADMINISTRATION
OPERATIONAL EXPENSES
(PIPELINE SAFETY FUND)
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary operational expenses of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, \$21,167,000, of which \$639,000 shall be derived from the Pipeline Safety Fund: *Provided*, That \$1,000,000 shall be transferred to "Pipeline Safety" in order to fund "Pipeline Safety Information Grants to Communities" as authorized under section 60130 of title 49, United States Code.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SAFETY

For expenses necessary to discharge the hazardous materials safety functions of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, \$42,762,000, of which \$1,725,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That up to \$800,000 in fees collected under 49 U.S.C. 5108(g) shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury as offsetting receipts: *Provided further*, That there may be credited to this appropriation, to be available until expended, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred for training, for reports publication and dissemination, and for travel expenses incurred in performance of hazardous materials exemptions and approvals functions.

PIPELINE SAFETY
(PIPELINE SAFETY FUND)
(OIL SPILL LIABILITY TRUST FUND)
(PIPELINE SAFETY DESIGN REVIEW FUND)

For expenses necessary to conduct the functions of the pipeline safety program, for grants-in-aid to carry out a pipeline safety program, as authorized by 49 U.S.C. 60107, and to discharge the pipeline program responsibilities of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, \$111,252,000, of which \$18,573,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund and shall remain available until September 30, 2016; and of which \$90,679,000 shall be derived from the Pipeline Safety Fund, of which \$52,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016; and of which \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be derived from the Pipeline Safety Design Review Fund, as authorized in 49 U.S.C. 60117(n): *Provided*, That not less than \$1,058,000 of the funds provided under this heading shall be for the One-Call state grant program.

EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS GRANTS
(EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS FUND)

For necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5128(b), \$188,000, to be derived from the Emergency Preparedness Fund, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That not more than \$28,318,000 shall be made available for obligation in fiscal year 2014 from amounts made available by 49 U.S.C. 5116(i) and 5128(b)-(c): *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available by 49 U.S.C. 5116(i), 5128(b), or 5128(c) shall be made available for obligation by individuals other than the Secretary of Transportation, or his designee.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Inspector General to carry out the provisions

of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$79,624,000: *Provided*, That the Inspector General shall have all necessary authority, in carrying out the duties specified in the Inspector General Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. App. 3), to investigate allegations of fraud, including false statements to the government (18 U.S.C. 1001), by any person or entity that is subject to regulation by the Department: *Provided further*, That the funds made available under this heading may be used to investigate, pursuant to section 41712 of title 49, United States Code: (1) unfair or deceptive practices and unfair methods of competition by domestic and foreign air carriers and ticket agents; and (2) the compliance of domestic and foreign air carriers with respect to item (1) of this proviso: *Provided further*, That: (1) the Inspector General shall have the authority to audit and investigate the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority (MWAA); (2) in carrying out these audits and investigations the Inspector General shall have all the authorities described under section 6 of the Inspector General Act (5 U.S.C. App.); (3) MWAA Board Members, employees, contractors, and subcontractors shall cooperate and comply with requests from the Inspector General, including providing testimony and other information; (4) The Inspector General shall be permitted to observe closed executive sessions of the MWAA Board of Directors; (5) MWAA shall pay the expenses of the Inspector General, including staff salaries and benefits and associated operating costs, which shall be credited to this appropriation and remain available until expended; and (6) if MWAA fails to make funds available to the Inspector General within 30 days after a request for such funds is received, then the Inspector General shall notify the Secretary of Transportation who shall not approve a grant for MWAA under section 47107(b) of title 49, United States Code, until such funding is made available for the Inspector General.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Surface Transportation Board, including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$29,310,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed \$1,250,000 from fees established by the Chairman of the Surface Transportation Board shall be credited to this appropriation as offsetting collections and used for necessary and authorized expenses under this heading: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated from the general fund shall be reduced on a dollar-for-dollar basis as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 2014, to result in a final appropriation from the general fund estimated at no more than \$28,060,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION

SEC. 180. During the current fiscal year, applicable appropriations to the Department of Transportation shall be available for maintenance and operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; purchase of liability insurance for motor vehicles operating in foreign countries on official department business; and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902).

SEC. 181. Appropriations contained in this Act for the Department of Transportation shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for an Executive Level IV.

SEC. 182. None of the funds in this Act shall be available for salaries and expenses of more than 110 political and Presidential appointees in the Department of Transpor-

tation: *Provided*, That none of the personnel covered by this provision may be assigned on temporary detail outside the Department of Transportation.

SEC. 183. (a) No recipient of funds made available in this Act shall disseminate personal information (as defined in 18 U.S.C. 2725(3)) obtained by a State department of motor vehicles in connection with a motor vehicle record as defined in 18 U.S.C. 2725(1), except as provided in 18 U.S.C. 2721 for a use permitted under 18 U.S.C. 2721.

(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Secretary shall not withhold funds provided in this Act for any grantee if a State is in noncompliance with this provision.

SEC. 184. Funds received by the Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, and Federal Railroad Administration from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred for training may be credited respectively to the Federal Highway Administration's "Federal-Aid Highways" account, the Federal Transit Administration's "Research and University Research Centers" account, and to the Federal Railroad Administration's "Safety and Operations" account, except for State rail safety inspectors participating in training pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 20105.

SEC. 185. None of the funds in this Act to the Department of Transportation may be used to make a grant unless the Secretary of Transportation notifies the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations not less than 3 full business days before any project competitively selected to receive a discretionary grant award, any discretionary grant award, letter of intent, or full funding grant agreement totaling \$500,000 or more is announced by the department or its modal administrations from:

(1) any discretionary grant program of the Federal Highway Administration including the emergency relief program;

(2) the airport improvement program of the Federal Aviation Administration;

(3) any program of the Federal Railroad Administration; or

(4) any program of the Federal Transit Administration other than the formula grants and fixed guideway modernization programs: *Provided*, That the Secretary gives concurrent notification to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations for any "quick release" of funds from the emergency relief program: *Provided further*, That no notification shall involve funds that are not available for obligation.

SEC. 186. Rebates, refunds, incentive payments, minor fees and other funds received by the Department of Transportation from travel management centers, charge card programs, the subleasing of building space, and miscellaneous sources are to be credited to appropriations of the Department of Transportation and allocated to elements of the Department of Transportation using fair and equitable criteria and such funds shall be available until expended.

SEC. 187. Amounts made available in this or any other Act that the Secretary determines represent improper payments by the Department of Transportation to a third-party contractor under a financial assistance award, which are recovered pursuant to law, shall be available—

(1) to reimburse the actual expenses incurred by the Department of Transportation in recovering improper payments; and

(2) to pay contractors for services provided in recovering improper payments or contractor support in the implementation of the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002: *Provided*, That amounts in excess of that required for paragraphs (1) and (2)—

(A) shall be credited to and merged with the appropriation from which the improper

payments were made, and shall be available for the purposes and period for which such appropriations are available; or

(B) if no such appropriation remains available, shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further*, That prior to the transfer of any such recovery to an appropriations account, the Secretary shall notify the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations of the amount and reasons for such transfer: *Provided further*, That for purposes of this section, the term “improper payments”, has the same meaning as that provided in section 2(d)(2) of Public Law 107–300.

SEC. 188. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if any funds provided in or limited by this Act are subject to a reprogramming action that requires notice to be provided to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, said reprogramming action shall be approved or denied solely by the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided*, That the Secretary may provide notice to other congressional committees of the action of the Committees on Appropriations on such reprogramming but not sooner than 30 days following the date on which the reprogramming action has been approved or denied by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 189. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act may be used by the Surface Transportation Board of the Department of Transportation to charge or collect any filing fee for rate complaints filed with the Board in an amount in excess of the amount authorized for district court civil suit filing fees under section 1914 of title 28, United States Code.

SEC. 190. Funds appropriated in this Act to the modal administrations may be obligated for the Office of the Secretary for the costs related to assessments or reimbursable agreements only when such amounts are for the costs of goods and services that are purchased to provide a direct benefit to the applicable modal administration or administrations.

SEC. 191. The Secretary of Transportation is authorized to carry out a program that establishes uniform standards for developing and supporting agency transit pass and transit benefits authorized under section 7905 of title 5, United States Code, including distribution of transit benefits by various paper and electronic media.

SEC. 192. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the California High-Speed Rail Program of the California High-Speed Rail Authority.

SEC. 193. (a) Unobligated balances of funds made available for section 1307(d) of Public Law 109–59 are hereby permanently rescinded.

(b) For an additional amount to be made available on September 30, 2014 from savings made available from subsection (a), the Secretary of Transportation shall make grants for grade crossing safety as described in section 148(a)(4)(B)(vi) of title 23, United States Code, and corridor planning improvements as described in section 26101(b) of title 49, United States Code.

SEC. 194. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used by the Surface Transportation Board to take any actions with respect to construction of a high-speed rail project in California unless the Board has jurisdiction over the entire project and the permit is or was issued by the Board with respect to the project in its entirety.

This title may be cited as the “Department of Transportation Appropriations Act, 2014”.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION
EXECUTIVE OFFICES

For necessary salaries and expenses for Executive Offices, which shall be comprised of the offices of the Secretary, Deputy Secretary, Hearings and Appeals, Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations, Public Affairs, and Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, \$12,000,000, of which \$500,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$25,000 of the amount made available under this heading shall be available to the Secretary for official reception and representation expenses as the Secretary may determine.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 68, line 11, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$3,000,000)”.

Page 68, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$3,000,000)”.

Page 69, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$3,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, my amendment moves \$3 million from the executive offices of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, including the Deputy Secretary’s office, to the Office of Field Policy and Management, for a very good reason. The leadership at the Department of Housing and Urban Development has failed my neighbors in Florida under its unsubstantiated plan to remove the on-the-ground, community-based personnel from our local communities and transfer these positions to a single bureaucratic behemoth.

On September 30 of this year, HUD executives plan to move our local community-based HUD professionals to other offices hundreds of miles away. Yet the housing and homeless challenges in my community will remain. Mr. Chairman, Congress was not consulted on HUD’s plan. After HUD’s plan was leaked, a number of Members of Congress inquired.

So what is HUD’s plan? The Deputy Secretary said HUD plans to remove its representatives from the Tampa Bay and Orlando areas, a region of over 6 million Americans, larger than 30 States, and from other communities across the country. I asked HUD’s Deputy Secretary, Is this a cost-saving measure? He said, No. I asked HUD’s Deputy Secretary, Have you done a workforce analysis so that the HUD workforce is devoted to the areas that need help and the appropriate places at the appropriate numbers? No.

HUD executives have failed to provide any reasonable justification to Congress regarding the closing of 16 field offices, including two in Florida.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest it is not appropriate to concentrate HUD per-

sonnel in offices hundreds of miles away from where they’re needed. HUD is just asking for higher travel costs and an agency that will be more disconnected from communities.

Today, my amendment cuts the executive office budget of HUD by 25 percent and moves those dollars away from Washington and back to the Office of Field Policy and Management to restore some of the HUD field offices that are being shuttered in 2 months. In moving the dollars out of Washington, my intent is to directly help our homeless veterans and those on the ground working for multifamily housing, Choice Neighborhoods grants, neighborhood stabilization, Hardest Hit, housing counseling, and more.

My State and local communities cannot be served effectively under HUD’s plan to stovepipe its personnel hundreds of miles away. Florida has a population of 19 million, and 1.5 million veterans live in Florida, of which about 8,000 are homeless. We have 57,000 people in Florida that are battling homelessness and our foreclosure rate is still too high. Over the last year, Florida has had the most homes—over 103,000—foreclosed upon. California is a distant second. Nearly 9 percent of all Florida homes with mortgages were in some stage of foreclosure.

Communities throughout Tampa Bay have been hit hard by the housing crisis, and the reliable and informed HUD professionals in the Tampa Bay field office have been on the ground helping our neighbors daily. Earlier this year, more than 5,000 notices of mortgage default, foreclosure auction, or repossession were sent across Tampa Bay. Florida continues to have a very high foreclosure rate—and Tampa is no exception.

HUD professionals in my community have been there to help. They have helped us weather the economic crisis. The Tampa Bay HUD office has been critical for many of my neighbors and for community-based nonprofits working to solve the housing and homeless problems.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment simply says that bureaucrats in Washington will have a little bit less to ensure that our communities, including my home of Tampa, Orlando, and other communities across the country, have the professionals in the field that we need to help our neighbors, our veterans, and others with housing challenges.

I would like to thank my colleagues, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. GRAYSON, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. COSTA for joining me in cosponsoring this amendment.

I urge a “yes” vote on the Castor amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2045

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

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment by my colleague from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), and I want to thank Ms. CASTOR for working on this amendment.

The housing crisis has hit countless districts across the country—Florida, California, and other States—especially including my own district.

I represent some of the hardest hit areas in the United States of America, including the San Joaquin Valley. Although the housing sector has improved in recent months, there is still much work to be done. We must ensure hardworking individuals and families have the best information possible when making important life decisions, and HUD field offices and officers play a critical role in this process.

Whether it's through foreclosure assistance or for first-time homebuyers, HUD help is needed. Unfortunately, HUD wants to close various offices throughout the country. We must focus on providing HUD with the appropriate resources to adequately assist areas like the San Joaquin Valley that have been disproportionately affected by the housing crisis. Reducing access to services is not the answer.

Mr. Chairman, we've held countless foreclosure summits and workshops in our district. I've seen individuals in front of me that are losing their homes—young men, young women—tears in their eyes. They're getting excellent information from the HUD service officers, and to take that resource away from these individuals is a travesty. This commonsense amendment by my colleague from Florida aims to address this issue by removing 25 percent from HUD's executive account and moving it toward the field offices and policy management account. I know that the people in my district need and deserve these services. Ensuring HUD has the funding to keep offices open is a step in the right direction.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to thank the gentlelady for bringing this issue to our attention. I know it not only affects her district, but others across the country.

I have to tell you that other Members have come to me, and their great concern is that in many cases the stakeholders at the local offices where there will be closure have not been consulted or have not had adequate input into the negative effects that the closures will have. So for this reason, Mr. Chairman, I support my colleague's amendment and I support the gentlelady, and I ask for an "aye" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT OFFICES

For necessary salaries and expenses for administration, management and operations of offices of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, \$479,000,000, of which \$5,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That \$1,000,000 shall be available for claims and indemnities and shall remain available until expended; not to exceed \$44,000,000 shall be available for the Office of the Chief Financial Officer; not to exceed \$90,000,000 shall be available for the Office of the General Counsel; not to exceed \$186,000,000 shall be available for the Office of Administration; not to exceed \$49,000,000 shall be available for the Office of the Chief Human Capital Officer; not to exceed \$50,000,000 shall be available for the Office of Field Policy and Management; not to exceed \$17,000,000 shall be available for the Office of the Chief Procurement Officer; not to exceed \$3,000,000 shall be available for the Office of Departmental Equal Employment Opportunity; not to exceed \$5,000,000 shall be available for the Office of Strategic Planning and Management; and not to exceed \$34,000,000 shall be available for the Office of the Chief Information Officer: *Provided further*, That funds provided under this heading may be used for necessary administrative and non-administrative expenses of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, not otherwise provided for, including purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefore, as authorized by U.S.C. 5901-5902; hire of passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated under this heading may be used for advertising and promotional activities that support the housing mission area: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall provide the Committees on Appropriations quarterly written notification regarding the status of pending congressional reports: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall provide all signed reports required by Congress electronically.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. CAPITO

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 68, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$75,000,000)".

Page 69, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$40,000,000)".

Page 69, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$25,000,000)".

Page 69, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

Page 70, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$50,000,000)".

Page 70, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$25,000,000)".

Page 70, line 17, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$100,000,000)".

Page 89, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$350,000,000)".

Page 89, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$350,000,000)".

Page 91, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$100,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to offer this amendment with my colleagues, Mr. KELLY from Penn-

sylvania, Mr. MCKINLEY of West Virginia, and Mr. BARLETTA of Pennsylvania. Our amendment puts \$350 million back into the Community Development Block Grant program. The CDBG's budget has been reduced by \$1.3 billion from last year, and these reductions we believe will deeply affect our local communities.

With our national debt approaching \$17 trillion, it is critical that Congress tighten its belt and direct limited resources to the most important priorities. I believe that funding for CDBG is a high priority.

This amendment has been scored by the Congressional Budget Office, and it will not increase the budget authority proposed in this bill. In fact, it will actually reduce the outlays for fiscal year 2014 by \$129 million.

The Community Development Block Grant program plays a critical role for the many communities who are trying to find funds to improve lower-income and under-utilized areas. It helps tremendously in the rural areas.

In my home State of West Virginia, unfortunately, there are still some West Virginians who have to drive to fill up a water tank because they don't have access to safe drinking water. The CDBG program has been critical in funding these safe drinking water and sewer projects to many areas in West Virginia. Through the small cities CDBG fund, West Virginia has invested \$80 million over the last 5 years to improve access to clean water and to develop water and wastewater systems. These projects include a safe drinking water project in Buffalo, West Virginia, which provided clean drinking water to over 100 residents.

In my home town of Charleston, West Virginia, this program has provided much-needed help for our senior citizens, for road repairs, and our homeless shelters. The program has produced results, and our local governments need this funding to be reinstated so they can continue helping the communities because they need our support.

It was very difficult to find an offset for this. The HOME program has helped a lot of low-income individuals find affordable housing over the past 20 years. However, there have been grave concerns regarding oversight of the program, and HUD has been slow to adapt to many of the recommendations proposed by various auditors, including a GAO audit performed last February. I'm hopeful that HUD will view these cuts in their budget as proof that Congress is serious about oversight and will increase the oversight of the HOME program.

The CDBG program is a vital one, essential to States like mine and those of my colleagues who introduced this amendment. So I ask all my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike last word.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentlewoman from West Virginia. Obviously, we've got a very difficult allocation, and we understand the importance of the program. So with that, I would ask for an "aye" vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I join Chairman LATHAM and the gentlelady from West Virginia. CDBG is a great program.

When I was a county supervisor, we used the moneys to do infrastructure development and helped the communities and allowed other local officials to decide how those moneys were going to be used. But I have concerns about this amendment. It cuts HUD's salaries and expenses by \$250 million. This level will likely mean staff layoffs, especially in the office that administers the CDBG program. It also cuts the HOME program by \$100 million, even while it is at a record low level in this bill.

The amendment makes these draconian cuts to other programs, and the CDBG levels would still be well below the 1975 level. Robbing Peter to pay Paul is a direct result of the Ryan budget and the inadequate 302(b) allocation.

For that reason, I would oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 68, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

Page 69, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$7,000,000)".

Page 69, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$3,000,000)".

Page 101, line 14, after the first dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, families that receive housing counseling and home inspections make better decisions when it comes to purchasing or refinancing a home. They understand the financial burdens they can reasonably assume and what future costs they may incur due to homeownership, reducing their individual risk of foreclosure in the future. Fewer individual foreclosures also benefit surrounding communities; home prices remain stable, blight is reduced, and more families remain in place. That is why I have been relentless in urging

HUD to improve the educational resources available to borrowers when purchasing or refinancing a home.

Currently, HUD is working to improve its certified housing counselor training for potential and existing homebuyers, as well as develop home inspection educational materials for consumers when purchasing a home. Unfortunately, the issuance of these resources has been delayed. To date, only a few of the housing counseling documents have been released for public comment, including the application for the Housing Counseling Federal Advisory Committee and certification for HUD housing counseling.

The legislation before us today, H.R. 2610, the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, would reduce funding to finalize these resources at the time they are most needed.

Many low-to-moderate-income homeowners are still struggling to afford their homes. My amendment would provide the additional \$10 million necessary to restore housing counseling assistance funding to its FY 2013 level. Funding from HUD's administrative supportive offices account would be used to offset the amendment.

It would not impact any of the transportation or housing programs funding amounts. The net impact is zero on the budget authority, and it would reduce 2014 outlays by \$4 million—actually saving the government money over time.

This increased funding would help HUD complete its statutory obligations and start providing housing counseling information to FHA-insured borrowers and other interested families. These resources are essential for educating families about the financial burdens of owning a home, the importance of conducting a home inspection prior to purchase, and informing underwater homeowners of their options to avoid foreclosure. We cannot allow these families to wait any longer for these critical homeownership information resources.

I urge the House to protect families' interests when purchasing a home by voting "yes" on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Our bill had already taken steps to reduce HUD's salary and expenses budget in the interest of fiscal responsibility. In addition to these reductions, we just passed an amendment that reduced that account. We also have several more amendments at the desk that further eat at the administrative expenses to offset increases in higher priority programs—again, like the Community Development Block Grants. At some point, however, we cannot continue to take cut after cut into these accounts without jeopard-

izing HUD's ability to responsibly carry out its mission.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I would ask for a "no" vote and oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, as described by my colleague, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, counseling is very important to current homeowners, prospective homeowners; and with it, we ensure that someone who is going into an FHA-backed home is able to have all the information in order to be a good homeowner. Obviously home inspection is very important. To those people who are still underwater, they still need the counseling and the information from HUD.

So for those reasons, Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentlelady's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2100

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BARBER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 68, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,500,000)".

Page 69, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,500,000)".

Page 71, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

Page 80, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

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

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to request approval of an amendment that will support citizens of our great Nation who desperately need and deserve our assistance.

I am talking about our Nation's homeless veterans. At a time when our country needed them, they answered the call, personally sacrificing for the greater good—for our greater good.

My amendment will increase funding for housing vouchers by \$1 million, and it is offset by a reduction in the Administrative Support Office's budget.

We owe these men and women more than just a debt of gratitude. We owe them our unflinching support commensurate with their level of service, equal

to their sacrifice for you and for me and for all Americans who enjoy the freedoms that these veterans have protected.

Unfortunately, too many veterans still lack the necessary resources to keep a permanent roof over their heads. This, I hope we all agree, is completely unacceptable.

The Department of Veterans Affairs estimates that approximately 62,000 veterans remain homeless. That is 62,000 members of our Armed Forces who made an unwavering commitment to stand in the breach for this Nation, for freedom, for democracy, and the values that are the foundation of the United States of America.

According to the United States Inter-agency Council on Homelessness, nearly one-third of chronically homeless people are veterans. The men and women who put on the uniform of our Armed Forces took a solemn oath to do what we asked them to do, and they should not go without in their time of need.

When our soldiers came home from Vietnam they were subject to despicable insults and, even worse, did not receive the supports we promised them. Thousands of them make up the homeless population in our country today. This was a national disgrace, and we must do better for them and for the new veterans from Iraq and Afghanistan who are coming home every day. We must not allow them to become yet another homeless veteran.

While the Department of Veterans Affairs has a commendable goal to end veteran homelessness by 2015, it is shameful to even let one single veteran become homeless.

In my home district in Tucson, the city is working to ensure that veteran homelessness is eradicated permanently. I applaud and support those efforts, but more can and must be done across my district and the Nation.

If my amendment is adopted, it would increase by \$1 million the amount available to veterans for housing vouchers. It is offset by a reduction of \$1.5 million from the HUD Administrative Support Offices.

While this amendment will not solve the issue of veteran homelessness, it is a small and important first step that we can take to show our commitment to our veterans.

We cannot continue to fail these men and women who have so bravely served this Nation. It is not a Democratic or a Republican issue; it is an American issue. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote "yes" on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. FOXX). The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. Unfortunately, this, once again, is a political amendment. If you remember

last year, the motion to recommit the gentleman had, that was purely political after Mr. Dicks from Washington and I had made sure that we had every dime in the bill to make sure that every veteran was taken care of. And now to play politics with veterans I think is extraordinarily offensive because, in this bill, we fully fund the President's request. Everything that HUD says that we must do, every dollar is here for the veterans. Now to raise an issue like this I think is something that is not becoming to the House of Representatives.

We have, like I said, Madam Chairman, fully funded \$75 million for 10,000 new vouchers for our veterans. These vouchers are labor intensive, involving both the Veterans Administration and HUD officials in an intensive process moving veterans out of homelessness. The program also provides veterans with supportive services so that they receive job training and other services so that they can move toward a path of independence.

We have heard repeatedly from HUD that 10,000 new veterans' vouchers is the maximum number that can be processed. Let me say it again. From the administration, from President Obama, from Secretary Donovan and HUD, they are saying that they cannot handle any more capacity than the money that we have.

Again, Madam Chairman, I would ask a "no" vote for this only political vote. This is the second year in a row that we have had this. I find it very, very offensive that anyone in this House believes that we are not funding this to the full extent of what is asked for and what is required for our veterans that have served this country so well.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. First of all, I want to commend Chairman LATHAM for including the \$75 million in the base bill. As he said, that will deal with 10,000 veterans who are homeless. I commend him and President Obama for honoring their commitment to service the veterans.

To speak about amendments having political motives or having political connotations, several amendments ago I think we did CDBG, and I'm sure it had a few political connotations, but that's the way some of these amendments come forward.

To Mr. BARBER's amendment, I do have concerns that the offset may impede HUD's ability to carry out its mission, but I look forward to working with the gentleman to continue this important work. Hopefully, as we work for the Senate, we'll be able to increase the allocation for this bill.

I support the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BARBER. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PROGRAM OFFICE SALARIES AND EXPENSES
PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Public and Indian Housing, \$197,000,000, of which \$2,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015.

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Community Planning and Development, \$99,000,000, of which \$1,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015.

HOUSING

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Housing, \$377,000,000, of which \$4,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall appoint an administrator of the Office of Manufactured Housing within 120 days of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That the funds made available under this heading shall be reduced by \$50,000 for each day that the Department is in violation of the previous proviso.

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Policy Development and Research, \$21,000,000, of which \$500,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015.

FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, \$71,000,000, of which \$1,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015.

OFFICE OF HEALTHY HOMES AND LEAD HAZARD CONTROL

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control, \$7,000,000, of which \$500,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015.

PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING

TENANT-BASED RENTAL ASSISTANCE

For activities and assistance for the provision of tenant-based rental assistance authorized under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.) ("the Act" herein), not otherwise provided for, \$14,610,564,000, to remain available until expended, shall be available on October 1, 2013 (in addition to the \$4,000,000,000 previously appropriated under this heading that became available on October 1, 2013), and \$4,000,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be available on October 1, 2014: *Provided*, That amounts made available under this heading are provided as follows:

(1) \$17,000,000,000 shall be available for renewals of expiring section 8 tenant-based annual contributions contracts (including renewals of enhanced vouchers under any provision of law authorizing such assistance under section 8(t) of the Act) and including renewal of other special purpose incremental vouchers: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, from amounts provided under this paragraph and any carryover, the Secretary for the calendar year 2014 funding cycle shall provide renewal funding for each public housing agency based on validated voucher management system

(VMS) leasing and cost data for the prior calendar year and by applying an inflation factor as established by the Secretary, by notice published in the Federal Register, and by making any necessary adjustments for the costs associated with the first-time renewal of vouchers under this paragraph, including tenant protection and HOPE VI vouchers: *Provided further*, That in determining calendar year 2014 funding allocation under this heading for public housing agencies, including agencies participating in the Moving To Work (MTW) demonstration, the Secretary may take into account the anticipated impact of changes in targeting, medical expense thresholds, and utility allowances, to public housing agencies' contract renewal needs: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall, to the extent necessary to stay within the amount specified under this paragraph (except as otherwise modified under this Act), pro rata each public housing agency's allocation otherwise established pursuant to this paragraph: *Provided further*, That except as provided in the following provisos, the entire amount specified under this paragraph (except as otherwise modified under this Act) shall be obligated to the public housing agencies based on the allocation and pro rata method described above, and the Secretary shall notify public housing agencies of their annual budget by the latter of 60 days after enactment of this Act or March 1, 2014: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may extend the notification period, with the prior written approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That public housing agencies participating in the MTW demonstration shall be funded pursuant to their MTW agreements and shall be subject to the same pro rata adjustments under the previous provisos: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may offset public housing agencies' calendar year 2014 allocations by the excess amount of agencies' reserves as established by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That public housing agencies participating in the MTW demonstration shall also be subject to the offset, as determined by the Secretary, from the agencies' calendar year 2014 MTW funding allocation: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall use any offset referred to in the previous two provisos throughout the calendar year to prevent the termination of rental assistance for families as the result of insufficient funding, as determined by the Secretary, and to avoid or reduce the proration of renewal funding allocations: *Provided further*, That up to \$50,000,000 shall be available only: (1) for adjustments in the allocations for public housing agencies, after application for an adjustment by a public housing agency, that experienced a significant increase, as determined by the Secretary, in renewal costs of vouchers resulting from unforeseen circumstances or from portability under section 8(r) of the Act; (2) for vouchers that were not in use during the 12-month period in order to be available to meet a commitment pursuant to section 8(o)(13) of the Act; (3) for adjustments for costs associated with HUD-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (HUD-VASH) vouchers; (4) for adjustments in the allocations for public housing agencies that experienced a significant increase, as determined by the Secretary, in renewal costs as a result of participation in the Small Area Fair Market Rent demonstration: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall allocate amounts under the previous proviso based on need as determined by the Secretary; and (5) for public housing agencies that despite taking reasonable cost savings measures, as determined by the Secretary, would otherwise be required to terminate rental assistance for families as the result of insufficient funding;

(2) \$75,000,000 shall be for section 8 rental assistance for relocation and replacement of housing units that are demolished or disposed of pursuant to section 18 of the Act, conversion of section 23 projects to assistance under section 8, the family unification program under section 8(x) of the Act, relocation of witnesses in connection with efforts to combat crime in public and assisted housing pursuant to a request from a law enforcement or prosecution agency, enhanced vouchers under any provision of law authorizing such assistance under section 8(t) of the Act, HOPE VI vouchers, mandatory and voluntary conversions, and tenant protection assistance including replacement and relocation assistance or for project-based assistance to prevent the displacement of unassisted elderly tenants currently residing in section 202 properties financed between 1959 and 1974 that are refinanced pursuant to Public Law 106-569, as amended, or under the authority as provided under this Act: *Provided*, That when a public housing development is submitted for demolition or disposition under section 18 of the Act, the Secretary may provide section 8 rental assistance when the units pose an imminent health and safety risk to residents: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may only provide replacement vouchers for units that were occupied within the previous 24 months that cease to be available as assisted housing, subject only to the availability of funds: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this paragraph, \$5,000,000 may be available to provide tenant protection assistance, not otherwise provided under this paragraph, to residents residing in low vacancy areas and who may have to pay rents greater than 30 percent of household income, as the result of (1) the maturity of a HUD-insured, HUD held or section 202 loan that requires the permission of the Secretary prior to loan prepayment; (2) the expiration of a rental assistance contract for which the tenants are not eligible for enhanced voucher or tenant protection assistance under existing law; or (3) the expiration of affordability restrictions accompanying a mortgage or preservation program administered by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That such tenant protection assistance made available under the previous proviso may be provided under the authority of section 8(t) or section 8(o)(13) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(t)); *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall issue guidance to implement the previous provisos, including, but not limited to, requirements for defining eligible at-risk households within 120 days of the enactment of this Act, for the purposes under this paragraph, may use unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryovers, remaining from amounts appropriated in prior fiscal years under this heading for voucher assistance for nonelderly disabled families and for disaster assistance made available under Public Law 110-329;

(3) \$1,350,000,000 shall be for administrative and other expenses of public housing agencies in administering the section 8 tenant-based rental assistance program, of which up to \$15,000,000 shall be available to the Secretary to allocate to public housing agencies that need additional funds to administer their section 8 programs, including fees associated with section 8 tenant protection rental assistance, the administration of disaster-related vouchers, Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing vouchers, and other special purpose incremental vouchers: *Provided*, That no less than \$1,335,000,000 of the amount provided in this paragraph shall be allocated to public housing agencies for the calendar year 2014 funding cycle based on section 8(q) of the Act (and related Appropriation Act provisions) as in effect immediately before

the enactment of the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-276): *Provided further*, That if the amounts made available under this paragraph are insufficient to pay the amounts determined under the previous proviso, the Secretary may decrease the amounts allocated to agencies by a uniform percentage applicable to all agencies receiving funding under this paragraph or may, to the extent necessary to provide full payment of amounts determined under the previous proviso, utilize unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryovers, remaining from funds appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development under this heading from prior fiscal years, notwithstanding the purposes for which such amounts were appropriated: *Provided further*, That all public housing agencies participating in the MTW demonstration shall be funded pursuant to their MTW agreements, and shall be subject to the same uniform percentage decrease as under the previous proviso: *Provided further*, That amounts provided under this paragraph shall be only for activities related to the provision of tenant-based rental assistance authorized under section 8, including related development activities;

(4) \$110,564,000 for the renewal of tenant-based assistance contracts under section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013), including necessary administrative expenses: *Provided*, That administrative and other expenses of public housing agencies in administering the special purpose vouchers in this paragraph shall be funded under the same terms and be subject to the same pro rata reduction as the percent decrease for administrative and other expenses to public housing agencies under paragraph (3) of this heading;

(5) \$75,000,000 for incremental rental voucher assistance for use through a supported housing program administered in conjunction with the Department of Veterans Affairs as authorized under section 8(o)(19) of the United States Housing Act of 1937: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall make such funding available, notwithstanding section 204 (competition provision) of this title, to public housing agencies that partner with eligible VA Medical Centers or other entities as designated by the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs, based on geographical need for such assistance as identified by the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs, public housing agency administrative performance, and other factors as specified by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in consultation with the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may waive, or specify alternative requirements for (in consultation with the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs), any provision of any statute or regulation that the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development administers in connection with the use of funds made available under this paragraph (except for requirements related to fair housing, nondiscrimination, labor standards, and the environment), upon a finding by the Secretary that any such waivers or alternative requirements are necessary for the effective delivery and administration of such voucher assistance: *Provided further*, That assistance made available under this paragraph shall continue to remain available for homeless veterans upon turn-over; and

(6) The Secretary shall separately track all special purpose vouchers funded under this heading.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 71, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000,000)".

Page 72, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000,000)".

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chairman, much of the debate today on this bill has focused on tough choices—accepting cuts to one program to make sure another program stays afloat. But the reality is that these so-called tough choices are nothing compared to the choices this bill would force on hundreds of thousands of low-income families: whether to buy food for their children, to fill their necessary prescriptions, or to pay their rent.

Today, the Housing Choice Voucher program, commonly known as section 8, ensures that many fewer families have to make such choices by providing rental assistance to 2.2 million households with incomes well below the poverty line. Half of these households are headed by seniors or people with disabilities, and the rest are typically families with children. Study after study by HUD, GAO, and independent researchers have demonstrated that the section 8 voucher program is a cost-effective means of providing very low-income families secure housing and preventing homelessness.

Typically, Congress has provided State and local housing agencies the funds necessary to renew every housing voucher used in the previous fiscal year, thereby ensuring that families have stable housing, kids stay in school, and parents stay in the workforce. This year, however, for only the third time in the program's 40-year history, this bill would fail to provide sufficient, or even close to sufficient, funding to renew all existing housing vouchers.

Because of sequestration, nearly 100,000 fewer families, and maybe as many as 150,000 fewer families, will receive housing assistance this year. I have already heard from housing agencies across New York State who are turning away families on waiting lists and pulling back issued vouchers for families who have not yet signed a lease agreement. If the bill becomes law as written, thousands of low-income families will lose their existing vouchers, will be evicted from their homes, and will end up living on the streets.

Despite the risks for these families, the bill before us today provides only \$17 billion for housing choice voucher renewals, locking in sequestration

cuts, and cutting off 100,000 families from housing assistance. To protect these families, I am offering this amendment to increase funding for section 8 voucher renewals by \$1 billion.

These additional funds will ensure that housing agencies can renew existing eligible vouchers this year and that no additional families will have to face the choice between putting food on the table and paying their rent, between filling their prescriptions and living on the street. I say no additional families will have to face this choice because the current allocation of section 8 is far too meager and there are hundreds of thousands of families on the waiting list. But at least with this amendment, no additional families will be thrown out on the street because we will renew existing vouchers.

□ 2115

Under the bill as written, upwards of 100,000 or so families will not have their vouchers renewed and will be forced to be evicted. This amendment will ensure not additional section 8 vouchers but simply that existing vouchers will be maintained for people who are living on section 8 vouchers now.

Madam Chairperson, our first objective must be to prevent further hardship to the poorest among us and to prevent the evictions of people currently receiving section 8 vouchers.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairwoman, I insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairwoman, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. The amendment is not in order under section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5, the 113th Congress, which states:

It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI.

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of this section. This amendment would increase net budget authority by \$1 billion.

I ask for a ruling of the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chairwoman, I think we can all agree the amendment is necessary. We are talking about evicting 100,000 to 150,000 families from an efficient, cost-effective program that keeps families together and that lowers our costs over the long term. Without this amendment, you will see a spike in homelessness, a spike in medical costs and a spike in hungry kids.

I understand the chairman's point of order, and I understand that the rules demand an offset for any funding increase in the bill. However, when funding levels are as restrictive across the board as they are in this bill and when the rules require that a majority in the House cannot increase the total funds allocated by the Appropriations Committee to this bill, it is impossible to—

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will confine his remarks to the point of order.

Mr. NADLER. I am very much on the point.

When the rules require that a majority in the House cannot increase the total funds allocated by the Appropriations Committee to this bill, it is impossible to remedy such a drastic cut without hurting other people in need. I hope, as we go forward, that we can find a way to provide these funds so that hundreds of thousands of very low-income working families and seniors are not put out on the street. I hope we will recognize that the Senate bill is less brutal than the bill now before us.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Iowa makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York violates section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5.

Section 3(d)(3) establishes a point of order against an amendment proposing a net increase in budget authority in the pending bill.

As persuasively asserted by the gentleman from Iowa, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSING CERTIFICATE FUND
(INCLUDES RESCISSIONS)

Unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development under this heading, the heading "Annual Contributions for Assisted Housing", and the heading "Project-Based Rental Assistance", for fiscal year 2014 and prior years may be used for renewal of or amendments to section 8 project-based contracts and for performance-based contract administrators, notwithstanding the purposes for which such funds were appropriated: *Provided*, That any obligated balances of contract authority from fiscal year 1974 and prior that have been terminated shall be rescinded: *Provided further*, That amounts previously recaptured, or recaptured during the current fiscal year, from section 8 project-based contracts from source years fiscal year 1975 through fiscal year 1987 are hereby permanently rescinded, and an amount of additional new budget authority, equivalent to the amount permanently rescinded is hereby appropriated, to remain available until expended, for the purposes set forth under this heading, in addition to amounts otherwise available.

PUBLIC HOUSING CAPITAL FUND

For the Public Housing Capital Fund Program to carry out capital and management

activities for public housing agencies, as authorized under section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g) (the "Act"), \$1,500,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, during fiscal year 2014 the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may not delegate to any Department official other than the Deputy Secretary and the Assistant Secretary for Public and Indian Housing any authority under paragraph (2) of section 9(j) regarding the extension of the time periods under such section: *Provided further*, That for purposes of such section 9(j), the term "obligate" means, with respect to amounts, that the amounts are subject to a binding agreement that will result in outlays, immediately or in the future: *Provided further*, That up to \$8,000,000 shall be to support ongoing Public Housing Financial and Physical Assessment activities: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, not to exceed \$20,000,000 shall be available for the Secretary to make grants, notwithstanding section 204 of this Act, to public housing agencies for emergency capital needs including safety and security measures necessary to address crime and drug-related activity as well as needs resulting from unforeseen or unpreventable emergencies and natural disasters excluding Presidentially declared emergencies and natural disasters under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) occurring in fiscal year 2014: *Provided further*, That from the funds made available under this heading, the Secretary shall provide bonus awards in fiscal year 2014 to public housing agencies that are designated high performers: *Provided further*, That up to \$15,000,000 of funds made available under this heading shall be used for a Jobs-Plus Pilot initiative modeled after the Jobs-Plus demonstration: *Provided further*, That the Jobs-Plus Pilot initiative shall provide competitive grants to partnerships between public housing authorities, local workforce investment boards established under section 117 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998, and other agencies and organizations that provide support to help public housing residents obtain employment and increase earnings: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may waive or specify alternative requirements for any provision of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (except for requirements related to fair housing, nondiscrimination, labor standards, and the environment) upon a finding by the Secretary that any such waivers or alternative requirements are necessary for the effective implementation of the Jobs-Plus Pilot initiative: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall publish by notice in the Federal Register any waivers or alternative requirements pursuant to the preceding proviso no later than 10 days before the effective date of such notice.

PUBLIC HOUSING OPERATING FUND

For 2014 payments to public housing agencies for the operation and management of public housing, as authorized by section 9(e) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g(e)), \$4,262,010,000: *Provided*, That in determining public housing agencies', including Moving to Work agencies', calendar year 2014 funding allocations under this heading, the Secretary shall take into account the impact of changes in flat rents and medical expense thresholds on public housing agencies' formula income levels.

CHOICE NEIGHBORHOODS INITIATIVE (RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available for "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Public and Indian Housing - Choice Neigh-

borhoods Initiative" by division F of Public Law 113-6, \$120,000,000 is rescinded.

FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY

For the Family Self-Sufficiency program to support family self-sufficiency coordinators under section 23 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, to promote the development of local strategies to coordinate the use of assistance under sections 8(o) and 9 of such Act with public and private resources, and enable eligible families to achieve economic independence and self-sufficiency, \$60,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary may, by Federal Register notice, waive or specify alternative requirements (except for requirements related to fair housing, nondiscrimination, labor standards, and the environment) for any provision of section 23 of such Act in order to better fulfill the purposes of section 23 of such Act, as determined by the Secretary.

NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING BLOCK GRANTS

For the Native American Housing Block Grants program, as authorized under title I of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (NAHASDA) (25 U.S.C. 4111 et seq.), \$600,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, to determine the amount of the allocation under title I of such Act for each Indian tribe, the Secretary shall apply the formula under section 302 of such Act with the need component based on single-race census data and with the need component based on multi-race census data, and the amount of the allocation for each Indian tribe shall be the greater of the two resulting allocation amounts: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, \$2,000,000 shall be contracted for assistance for national or regional organizations representing Native American housing interests for providing training and technical assistance to Indian housing authorities and tribally designated housing entities as authorized under NAHASDA; and \$2,000,000 shall be to support the inspection of Indian housing units, contract expertise, training, and technical assistance in the training, oversight, and management of such Indian housing and tenant-based assistance, including up to \$300,000 for related travel: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, \$2,000,000 shall be made available for the cost of guaranteed notes and other obligations, as authorized by title VI of NAHASDA: *Provided further*, That such costs, including the costs of modifying such notes and other obligations, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize the total principal amount of any notes and other obligations, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed \$16,530,000.

INDIAN HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of guaranteed loans, as authorized by section 184 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 1715z-13a), \$6,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such costs, including the costs of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, up to \$1,818,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That up to \$750,000 of this amount may be used for administrative contract expenses including management processes and systems to carry out the loan guarantee program.

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PERSONS WITH AIDS

For carrying out the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS program, as authorized by the AIDS Housing Opportunity Act (42 U.S.C. 12901 et seq.), \$303,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, except that amounts allocated pursuant to section 854(c)(3) of such Act shall remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall renew all expiring contracts for permanent supportive housing that initially were funded under section 854(c)(3) of such Act from funds made available under this heading in fiscal year 2010 and prior fiscal years that meet all program requirements before awarding funds for new contracts under each section, and if amounts provided under this heading pursuant to such section are insufficient to fund renewals for all such expiring contracts, then amounts made available under this heading for formula grants pursuant to section 854(c)(1) shall be used to provide the balance of such renewal funding before awarding funds for such formula grants: *Provided further*, That the Department shall notify grantees of their formula allocation within 60 days of enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairwoman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 88, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$29,000,000)".

Page 110, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$29,000,000)".

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chairman, since 1992, the Housing Opportunities for People with AIDS, or HOPWA, has provided a vital housing safety net for people battling HIV-AIDS. Nearly 1.2 million Americans are living with HIV-AIDS. More than 145,000 currently lack stable housing, and 500,000 will need some form of housing assistance during the course of their illnesses. Research consistently shows that a lack of stable housing is a major barrier to effective treatment for people living with AIDS and puts them at significant risk of premature death from poor nutrition, exposure to other diseases and a lack of medical care.

HOPWA fills this gap by providing secure housing through one of the most effective programs in HUD's portfolio, and it is the only one that addresses the intersection of housing and health. Within 1 year, 96 percent of HOPWA participants achieve disease stabilization and reduced viral loads. Because housing stability plays a key role in preventing the spread of the virus, HOPWA contributes to better individual and community health outcomes. Further, for every \$1 of HOPWA funding spent, \$3.35 is leveraged from other Federal, State and local programs, and every \$1 million in HOPWA

funding provides housing and support for 171 families. For that reason, HOPWA has enjoyed broad, bipartisan support since its first authorization more than 20 years ago.

Despite HOPWA's proven track record in improving health and housing outcomes for communities, this year's Transportation-HUD appropriations bill would cut \$29 million in HOPWA funding. The committee's recommendation of \$303 million brings the allocation for HOPWA back to FY 2008 funding levels despite the fact that there are 100,000 individuals more who are infected with HIV-AIDS than in 2008.

I recognize that \$29 million may sound small by Federal budgeting standards, but to the individuals and families who rely on HOPWA for stable housing and access to support services, these cuts are anything but small. If this funding level becomes law, nearly 5,000 families and individuals will lose access to HOPWA housing and all the health benefits that go with it. For those families, this cut is a matter of life and death.

For that reason, I am offering this amendment to restore the \$29 million cut from HOPWA this year and return it to the same funding level it has received for the last 2 fiscal years. This amendment would ensure that those 5,000 families and individuals who rely on HOPWA for secure, stable housing will not suddenly find themselves back on the street with no access to life-saving medical treatment.

To protect those 5,000 households and stay within the House rules, I would have to cut \$29 million from another account, but at the funding levels included in this bill, any offset would fundamentally undermine HUD's ability to provide services to hundreds of millions of families every day.

HOPWA provides life-saving, efficient services to thousands of families and individuals impacted by HIV-AIDS. Will you work in conference to reach a workable funding level that ensures families and individuals currently served by HOPWA do not lose access to their housing?

Mr. LATHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NADLER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. I will be more than happy to work with the gentleman on this issue as we move through the process.

Mr. NADLER. Thank you.

Madam Chairman, I appreciate the chairman's willingness to work on this issue in conference and to find a funding level that maintains this highly effective life-saving program, and I am, therefore, looking forward to those efforts.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUND

For assistance to units of State and local government, and to other entities, for economic and community development activities, and for other purposes, \$1,696,813,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016, unless otherwise specified: *Provided*, That of the total amount provided, \$1,636,813,000 is for carrying out the community development block grant program under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended (the "Act" herein) (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.): *Provided further*, That unless explicitly provided for under this heading, not to exceed 20 percent of any grant made with funds appropriated under this heading shall be expended for planning and management development and administration: *Provided further*, That \$60,000,000 shall be for grants to Indian tribes notwithstanding section 106(a)(1) of such Act, of which, notwithstanding any other provision of law (including section 204 of this Act), up to \$3,960,000 may be used for emergencies that constitute imminent threats to health and safety: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this heading may be used for grants for the Economic Development Initiative ("EDI") or Neighborhood Initiatives activities, Rural Innovation Fund, or for grants pursuant to section 107 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5307): *Provided further*, That the Department shall notify grantees of their formula allocation within 60 days of enactment of this Act.

EMPOWERMENT ZONES/ENTERPRISE
COMMUNITIES/RENEWAL COMMUNITIES
(RESCISSION)

Unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development under this heading are hereby permanently rescinded.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT LOAN GUARANTEES
PROGRAM ACCOUNT
(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

Subject to section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, during fiscal year 2014 commitments to guarantee loans under section 108 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, any part of which is guaranteed, shall not exceed a total principal amount of \$500,000,000, notwithstanding any aggregate limitation on outstanding obligations guaranteed in subsection (k) of such section 108: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall collect fees from borrowers, notwithstanding subsection (m) of such section 108, to result in a credit subsidy cost of zero, and such fees shall be collected in accordance with section 502(7) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That all unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development under this heading are hereby permanently rescinded.

HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM

For the HOME Investment Partnerships program, as authorized under title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, as amended, \$700,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the amount made available under this heading, the threshold reduction requirements in sections 216(10) and 217(b)(4) of such Act shall not apply to allocation of such amount: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this heading used for projects not completed within 4 years of the commitment date, as

determined by a signature of each party to the agreement, shall be repaid: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may extend the deadline by 1 year if the Secretary determines that the failure to complete the project is beyond the control of the participating jurisdiction: *Provided further*, That no funds provided under this heading may be committed to any project included as part of a participating jurisdiction's plan under section 105(b), unless each participating jurisdiction certifies that it has conducted an underwriting review, assessed developer capacity and fiscal soundness, and examined neighborhood market conditions to ensure adequate need for each project: *Provided further*, That any homeownership units funded under this heading which cannot be sold to an eligible homeowner within 6 months of project completion shall be rented to an eligible tenant: *Provided further*, That no funds provided under this heading may be awarded for development activities to a community housing development organization that cannot demonstrate that it has staff with demonstrated development experience: *Provided further*, That the preceding provisos, except the first proviso, shall not be effective during any period in which the Final Rule titled "Home Investment Partnerships Program; Improving Performance and Accountability; Updating Property Standards" is published and effective: *Provided further*, That funds provided in prior appropriations Acts for technical assistance, and that still remain available, may be used for HOME technical assistance notwithstanding the purposes for which such amounts were appropriated: *Provided further*, That the Department shall notify grantees of their formula allocations within 60 days of enactment of this Act.

SELF-HELP AND ASSISTED HOMEOWNERSHIP
OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

For the Self-Help and Assisted Homeownership Opportunity Program, as authorized under section 11 of the Housing Opportunity Program Extension Act of 1996, as amended, \$30,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, \$10,000,000 shall be made available to the Self-Help and Assisted Homeownership Opportunity Program as authorized under section 11 of the Housing Opportunity Program Extension Act of 1996, as amended: *Provided further*, That \$15,000,000 shall be made available for the second, third, and fourth capacity building activities authorized under section 4(a) of the HUD Demonstration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 9816 note), of which not less than \$5,000,000 shall be made available for rural capacity-building activities: *Provided further*, That \$5,000,000 shall be made available for capacity building by national rural housing organizations with experience assessing national rural conditions and providing financing, training, technical assistance, information, and research to local nonprofits, local governments and Indian Tribes serving high need rural communities.

HOMELESS ASSISTANCE GRANTS

For the emergency solutions grants program as authorized under subtitle B of title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, as amended; and the continuum of care program as authorized under subtitle C of title IV of such Act; and the rural housing stability assistance program as authorized under subtitle D of title IV of such Act, \$2,088,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That any rental assistance amounts that are recaptured under such continuum of care program shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That not less than \$200,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for such emergency solutions

grants program: *Provided further*, That not less than \$1,882,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for such continuum of care and rural housing stability assistance program: *Provided further*, That up to \$6,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for the national homeless data analysis project: *Provided further*, That all funds awarded for supportive services under the continuum of care program and the rural housing stability assistance program shall be matched by not less than 25 percent in cash or in kind by each grantee: *Provided further*, That for all match requirements applicable to funds made available under this heading for this fiscal year and prior years, a grantee may use (or could have used) as a source of match funds other funds administered by the Secretary and other Federal agencies unless there is (or was) a specific statutory prohibition on any such use of any such funds: *Provided further*, That all awards of assistance under this heading shall be required to coordinate and integrate homeless programs with other mainstream health, social services, and employment programs for which homeless populations may be eligible, including Medicaid, State Children's Health Insurance Program, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, Food Stamps, and services funding through the Mental Health and Substance Abuse Block Grant, Workforce Investment Act, and the Welfare-to-Work grant program: *Provided further*, That all balances for Shelter Plus Care renewals previously funded from the Shelter Plus Care Renewal account and transferred to this account shall be available, if recaptured, for continuum of care renewals in fiscal year 2014: *Provided further*, That the Department shall notify grantees of their formula allocation from amounts allocated (which may represent initial or final amounts allocated) for the emergency solutions grant program within 60 days of enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 94, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "reduced by \$55,000,000".

Page 94, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "reduced by \$55,000,000".

Page 150, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "increased by \$55,000,000".

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairman, this amendment would remove the \$55 million increase—and only the increase—from the Homeless Assistance Grant Program and transfer that same amount into the Spending Reduction account.

I understand that times are tough nationwide—that they are tough for families, that they are tough for businesses and that everyone has to cut back. We have to live within our means, but the fact remains that we are broke as a country. Our Federal Government is in massive, massive debt. According to the committee report, the \$55 million increase proposed for this program would be used to increase funding for the Continuum of Care Projects and Emergency Solutions Grants.

Madam Chairman, these are worthy programs. They help a lot of people

who are transitioning out of homelessness, but I'm not asking that we cut their funding. Not at all. I'm simply asking that we hold the line—fund what we have been funding and put the rest of this large increase towards fixing our Nation's debt crisis.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairwoman, I must rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

I think everyone needs to understand that we already cut \$7.7 billion from what was provided in 2013 and that this is actually \$4.4 billion less than the current rate of spending under sequestration. So everybody talks about sequestration when, in this bill, we are actually \$4.4 billion less than that already. To deliver this fiscally responsible reduction, we carefully prioritized programs to preserve housing options for families that are already counting on HUD for support in 2014.

The funding level provided reflects what is required to renew commitments by HUD to State and local programs that serve the homeless. With less funding, homeless shelters and other service providers will operate at a lower capacity or, Madam Chairman, many of them will close, putting people who currently need help at risk.

For those reasons, Madam Chairwoman, I urge a "no" on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chairman, I listened carefully to the gentleman from Georgia, who talks about the fiscal crisis—that this country is broke and that we have to cut spending drastically. This country is not broke. This country is the wealthiest country in the world, but we are breaking ourselves, and we are breaking ourselves by cutting too much and by following a silly economic policy.

When President Obama took office, this country had a deficit in the first fiscal year of \$1.6 trillion. That was the last Bush budget, because, in the first year of any President, he is living under the former budget. The budget passed just before he took office.

□ 2130

We had a \$1.6 trillion budget deficit, and we were losing 800,000 jobs a month. The President and the Democratic Congress decided that to reduce the deficit and to reduce unemployment, we had to spend some money to stimulate the economy. We had to put money into infrastructure, into jobs; and we did it. Congress passed it. It didn't do enough. But the fact is, with-

in a year, we were gaining 250,000 jobs a month instead of losing 800,000 a month. We turned the economy around by a million jobs a month, and the deficit started falling.

The deficit has fallen like a rock. It's been reduced by 60 percent since the 2009 fiscal year. We've had the fastest deficit reduction in the last 3 years since the demobilization after World War II; and, frankly, it's going too fast. Any economist will tell you that the too-rapid reduction in Federal spending is hindering the economy and hurting jobs.

The sequester has probably cut about one point off the gross domestic product. We have done what we have to do on the deficit for now. We have to do more in the long term. For now, it's still dropping like a rock. It's been cut by 60 percent. And now we ought to pivot and create jobs, even if that means spending money, but certainly not by cutting so much more. When we create jobs, that creates tax revenues; it reduces expenditures on things like unemployment and food stamps and reduces the deficit.

If you want to see exactly what happened—it's rare in life that you get a controlled experiment. The economies in the United States and Europe tracked. They collapsed in 2007 until 2009. In 2009, they started going up slowly, and they kept going up until 2010. In 2010, the U.S. economy kept going up slowly, and the European economies went into a double-dip recession and tanked and unemployment went way up. Why? Because in Europe in 2010, they did what the American voters wisely refused to do, they elected conservative governments which cut spending much more and which endorsed austerity policies. What did they get? Higher unemployment and higher deficits.

When I hear this rhetoric, it's just backwards. We've done enough on the deficit for now. We have more to do later, but for now we ought to create jobs. That will reduce the deficit by increasing employment, by increasing tax revenues from people who are employed, and by decreasing expenditures that go up when there's unemployment, mainly food stamps and unemployment insurance.

I just had to say that this rhetoric is just wrong. The policies that we keep hearing about from that side of the aisle are driving us more and more into debt and more and more into unemployment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment as this is one of the few accounts in this bill which reached an increase; yet it is still nearly \$3 million below the President's request and actual need.

As it is, HUD and homeless providers are skeptical that the amount provided in the bill is sufficient to provide the same level of services that we provided last year. Reducing this account would further jeopardize our Nation's ability to provide housing for the homeless.

I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSING PROGRAMS

PROJECT-BASED RENTAL ASSISTANCE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For activities and assistance for the provision of project-based subsidy contracts under the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.) ("the Act"), not otherwise provided for, \$9,050,672,000, to remain available until expended, shall be available on October 1, 2013 (in addition to the \$400,000,000 previously appropriated under this heading that became available October 1, 2013), and \$400,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be available on October 1, 2014: *Provided*, That the amounts made available under this heading shall be available for expiring or terminating section 8 project-based subsidy contracts (including section 8 moderate rehabilitation contracts), for amendments to section 8 project-based subsidy contracts (including section 8 moderate rehabilitation contracts), for contracts entered into pursuant to section 441 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11401), for renewal of section 8 contracts for units in projects that are subject to approved plans of action under the Emergency Low Income Housing Preservation Act of 1987 or the Low-Income Housing Preservation and Resident Homeownership Act of 1990, and for administrative and other expenses associated with project-based activities and assistance funded under this paragraph: *Provided further*, That of the total amounts provided under this heading, up to \$200,000,000 may be transferred to the Office of Housing for the administration of contracts funded under this heading: *Provided further*, That amounts recaptured under this heading, the heading "Annual Contributions for Assisted Housing", or the heading "Housing Certificate Fund" may be used for renewals of or amendments to section 8 project-based contracts, notwithstanding the purposes for which such amounts were appropriated: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, upon the request of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, project funds that are held in residual receipts accounts for any project subject to a section 8 project-based Housing Assistance Payments contract that authorizes HUD to require that surplus project funds be deposited in an interest-bearing residual receipts account and that are in excess of an amount to be determined by the Secretary, shall be remitted to the Department and deposited in this account, to

be available until expended: *Provided further*, That amounts deposited pursuant to the previous proviso shall be available in addition to the amount otherwise provided by this heading for uses authorized under this heading.

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

For amendments to capital advance contracts for housing for the elderly, as authorized by section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended, and for project rental assistance for the elderly under section 202(c)(2) of such Act, including amendments to contracts for such assistance and renewal of expiring contracts for such assistance for up to a 1-year term, and for senior preservation rental assistance contracts, as authorized by section 811(e) of the American Housing and Economic Opportunity Act of 2000, as amended, and for supportive services associated with the housing, \$374,627,000 to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That of the amount provided under this heading, up to \$70,000,000 shall be for service coordinators and the continuation of existing congregate service grants for residents of assisted housing projects: *Provided further*, That amounts under this heading shall be available for Real Estate Assessment Center inspections and inspection-related activities associated with section 202 projects: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may waive the provisions of section 202 governing the terms and conditions of project rental assistance, except that the initial contract term for such assistance shall not exceed 5 years in duration: *Provided further*, That upon the request of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, project funds that are held in residual receipts accounts for any project subject to a section 202 project rental assistance contract and that upon termination of such contract are in excess of an amount to be determined by the Secretary shall be remitted to the Department and deposited in this account, to be available until September 30, 2017: *Provided further*, That amounts deposited in this account pursuant to the previous proviso shall be available, in addition to the amounts otherwise provided by this heading, for the purposes authorized under this heading, and such funds, together with such other funds, may be used by the Secretary for demonstration programs to test housing with services models for the elderly: *Provided further*, That unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds transferred to or appropriated under this heading may be used for the current purposes authorized under this heading, notwithstanding the purposes for which such funds were originally appropriated.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LATHAM

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 96, line 9, strike "(in addition to the \$400,000,000 previously appropriated under this heading that became available October 1, 2013), and" and insert ", of which \$400,000,000 was previously appropriated under this heading to be available October 1, 2013; and in addition,".

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairwoman, this is purely a technical amendment

clarifying the funds available for the project-based rental assistance account.

It was our intention to provide the same amount for the rental contracts in FY 14 as was provided in FY 13. However, because of a clerical error that was carried forward in the CBO scoring, we need this amendment to keep the bill within our 302(b) allocation. This amendment does not change the committee's intention of level-funding the project-based rental contracts.

I urge the adoption of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Madam Chairwoman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Madam Chairwoman, the gentleman has cleared this amendment with our side, and it makes technical corrections to the section of the bill.

We have no objection to this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Ms. JENKINS. Madam Chairwoman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Kansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JENKINS. Madam Chairwoman, I would like to thank Chairman LATHAM for his work in crafting this appropriation bill to fund our Federal transportation and housing programs. This already difficult task was made more difficult because of the House's adherence to the sequestration cuts, and I applaud the entire committee for working within these parameters.

I'd also like to rise in support of a provision to strengthen the safety net for our veterans in need by making some changes to the HUD Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing or HUD-VASH program. The HUD-VASH program is an example of a program worthy of Federal funding. It helps our homeless veterans who served and defended our Nation to obtain viable housing assistance. I believe that we can all agree that supporting our veterans, particularly our homeless veterans, is a worthy and worthwhile initiative. Veterans and their families sacrifice tremendously to fight to preserve the freedoms you and I enjoy.

After discussing the program with communities in Kansas, I believe there are several changes that can be made in order to improve delivery of the program from local housing authorities to veterans. The changes would direct that the Department of Housing and Urban Development track HUD-VASH vouchers after they've been awarded to public housing agencies to ensure these funds are able to be fully utilized to help homeless veterans. This will aid

housing agencies in differentiating VASH vouchers from other section 9 vouchers in the same pool. The suggested changes would also require the Department of Housing and Urban Development to work with public agencies to adopt a simple process for reporting HUD-VASH vouchers from one community to another based on need by a community's homeless veterans. Streamlining this process would give flexibility to our communities to ensure that VASH vouchers are utilized by as many qualified veterans as possible.

Finally, my proposal would require HUD to implement a guidance recognizing the delay that public housing authorities sometimes face in distributing a HUD-VASH voucher while a veteran is in a drug or alcohol rehabilitation program. This will continue to allow housing agencies to reserve HUD-VASH vouchers for these homeless veterans without it affecting their administrative performance in the eyes of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Mr. LATHAM. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairwoman, I want to thank the gentlelady for her concern about housing for our Nation's most vulnerable veterans. I agree with her that we should do everything in our power to ensure that the HUD-VASH program works and serves homeless veterans in the most efficient manner possible.

I look forward to working with the gentlelady on her concerns and would encourage the authorizers to look at this issue as they consider reforms across the housing programs.

Ms. JENKINS. Madam Chair, reclaiming my time, again I would like to thank the chairman for his commitment to our Nation's veterans. I believe that he and I recognize that, just as it is critical to support our troops in the midst of combat, we must also ensure that our veterans receive the highest quality of care and service upon their return home.

I would thank him again, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSING FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

For amendments to capital advance contracts for supportive housing for persons with disabilities, as authorized by section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013), for project rental assistance for supportive housing for persons with disabilities under section 811(d)(2) of such Act and for project assistance contracts pursuant to section 202(h) of the Housing Act of 1959 (Public Law 86-372; 73 Stat. 667), including amendments to contracts for such assistance and renewal of expiring contracts for such assistance for up to a 1-year term, for project rental assistance to State housing finance agencies and other appropriate entities as authorized under section 811(b)(3) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Housing Act, and for supportive serv-

ices associated with the housing for persons with disabilities as authorized by section 811(b)(1) of such Act, \$126,000,000 to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That amounts made available under this heading shall be available for Real Estate Assessment Center inspections and inspection-related activities associated with section 811 Projects: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, upon the request of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, project funds that are held in residual receipts accounts for any project subject to a section 811 project rental assistance contract and that upon termination of such contract are in excess of an amount to be determined by the Secretary shall be remitted to the Department and deposited in this account, to be available until expended: *Provided further*, That amounts deposited in this account pursuant to the previous proviso shall be available in addition to the amounts otherwise provided by this heading for the purposes authorized under this heading: *Provided further*, That unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds transferred to or appropriated under this heading may be used for the current purposes authorized under this heading notwithstanding the purposes for which such funds originally were appropriated.

HOUSING COUNSELING ASSISTANCE

For contracts, grants, and other assistance excluding loans, as authorized under section 106 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, as amended, \$35,000,000, including up to \$4,500,000 for administrative contract services, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That grants made available from amounts provided under this heading shall be awarded within 120 days of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That funds shall be used for providing counseling and advice to tenants and homeowners, both current and prospective, with respect to property maintenance, financial management/literacy, and such other matters as may be appropriate to assist them in improving their housing conditions, meeting their financial needs, and fulfilling the responsibilities of tenancy or homeownership; for program administration; and for housing counselor training.

OTHER ASSISTED HOUSING PROGRAMS

RENTAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE

For amendments to contracts under section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (12 U.S.C. 1701s) and section 236(f)(2) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-1) in State-aided, noninsured rental housing projects, \$21,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount, together with unobligated balances from recaptured amounts appropriated prior to fiscal year 2006 from terminated contracts under such sections of law, and any unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds appropriated under this heading after fiscal year 2005, shall also be available for extensions of up to one year for expiring contracts under such sections of law.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairwoman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 102, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "reduced by \$5,000,000".

Page 150, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "increased by \$5,000,000".

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairman, this amendment would simply reduce the \$19.7 million increase proposed for the rental housing assistance program under HUD by \$5 million, putting this amount in the spending reduction account.

As before, this would not be a cut to this program. It wouldn't even bring funding back to the 2013 levels like many amendments that I've offered today would have done. Instead, it would allow for a \$14.7 million increase to this program instead of the \$19.7 million increase.

I'm not arguing the merits of this program, Madam Chairman; but as I've said before, and I'll say it again, this country is broke.

I commend the subcommittee and the chairman, my friend, Mr. LATHAM, for making some tough choices in this bill. He's done a great job in doing so, and I applaud his efforts. But if we want to solve our current fiscal crisis, we must continue to make very careful decisions. This is a small reduction, and it will just help in the process of getting our government to living within its means.

I urge support of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairwoman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairwoman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The gentleman said there's a big difference as far as an increase in funding in this account from last year. The fact of the matter is that what was actually spent was not increased and will not be increased this year. We recaptured a great deal of money from accounts previously to fund our bill last year. So the funding level is actually the same as what it was last year.

The bill funds the rental housing assistance at \$21 million, which is the amount with the recapture from last year that was spent, and this amount is necessary to fund 18,000 existing long-term project-based rental assistance contracts. This will ensure that these units remain available for low-income families.

The bill funding levels are not arbitrary, Madam Chairwoman. We have scrubbed these accounts. We've held hearings on them and made recommendations on what must be funded. Again, although it appears a sizeable increase, in fact, it is not because of the recapture we had from last year.

I urge a "no" vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

□ 2145

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

This account renews long-term assistance contracts, and the number varies from year to year. The amount needed to renew these contracts depends on how many agreements HUD entered into years ago, not the number we renewed last year. Reducing the funding in this account will threaten the viability of these units if the funding is not preserved.

I oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RENT SUPPLEMENT
(RESCISSION)

Of the amounts recaptured from terminated contracts under section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (12 U.S.C. 1701s) and section 236 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-1) \$3,500,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That no amounts may be rescinded from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

PAYMENT TO MANUFACTURED HOUSING FEES
TRUST FUND

For necessary expenses as authorized by the National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5401 et seq.), up to \$6,530,000, to remain available until expended, to be derived from the Manufactured Housing Fees Trust Fund: *Provided*, That not to exceed the total amount appropriated under this heading shall be available from the general fund of the Treasury to the extent necessary to incur obligations and make expenditures pending the receipt of collections to the Fund pursuant to section 620 of such Act: *Provided further*, That the amount made available under this heading from the general fund shall be reduced as such collections are received during fiscal year 2014 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2014 appropriation from the general fund estimated at zero and fees pursuant to such section 620 shall be modified as necessary to ensure such a final fiscal year 2014 appropriation: *Provided further*, That for the dispute resolution and installation programs, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may assess and collect fees from any program participant: *Provided further*, That such collections shall be deposited into the Fund, and the Secretary, as provided herein, may use such collections, as well as fees collected under section 620, for necessary expenses of such Act: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding the requirements of section 620 of such Act, the Secretary may carry out responsibilities of the Secretary under such Act through the use of approved service providers that are paid directly by the recipients of their services.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION
MUTUAL MORTGAGE INSURANCE PROGRAM
ACCOUNT

New commitments to guarantee single family loans insured under the Mutual Mort-

gage Insurance Fund shall not exceed \$400,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That during fiscal year 2014, obligations to make direct loans to carry out the purposes of section 204(g) of the National Housing Act, as amended, shall not exceed \$20,000,000: *Provided further*, That the foregoing amount in the previous proviso shall be for loans to nonprofit and governmental entities in connection with sales of single family real properties owned by the Secretary and formerly insured under the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund. For administrative contract expenses of the Federal Housing Administration, \$127,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided further*, That to the extent guaranteed loan commitments exceed \$200,000,000,000 on or before April 1, 2013, an additional \$1,400 for administrative contract expenses shall be available for each \$1,000,000 in additional guaranteed loan commitments (including a pro rata amount for any amount below \$1,000,000), but in no case shall funds made available by this proviso exceed \$30,000,000.

GENERAL AND SPECIAL RISK PROGRAM ACCOUNT

New commitments to guarantee loans insured under the General and Special Risk Insurance Funds, as authorized by sections 238 and 519 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-3 and 1735c), shall not exceed \$30,000,000,000 in total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That during fiscal year 2014, gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans, as authorized by sections 204(g), 207(l), 238, and 519(a) of the National Housing Act, shall not exceed \$20,000,000, which shall be for loans to nonprofit and governmental entities in connection with the sale of single family real properties owned by the Secretary and formerly insured under such Act.

GOVERNMENT NATIONAL MORTGAGE
ASSOCIATION

GUARANTEES OF MORTGAGE-BACKED SECURITIES
LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

New commitments to issue guarantees to carry out the purposes of section 306 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1721(g)), shall not exceed \$500,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That \$19,000,000 shall be available for necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Government National Mortgage Association: *Provided further*, That to the extent that guaranteed loan commitments will and do exceed \$155,000,000,000 on or before April 1, 2014, an additional \$100 for necessary salaries and expenses shall be available until expended for each \$1,000,000 in additional guaranteed loan commitments (including a pro rata amount for any amount below \$1,000,000), but in no case shall funds made available by this proviso exceed \$3,000,000: *Provided further*, That receipts from Commitment and Multiclass fees collected pursuant to title III of the National Housing Act, as amended, shall be credited as offsetting collections to this account.

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH
RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

For contracts, grants, and necessary expenses of programs of research and studies relating to housing and urban problems, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by title V of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 (12 U.S.C. 1701z-1 et seq.), including carrying out the functions of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development under section 1(a)(1)(i) of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1968, \$21,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That with respect to amounts made available under this heading, notwithstanding

section 204 of this title, the Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements funded with philanthropic entities, other Federal agencies, or State or local governments and their agencies for research projects: *Provided further*, That with respect to the previous proviso, such partners to the cooperative agreements must contribute at least a 50 percent match toward the cost of the project: *Provided further*, That for non-competitive agreements entered into in accordance with the previous two provisos, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall comply with section 2(b) of the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-282, 31 U.S.C. note) in lieu of compliance with section 102(a)(4)(C) with respect to documentation of award decisions.

FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

FAIR HOUSING ACTIVITIES

For contracts, grants, and other assistance, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, as amended by the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988, and section 561 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987, as amended, \$55,847,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, the Secretary may assess and collect fees to cover the costs of the Fair Housing Training Academy, and may use such funds to provide such training: *Provided further*, That no funds made available under this heading shall be used to lobby the executive or legislative branches of the Federal Government in connection with a specific contract, grant or loan: *Provided further*, That, of the funds made available under this heading, \$300,000 shall be available to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for the creation and promotion of translated materials and other programs that support the assistance of persons with limited English proficiency in utilizing the services provided by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. AL GREEN OF
TEXAS

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 108, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$12,500,000)".

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Madam Chair, I thank the ranking member and I thank the chair. I would like to, if I may, compliment you and thank you for what you did with the HUD-VASH vouchers, the \$75 million which is what was requested. I did join in that request, serving on Financial Services, and we share some jurisdiction with reference to the VASH vouchers. So I am appreciative, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Ranking Member, for what was done. And, of course, I respect anyone who wants to increase the amount that we accord our veterans. They have gone to distant places; and many times when they return, they don't return home to

circumstances that we enjoy, and I'm eager to do all that I can to make sure that they have a place to call home when they return.

With reference to this amendment, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Ranking Member, this amendment deals with the Fair Housing Initiative Program and the Fair Housing Assistance Program. The Fair Housing Assistance Program was started in 1968, the Fair Housing Initiatives Program in 1987. They have enjoyed bipartisan support here in Congress, and the purpose of these two programs happens to be that of elimination of invidious discrimination.

Invidious discrimination does not know the boundaries that many of us assume it is limited to. We find right now that a good many of our persons who have gone to war and who are returning home have been injured. A good many of them don't return the way they left. And the truth be told, the greatest number of complaints that we have in this area of discrimination are related to persons who have disabilities. Evidence shows us we had 27,092 complaints in 2011 and 28,519 complaints in 2012. That's a 1,427 complaint increase; and disability are the greatest percentage of these complaints, with 47.1 to 55.6 percent going against persons who have disabilities.

This piece of legislation seeks to make sure that all persons—this would include our veterans who may have disabilities—have a place to call home and that they are not discriminated against. I know “discrimination” is not a word that we like to use. I, quite frankly, don't find favor with the word, but for making our point, we have to mention it because there are people who are suffering from it.

I would hope that we can restore FHIP to the amount that was in the original bill from the Senate, and FHAP as well. This is the Fair Housing Initiatives Program, FHIP, and the Fair Housing Assistance Program, FHAP, as they are commonly called. The bill reduces FHIP to \$32.2 million, and this amendment restores it to \$44.1 million, which is an \$11.9 million increase. The bill reduces the Fair Housing Assistance Program to \$23.4 million, and the amendment restores it to \$24 million. That's a \$600,000 increase, making a total of a \$12.5 million increase.

It is my hope that we can find a way to accord these programs the losses they are suffering because the losses go beyond just the numbers. They impact people, and a good many of these people are our veterans.

With that, I ask the chairman if he would engage me in a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, my assumption is that you have a point of order on this piece of legislation, the amendment, and I understand why; but I wanted to make sure that I emphasized the need to protect all persons, and I wanted to focus on our veterans tonight. My hope is that as we move forward, you and I and the ranking member can work together

so that we can make sure that veterans are not the victims of invidious discrimination.

Mr. LATHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the gentleman for his most sincere concern for these folks who need help, and I would pledge, if possible, if we can find ways. But under our allocation, you understand we have a very difficult situation, so I would have to insist on the point of order; but I appreciate the gentleman's efforts, and I look forward to working with him.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. With that, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment. I hope that we can find that common ground that you mentioned, and I look forward to working with the ranking member who has always done whatever he can to help our veterans as well.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 108, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$150,000)”.

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

Mr. GRAYSON. Madam Chair, this is an amendment that relates to fair housing programs, and specifically the part of the program regarding the Limited English Proficiency Initiative.

This is a small program that is capped in the bill presently at \$300,000. The President had asked that this be increased to \$500,000. We now offer an amendment that would increase it to \$450,000, still less than what the President offered, but nowhere near what a program like this actually justifies. I want to point out we're not taking away from any other programs. We are just slightly lifting the cap on this particular program to allow the purpose of this program to be carried out.

This initiative is vital to ensuring that individuals who are not proficient in English are aware of their rights, able to understand the terms of leases and other housing-related documents, and able to receive important announcements that affect the health and safety of their households.

In addition, the initiative educates the HUD-assisted housing providers on their responsibilities under Federal law and HUD regulations to ensure that their housing programs and activities are fully accessible to all, regardless of national origin or English proficiency.

Finally, the initiative saves HUD staff time as it helps HUD to more efficiently communicate with and, thereby, serve the needs of people who are not proficient in English.

Madam Chair, I have heard from time to time that the folks on the other side

of the aisle are looking for some way to reach out to the Hispanic community and make their party more appealing to the Hispanic community here in America. We have to realize that there are over 40 million Americans who do not speak English as their first language. This is a tiny program that is meant to allow for people who do not have English proficiency to have some of the same benefits and benefit from the same programs as those who do. Certainly it would be a very small and minor concession on the part of the folks on the other side of the aisle to give this little nod to the Hispanic community and show their concern that we have equal protection under the law for all, regardless of whether they are English speaking or Spanish speaking or speak some other language.

Since Congress initiated this program in fiscal year 2008, the Department has used this funding to translate vital HUD documents, such as model leases, fair housing complaint forms, statements of residents' rights and responsibilities, information on how to become a first-time homeowner, how to avoid loan fraud and foreclosure, and fair housing information for disaster housing providers and survivors.

This request will not only fund translation of HUD documents and printing, but also oral interpretation services at HUD events, oral interpretation for persons seeking access to HUD services by telephone, acquisition of technology that conducts simultaneous oral translation, marketing of HUD's language access services to populations that need them, and public education on the availability of and the right to obtain information regarding HUD-funded services in multiple languages.

Given the tiny amount of money that's involved here, this program has been extraordinarily effective. In the last year for which we have statistics, almost 30,000 people benefited from a program that cost the Federal Government only \$300,000. This program has been incredibly cost effective. It is very much needed by Hispanics throughout America and other minorities who do not have English as their first language. I ask the majority, my friends across the aisle, to consider the value of this program to the Hispanic community and everyone else in America.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. LATHAM. I rise in opposition to this amendment.

This account that he is taking the money from is already stretched extremely thin. His amendment seeks to take funds away from the investigations and adjudication for fair housing claims. So the exact people that he's talking about being concerned about, he is going to take away enforcement for fair housing. I don't understand the trade-off.

I think that fair housing is extraordinarily important, and we have \$300,000 in this account already; and to rob an account that enforces the law to make housing available so there is no discrimination, whether it be Hispanic or any nationality in their housing, you don't want to have cases where people, because of race, are not allowed in their housing.

So I think it is ill thought out, something that certainly when you're taking away enforcement, fair housing is simply the wrong account. Again, we have \$300,000 in this account for this purpose.

Madam Chair, I ask for a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. It is his and my effort to help the majority with Republican outreach to Hispanic voters. This amendment would increase by \$150,000 the amount of funding HUD shall spend on translating documents for people who are not proficient English speakers.

Because of our record to help the outreach program, we support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF LEAD HAZARD CONTROL AND
HEALTHY HOMES
LEAD HAZARD REDUCTION

For the Lead Hazard Reduction Program, as authorized by section 1011 of the Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992, \$50,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That up to \$5,000,000 of that amount shall be for the Healthy Homes Initiative, pursuant to sections 501 and 502 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 that shall include research, studies, testing, and demonstration efforts, including education and outreach concerning lead-based paint poisoning and other housing-related diseases and hazards: *Provided further*, That for purposes of environmental review, pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and other provisions of the law that further the purposes of such Act, a grant under the Healthy Homes Initiative or the Lead Technical Studies program under this heading or under prior appropriations Acts for such purposes under this heading, shall be considered to be funds for a special project for purposes of section 305(c) of the Multifamily Housing Property Disposition Reform Act of 1994: *Provided further*, That amounts made available under this heading in this or prior appropriations Acts, and that still remain available, may be used for any purpose under this heading notwithstanding the purpose for which such amounts were appropriated if a program competition is undersubscribed and there are other program competitions under this heading that are oversubscribed.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY FUND

For the development of, modifications to, and infrastructure for Department-wide and program-specific information technology systems, for the continuing operation and maintenance of both Department-wide and program-specific information systems, and for program-related maintenance activities, \$100,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That up to \$25,000,000 may be used for Development Modernization and Enhancement: *Provided further*, That any amounts transferred to this Fund under this Act shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That not more than 25 percent of the funds made available under this heading for Development, Modernization and Enhancement, including development and deployment of a Next Generation Management System and development and deployment of modernized Federal Housing Administration systems may be obligated until the Secretary submits to the Committees on Appropriations and the Comptroller General of the United States a plan for expenditure that—(A) provides for all information technology investments: (i) the cost and schedule baselines with explanations for each associated variance, (ii) the status of functional and performance capabilities delivered or planned to be delivered, and (iii) mitigation strategies to address identified risks; (B) outlines activities to ensure strategic, consistent, and effective application of information technology management controls: (i) enterprise architecture, (ii) project management, (iii) investment management, and (iv) human capital management.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$124,000,000: *Provided*, That the Inspector General shall have independent authority over all personnel issues within this office.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF
HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 201. Fifty percent of the amounts of budget authority, or in lieu thereof 50 percent of the cash amounts associated with such budget authority, that are recaptured from projects described in section 1012(a) of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Amendments Act of 1988 (42 U.S.C. 1437 note) shall be cancelled or in the case of cash, shall be remitted to the Treasury, and such amounts of budget authority or cash recaptured and not cancelled or remitted to the Treasury shall be used by State housing finance agencies or local governments or local housing agencies with projects approved by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for which settlement occurred after January 1, 1992, in accordance with such section. Notwithstanding the previous sentence, the Secretary may award up to 15 percent of the budget authority or cash recaptured and not cancelled or remitted to the Treasury to provide project owners with incentives to refinance their project at a lower interest rate.

SEC. 202. None of the amounts made available under this Act may be used during fiscal year 2014 to investigate or prosecute under the Fair Housing Act any otherwise lawful activity engaged in by one or more persons, including the filing or maintaining of a non-frivolous legal action, that is engaged in solely for the purpose of achieving or preventing action by a Government official or entity, or a court of competent jurisdiction.

SEC. 203. Sections 203 and 209 of division C of Public Law 112-55 (125 Stat. 693-694) shall apply during fiscal year 2014 as if such sections were included in this title, except that

during such fiscal year such sections shall be applied by substituting "fiscal year 2014" for "fiscal year 2011" and "fiscal year 2012", each place such terms appear.

SEC. 204. Except as explicitly provided in law, any grant, cooperative agreement or other assistance made pursuant to title II of this Act shall be made on a competitive basis and in accordance with section 102 of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Reform Act of 1989 (42 U.S.C. 3545).

SEC. 205. Funds of the Department of Housing and Urban Development subject to the Government Corporation Control Act or section 402 of the Housing Act of 1950 shall be available, without regard to the limitations on administrative expenses, for legal services on a contract or fee basis, and for utilizing and making payment for services and facilities of the Federal National Mortgage Association, Government National Mortgage Association, Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, Federal Financing Bank, Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, Federal Home Loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1811-1).

SEC. 206. Unless otherwise provided for in this Act or through a reprogramming of funds, no part of any appropriation for the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall be available for any program, project or activity in excess of amounts set forth in the budget estimates submitted to Congress.

SEC. 207. Corporations and agencies of the Department of Housing and Urban Development which are subject to the Government Corporation Control Act are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accordance with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of such Act as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for 2014 for such corporation or agency except as hereinafter provided: *Provided*, That collections of these corporations and agencies may be used for new loan or mortgage purchase commitments only to the extent expressly provided for in this Act (unless such loans are in support of other forms of assistance provided for in this or prior appropriations Acts), except that this proviso shall not apply to the mortgage insurance or guaranty operations of these corporations, or where loans or mortgage purchases are necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States Government.

SEC. 208. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall provide quarterly reports to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations regarding all uncommitted, unobligated, recaptured and excess funds in each program and activity within the jurisdiction of the Department and shall submit additional, updated budget information to these Committees upon request.

SEC. 209. The President's formal budget request for fiscal year 2015, as well as the Department of Housing and Urban Development's congressional budget justifications to be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall use the identical account and sub-account structure provided under this Act.

SEC. 210. A public housing agency or such other entity that administers Federal housing assistance for the Housing Authority of the county of Los Angeles, California, the States of Alaska, Iowa, and Mississippi shall not be required to include a resident of public housing or a recipient of assistance provided under section 8 of the United States

Housing Act of 1937 on the board of directors or a similar governing board of such agency or entity as required under section (2)(b) of such Act. Each public housing agency or other entity that administers Federal housing assistance under section 8 for the Housing Authority of the county of Los Angeles, California and the States of Alaska, Iowa and Mississippi that chooses not to include a resident of public housing or a recipient of section 8 assistance on the board of directors or a similar governing board shall establish an advisory board of not less than six residents of public housing or recipients of section 8 assistance to provide advice and comment to the public housing agency or other administering entity on issues related to public housing and section 8. Such advisory board shall meet not less than quarterly.

SEC. 211. No funds provided under this title may be used for an audit of the Government National Mortgage Association that makes applicable requirements under the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661 et seq.).

SEC. 212. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, subject to the conditions listed in subsection (b), for fiscal years 2014 and 2015, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may authorize the transfer of some or all project-based assistance, debt and statutorily required low-income and very low-income use restrictions, associated with one or more multifamily housing project to another multifamily housing project or projects.

(b) PHASED TRANSFERS.—Transfers of project-based assistance under this section may be done in phases to accommodate the financing and other requirements related to rehabilitating or constructing the project or projects to which the assistance is transferred, to ensure that such project or projects meet the standards under section (c).

(c) The transfer authorized in subsection (a) is subject to the following conditions:

(1) NUMBER AND BEDROOM SIZE OF UNITS.—

(A) For occupied units in the transferring project: the number of low-income and very low-income units and the configuration (i.e. bedroom size) provided by the transferring project shall be no less than when transferred to the receiving project or projects and the net dollar amount of Federal assistance provided by the transferring project shall remain the same in the receiving project or projects.

(B) For unoccupied units in the transferring project: the Secretary may authorize a reduction in the number of dwelling units in the receiving project or projects to allow for a reconfiguration of bedroom sizes to meet current market demands, as determined by the Secretary and provided there is no increase in the project-based section 8 budget authority.

(2) The net dollar amount of Federal assistance provided to the transferring project shall remain the same as the receiving project or projects.

(3) The transferring project shall, as determined by the Secretary, be either physically obsolete or economically nonviable.

(4) The receiving project or projects shall meet or exceed applicable physical standards established by the Secretary.

(5) The owner or mortgagor of the transferring project shall notify and consult with the tenants residing in the transferring project and provide a certification of approval by all appropriate local governmental officials.

(6) The tenants of the transferring project who remain eligible for assistance to be provided by the receiving project or projects shall not be required to vacate their units in the transferring project or projects until new units in the receiving project are available for occupancy.

(7) The Secretary determines that this transfer is in the best interest of the tenants.

(8) If either the transferring project or the receiving project or projects meets the condition specified in subsection (d)(2)(A), any lien on the receiving project resulting from additional financing obtained by the owner shall be subordinate to any FHA-insured mortgage lien transferred to, or placed on, such project by the Secretary, except that the Secretary may waive this requirement upon determination that such a waiver is necessary to facilitate the financing of acquisition, construction, and/or rehabilitation of the receiving project or projects.

(9) If the transferring project meets the requirements of subsection (c)(2)(E), the owner or mortgagor of the receiving project or projects shall execute and record either a continuation of the existing use agreement or a new use agreement for the project where, in either case, any use restrictions in such agreement are of no lesser duration than the existing use restrictions.

(10) The transfer does not increase the cost (as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended) of any FHA-insured mortgage, except to the extent that appropriations are provided in advance for the amount of any such increased cost.

(d) For purposes of this section—

(1) the terms “low-income” and “very low-income” shall have the meanings provided by the statute and/or regulations governing the program under which the project is insured or assisted;

(2) the term “multifamily housing project” means housing that meets one of the following conditions—

(A) housing that is subject to a mortgage insured under the National Housing Act;

(B) housing that has project-based assistance attached to the structure including projects undergoing mark to market debt restructuring under the Multifamily Assisted Housing Reform and Affordability Housing Act;

(C) housing that is assisted under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 as amended by section 801 of the Cranston-Gonzales National Affordable Housing Act;

(D) housing that is assisted under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as such section existed before the enactment of the Cranston-Gonzales National Affordable Housing Act;

(E) housing that is assisted under section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzales National Affordable Housing Act; or

(F) housing or vacant land that is subject to a use agreement;

(3) the term “project-based assistance” means—

(A) assistance provided under section 8(b) of the United States Housing Act of 1937;

(B) assistance for housing constructed or substantially rehabilitated pursuant to assistance provided under section 8(b)(2) of such Act (as such section existed immediately before October 1, 1983);

(C) rent supplement payments under section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965;

(D) interest reduction payments under section 236 and/or additional assistance payments under section 236(f)(2) of the National Housing Act;

(E) assistance payments made under section 202(c)(2) of the Housing Act of 1959; and

(F) assistance payments made under section 811(d)(2) of the Housing Act of 1959;

(4) the term “receiving project or projects” means the multifamily housing project or projects to which some or all of the project-based assistance, debt, and statutorily required use low-income and very low-income restrictions are to be transferred;

(5) the term “transferring project” means the multifamily housing project which is transferring some or all of the project-based assistance, debt and the statutorily required low-income and very low-income use restrictions to the receiving project or projects; and

(6) the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

(e) The Secretary shall publish by notice in the Federal Register the terms and conditions, including criteria for HUD approval, of transfers pursuant to this section no later than 30 days before the effective date of such notice.

SEC. 213. (a) No assistance shall be provided under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f) to any individual who—

(1) is enrolled as a student at an institution of higher education (as defined under section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002));

(2) is under 24 years of age;

(3) is not a veteran;

(4) is unmarried;

(5) does not have a dependent child;

(6) is not a person with disabilities, as such term is defined in section 3(b)(3)(E) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)(3)(E)) and was not receiving assistance under such section 8 as of November 30, 2005; and

(7) is not otherwise individually eligible, or has parents who, individually or jointly, are not eligible, to receive assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f).

(b) For purposes of determining the eligibility of a person to receive assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f), any financial assistance (in excess of amounts received for tuition and any other required fees and charges) that an individual receives under the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), from private sources, or an institution of higher education (as defined under the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002)), shall be considered income to that individual, except for a person over the age of 23 with dependent children.

SEC. 214. The funds made available for Native Alaskans under the heading “Native American Housing Block Grants” in title II of this Act shall be allocated to the same Native Alaskan housing block grant recipients that received funds in fiscal year 2005.

SEC. 215. Notwithstanding the limitation in the first sentence of section 255(g) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1725z–20(g)), the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may, until September 30, 2014, insure and enter into commitments to insure mortgages under such section 255.

SEC. 216. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in fiscal year 2014, in managing and disposing of any multifamily property that is owned or has a mortgage held by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and during the process of foreclosure on any property with a contract for rental assistance payments under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 or other Federal programs, the Secretary shall maintain any rental assistance payments under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 and other programs that are attached to any dwelling units in the property. To the extent the Secretary determines, in consultation with the tenants and the local government, that such a multifamily property owned or held by the Secretary is not feasible for continued rental assistance payments under such section 8 or other programs, based on consideration of (1) the costs of rehabilitating and operating the property and all available Federal, State, and local resources, including rent adjustments under

section 524 of the Multifamily Assisted Housing Reform and Affordability Act of 1997 (“MAHRAA”) and (2) environmental conditions that cannot be remedied in a cost-effective fashion, the Secretary may, in consultation with the tenants of that property, contract for project-based rental assistance payments with an owner or owners of other existing housing properties, or provide other rental assistance. The Secretary shall also take appropriate steps to ensure that project-based contracts remain in effect prior to foreclosure, subject to the exercise of contractual abatement remedies to assist relocation of tenants for imminent major threats to health and safety after written notice to and informed consent of the affected tenants and use of other available remedies, such as partial abatements or receivership. After disposition of any multifamily property described under this section, the contract and allowable rent levels on such properties shall be subject to the requirements under section 524 of MAHRAA.

SEC. 217. During fiscal year 2014, in the provision of rental assistance under section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)) in connection with a program to demonstrate the economy and effectiveness of providing such assistance for use in assisted living facilities that is carried out in the counties of the State of Michigan notwithstanding paragraphs (3) and (18)(B)(iii) of such section 8(o), a family residing in an assisted living facility in any such county, on behalf of which a public housing agency provides assistance pursuant to section 8(o)(18) of such Act, may be required, at the time the family initially receives such assistance, to pay rent in an amount exceeding 40 percent of the monthly adjusted income of the family by such a percentage or amount as the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development determines to be appropriate.

SEC. 218. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the recipient of a grant under section 202(b) of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q) after December 26, 2000, in accordance with the unnumbered paragraph at the end of section 202(b) of such Act, may, at its option, establish a single-asset nonprofit entity to own the project and may lend the grant funds to such entity, which may be a private nonprofit organization described in section 831 of the American Homeownership and Economic Opportunity Act of 2000.

SEC. 219. The commitment authority funded by fees as provided under the heading “Community Development Loan Guarantees Program Account” may be used to guarantee, or make commitments to guarantee, notes, or other obligations issued by any State on behalf of non-entitlement communities in the State in accordance with the requirements of section 108 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974: *Provided*, That any State receiving such a guarantee or commitment shall distribute all funds subject to such guarantee to the units of general local government in non-entitlement areas that received the commitment.

SEC. 220. Public housing agencies that own and operate 400 or fewer public housing units may elect to be exempt from any asset management requirement imposed by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in connection with the operating fund rule: *Provided*, That an agency seeking a discontinuance of a reduction of subsidy under the operating fund formula shall not be exempt from asset management requirements.

SEC. 221. With respect to the use of amounts provided in this Act and in future Acts for the operation, capital improvement and management of public housing as authorized by sections 9(d) and 9(e) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g(d) and (e)), the Secretary shall not im-

pose any requirement or guideline relating to asset management that restricts or limits in any way the use of capital funds for central office costs pursuant to section 9(g)(1) or 9(g)(2) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g(g)(1), (2)): *Provided*, That a public housing agency may not use capital funds authorized under section 9(d) for activities that are eligible under section 9(e) for assistance with amounts from the operating fund in excess of the amounts permitted under section 9(g)(1) or 9(g)(2).

SEC. 222. No official or employee of the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall be designated as an allotment holder unless the Office of the Chief Financial Officer has determined that such allotment holder has implemented an adequate system of funds control and has received training in funds control procedures and directives. The Chief Financial Officer shall ensure that there is a trained allotment holder for each HUD sub-office under the accounts “Executive Offices” and “Administrative Support Offices,” as well as each account receiving appropriations for “Program Office Salaries and Expenses” within the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

SEC. 223. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall report annually to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on the status of all section 8 project-based housing, including the number of all project-based units by region as well as an analysis of all federally subsidized housing being refinanced under the Mark-to-Market program. The Secretary shall in the report identify all existing units maintained by region as section 8 project-based units and all project-based units that have opted out of section 8 or have otherwise been eliminated as section 8 project-based units. The Secretary shall identify in detail and by project all the efforts made by the Department to preserve all section 8 project-based housing units and all the reasons for any units which opted out or otherwise were lost as section 8 project-based units. Such analysis shall include a review of the impact of the loss of any subsidized units in that housing marketplace, such as the impact of cost and the loss of available subsidized, low-income housing in areas with scarce housing resources for low-income families.

SEC. 224. The Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall, for fiscal year 2014 and subsequent fiscal years, notify the public through the Federal Register and other means, as determined appropriate, of the issuance of a notice of the availability of assistance or notice of funding availability (NOFA) for any program or discretionary fund administered by the Secretary that is to be competitively awarded. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for fiscal year 2014 and subsequent fiscal years, the Secretary may make the NOFA available only on the Internet at the appropriate Government Web site or through other electronic media, as determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 225. Payment of attorney fees in program-related litigation must be paid from individual program office personnel benefits and compensation funding. The annual budget submission for program office personnel benefit and compensation funding must include program-related litigation costs for attorney fees as a separate line item request.

SEC. 226. Except for funds provided for claims and indemnities, the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development is authorized to transfer up to 5 percent or \$5,000,000, whichever is less, of the funds appropriated for any office funded under the headings “Management and Administration” and “Program Office Salaries and Expenses”, to any other office funded

under such headings: *Provided*, That no appropriation for any office funded under such headings shall be increased or decreased by more than 5 percent or \$5,000,000, whichever is less, without prior written approval from the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 227. The Disaster Housing Assistance Programs, administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, shall be considered a “program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development” under section 904 of the McKinney Act for the purpose of income verifications and matching.

SEC. 228. None of the funds made available by this Act, or any other Act, for purposes authorized under section 8 (only with respect to the tenant-based rental assistance program) and section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.) may be used by any public housing agency for any amount of salary, for the chief executive officer of which, or any other official or employee of which, that exceeds the annual rate of basic pay payable for a position at level IV of the Executive Schedule at any time during any public housing agency fiscal year 2014.

SEC. 229. Title II of Division K of Public Law 110-161 is amended by striking the entire item relating to “Flexible Subsidy Fund”.

SEC. 230. Paragraph (1) of section 242(i) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-7(i)(1)) is amended by striking “July 31, 2011” and inserting “July 31, 2016”.

SEC. 231. Subsection (d) of section 184 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 1715z-13a(d)) is amended to read as follows:

“(d) GUARANTEE FEE.—The Secretary shall establish and collect, at the time of issuance of the guarantee, a fee for the guarantee of loans under this section, in an amount not exceeding 3 percent of the principal obligation of the loan. The Secretary may also establish and collect annual premium payments in an amount not exceeding 1 percent of the remaining guaranteed balance (excluding the portion of the remaining balance attributable to the fee collected at the time of issuance of the guarantee). The Secretary shall establish the amount of the fees and premiums by publishing a notice in the Federal Register. The Secretary shall deposit any fees and premiums collected under this subsection in the Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Fund established under subsection (i).”.

SEC. 232. Notwithstanding Section 24(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437v(o)), amounts made available in prior appropriations Acts under the heading “Revitalization of Severely Distressed Public Housing (HOPE VI)” may continue to be provided as assistance pursuant to such section 24.

SEC. 233. The proviso under the “Community Development Fund” heading in Public Laws 109-148, 109-234, 110-252, and 110-329 which requires the Secretary to establish procedures to prevent duplication of benefits and to report to the Committees on Appropriations on all steps to prevent fraud and abuse is amended by striking “quarterly” and inserting “annually”.

SEC. 234. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to require or enforce the Green Physical Needs Assessment (GPNA).

SEC. 235. None of the funds in this Act may be available for the doctoral dissertation research grant program at the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

This title may be cited as the “Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act, 2014”.

TITLE III—RELATED AGENCIES

ACCESS BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Access Board, as authorized by section 502 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, \$7,400,000: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, there may be credited to this appropriation funds received for publications and training expenses.

FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, \$38,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, to be derived from the Federal National Mortgage Association, Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, and the Federal Home Loan Banks under section 1106 of the Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008: *Provided*, That concurrent with the President's budget request for fiscal year 2015, the Inspector General shall submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a budget request for fiscal year 2015 in similar format and substance to those submitted by executive agencies of the Federal Government.

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Maritime Commission as authorized by section 201(d) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 307), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; hire of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343(b); and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902, \$24,200,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$2,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

□ 2200

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 134, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$100,000)”.

Page 150, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$100,000)”.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, this amendment would reduce funding in the bill for the Federal Maritime Commission's Salaries and Expenses by \$100,000, and transfer that same amount to the Spending Reduction Account.

This amendment would have the effect of bringing the appropriations for this purpose back to the current levels, what we have right now. I offered a similar amendment to this bill last year, which would have eliminated a proposed \$900,000 increase to this same account. Unfortunately, that amendment failed by a 172–249 vote, a pretty strong margin.

So this year, I bring you a request to hold the line, to eliminate this very small increase of \$100,000, an amount which is less than many bureaucrats here in Washington take home as their yearly salary.

Perhaps more than any of my amendments that I've offered tonight, I hope that this one passes, Madam Chair, because if this amendment to strike a \$100,000 increase to Federal employee salaries fails, it means that we are in serious, serious trouble when it comes to solving our spending problem.

I urge my colleagues to prove me wrong and to support my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I'm not going to oppose this amendment. It is an account that the maritime industry, with the concerns that we've had and some of the incidents on cruise ships, it's an account that is much needed. But with a very small reduction here, bringing it back to last year's funding level, that would be acceptable to me and we would accept the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General for the National Railroad Passenger Corporation to carry out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$25,300,000: *Provided*, That the Inspector General shall have all necessary authority, in carrying out the duties specified in the Inspector General Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. App. 3), to investigate allegations of fraud, including false statements to the government (18 U.S.C. 1001), by any person or entity that is subject to regulation by the National Railroad Passenger Corporation: *Provided further*, That the Inspector General may enter into contracts and other arrangements for audits, studies, analyses, and other services with public agencies and with private persons, subject to the applicable laws and regulations that govern the obtaining of such services within the National Railroad Passenger Corporation: *Provided further*, That the Inspector General may select, appoint, and employ such officers and employees as may be necessary for carrying out the functions, powers, and duties of the Office of Inspector General, subject to the applicable laws and regulations that govern such selections, appointments, and employment within Amtrak: *Provided further*, That concurrent with the President's budget request for fiscal year 2015, the Inspector General shall submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a budget request for fiscal year 2015 in similar format and substance to those submitted by executive agencies of the Federal Government.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 134, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$4,800,000)”.

Page 150, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$4,800,000)”.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, I've got good news for my friends from Arizona and from Iowa. This is the last amendment that I plan to offer on this bill.

It would reduce the proposed funding for the Amtrak Office of Inspector General's Salaries and Expenses by \$4,800,000 and transfer that same amount to the Spending Reduction Account.

Like many of the amendments that I've offered today, it would simply remove a proposed increase, returning the final amendment back to current spending levels.

The Amtrak IG's role is to root out waste, fraud and abuse within the corporation. As I detailed during consideration of my earlier amendment related to Amtrak, I am of the opinion that the IG still has a ways to go in this regard.

Yet, the committee report includes an interesting statement which appears to serve as a pat on the back for the OIG, and perhaps even as a justification for this large proposed increase.

The line simply says: “The Committee appreciates that the Amtrak OIG submitted a separate budget request to the Committees on Appropriations and directs it to do so in Fiscal Year 2015.”

Now, to my read, this means that simply because the OIG did his job, it will receive nearly \$5 million in extra Federal dollars for salaries and expenses. I think that's preposterous.

Madam Chairman, I talked a lot about Amtrak's failings earlier, and I'm not going to rehash the same arguments. I only ask that my colleagues support my amendment. Let's hold the spending to the current levels, and hold the line on wasteful spending. Let's live within our means, and let's roll back this increase.

I encourage acceptance of my amendment, and I recommended an “aye” vote.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I must rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

Madam Chair, as you know, one of the very important functions of this committee is oversight, ensuring agencies under our purview are efficiently and effectively managed.

This bill provides Amtrak, the OIG, with \$25.3 million for oversight studies and investigations into fraud, waste and abuse at Amtrak. Through these investigations, the Amtrak OIG has helped improve the economy, efficiency and effectiveness of Amtrak programs and operations.

Amtrak OIG runs a program that has identified improper and overpayments

to the tune of \$85 million. Amtrak has collected some of this back, which has saved the taxpayer money.

The bill's funding levels are not arbitrary, Madam Chair. We have scrubbed these accounts. We have held hearings and made recommendations on what must be funded.

□ 2215

I think this is an extremely important function that we have so that we can look at Amtrak. We're spending an awful lot of money with Amtrak. We need to have a strong Office of Inspector General to keep tabs on it. I think this is money well spent.

I would certainly urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 150, line 2 be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The text of that portion of the bill is as follows:

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the National Transportation Safety Board, including hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for a GS-15; uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902), \$102,400,000, of which not to exceed \$2,000 may be used for official reception and representation expenses. The amounts made available to the National Transportation Safety Board in this Act include amounts necessary to make lease payments on an obligation incurred in fiscal year 2001 for a capital lease.

NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION
PAYMENT TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD
REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

For payment to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation for use in neighborhood reinvestment activities, as authorized by the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation Act (42 U.S.C. 8101-8107), \$127,100,000: *Provided*, That in addition, \$58,000,000 shall be made available until expended to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation for mortgage foreclosure mitigation activities, under the following terms and conditions:

(1) The Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation ("NRC") shall make grants to counseling intermediaries approved by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) (with match to be determined by the NRC based on affordability and the economic

conditions of an area; a match also may be waived by the NRC based on the aforementioned conditions) to provide mortgage foreclosure mitigation assistance primarily to States and areas with high rates of defaults and foreclosures to help eliminate the default and foreclosure of mortgages of owner-occupied single-family homes that are at risk of such foreclosure. Other than areas with high rates of defaults and foreclosures, grants may also be provided to approved counseling intermediaries based on a geographic analysis of the Nation by the NRC which determines where there is a prevalence of mortgages that are risky and likely to fail, including any trends for mortgages that are likely to default and face foreclosure. A State Housing Finance Agency may also be eligible where the State Housing Finance Agency meets all the requirements under this paragraph. A HUD-approved counseling intermediary shall meet certain mortgage foreclosure mitigation assistance counseling requirements, as determined by the NRC, and shall be approved by HUD or the NRC as meeting these requirements.

(2) Mortgage foreclosure mitigation assistance shall only be made available to homeowners of owner-occupied homes with mortgages in default or in danger of default. These mortgages shall likely be subject to a foreclosure action and homeowners will be provided such assistance that shall consist of activities that are likely to prevent foreclosures and result in the long-term affordability of the mortgage retained pursuant to such activity or another positive outcome for the homeowner. No funds made available under this paragraph may be provided directly to lenders or homeowners to discharge outstanding mortgage balances or for any other direct debt reduction payments.

(3) The use of Mortgage Foreclosure Mitigation Assistance by approved counseling intermediaries and State Housing Finance Agencies shall involve a reasonable analysis of the borrower's financial situation, an evaluation of the current value of the property that is subject to the mortgage, counseling regarding the assumption of the mortgage by another non-Federal party, counseling regarding the possible purchase of the mortgage by a non-Federal third party, counseling and advice of all likely restructuring and refinancing strategies or the approval of a work-out strategy by all interested parties.

(4) NRC may provide up to 15 percent of the total funds under this paragraph to its own charter members with expertise in foreclosure prevention counseling, subject to a certification by the NRC that the procedures for selection do not consist of any procedures or activities that could be construed as an unacceptable conflict of interest or have the appearance of impropriety.

(5) HUD-approved counseling entities and State Housing Finance Agencies receiving funds under this paragraph shall have demonstrated experience in successfully working with financial institutions as well as borrowers facing default, delinquency and foreclosure as well as documented counseling capacity, outreach capacity, past successful performance and positive outcomes with documented counseling plans (including post mortgage foreclosure mitigation counseling), loan workout agreements and loan modification agreements. NRC may use other criteria to demonstrate capacity in underserved areas.

(6) Of the total amount made available under this paragraph, up to \$3,000,000 may be made available to build the mortgage foreclosure and default mitigation counseling capacity of counseling intermediaries through NRC training courses with HUD-approved counseling intermediaries and their

partners, except that private financial institutions that participate in NRC training shall pay market rates for such training.

(7) Of the total amount made available under this paragraph, up to 6 percent may be used for associated administrative expenses for the NRC to carry out activities provided under this section.

(8) Mortgage foreclosure mitigation assistance grants may include a budget for outreach and advertising, and training, as determined by the NRC.

(9) The NRC shall continue to report bi-annually to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations as well as the Senate Banking Committee and House Financial Services Committee on its efforts to mitigate mortgage default.

UNITED STATES INTERAGENCY COUNCIL ON
HOMELESSNESS
OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses (including payment of salaries, authorized travel, hire of passenger motor vehicles, the rental of conference rooms, and the employment of experts and consultants under section 3109 of title 5, United States Code) of the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness in carrying out the functions pursuant to title II of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, as amended, \$3,000,000.

TITLE IV

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS ACT

SEC. 401. None of the funds in this Act shall be used for the planning or execution of any program to pay the expenses of, or otherwise compensate, non-Federal parties intervening in regulatory or adjudicatory proceedings funded in this Act.

SEC. 402. None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, nor may any be transferred to other appropriations, unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 403. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract pursuant to section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 404. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, none of the funds provided in this Act, provided by previous appropriations Acts to the agencies or entities funded in this Act that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 2014, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury derived by the collection of fees and available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that:

- (1) creates a new program;
- (2) eliminates a program, project, or activity;
- (3) increases funds or personnel for any program, project, or activity for which funds have been denied or restricted by the Congress;
- (4) proposes to use funds directed for a specific activity by either the House or Senate Committees on Appropriations for a different purpose;
- (5) augments existing programs, projects, or activities in excess of \$5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less;
- (6) reduces existing programs, projects, or activities by \$5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less; or
- (7) creates, reorganizes, or restructures a branch, division, office, bureau, board, commission, agency, administration, or department different from the budget justifications

submitted to the Committees on Appropriations or the table accompanying the explanatory statement accompanying this Act, whichever is more detailed, unless prior approval is received from the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided*, That not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, each agency funded by this Act shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives to establish the baseline for application of reprogramming and transfer authorities for the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the report shall include:

(A) a table for each appropriation with a separate column to display the President's budget request, adjustments made by Congress, adjustments due to enacted rescissions, if appropriate, and the fiscal year enacted level;

(B) a delineation in the table for each appropriation both by object class and program, project, and activity as detailed in the budget appendix for the respective appropriation; and

(C) an identification of items of special congressional interest: *Provided further*, That the amount appropriated or limited for salaries and expenses for an agency shall be reduced by \$100,000 per day for each day after the required date that the report has not been submitted to the Congress.

SEC. 405. Except as otherwise specifically provided by law, not to exceed 50 percent of unobligated balances remaining available at the end of fiscal year 2014 from appropriations made available for salaries and expenses for fiscal year 2014 in this Act, shall remain available through September 30, 2015, for each such account for the purposes authorized: *Provided*, That a request shall be submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations prior to the expenditure of such funds: *Provided further*, That these requests shall be made in compliance with reprogramming guidelines under section 404 of this Act.

SEC. 406. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be obligated or expended for any employee training that—

(1) does not meet identified needs for knowledge, skills, and abilities bearing directly upon the performance of official duties;

(2) contains elements likely to induce high levels of emotional response or psychological stress in some participants;

(3) does not require prior employee notification of the content and methods to be used in the training and written end of course evaluation;

(4) contains any methods or content associated with religious or quasi-religious belief systems or "new age" belief systems as defined in Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Notice N-915.022, dated September 2, 1988; or

(5) is offensive to, or designed to change, participants' personal values or lifestyle outside the workplace.

(b) Nothing in this section shall prohibit, restrict, or otherwise preclude an agency from conducting training bearing directly upon the performance of official duties.

SEC. 407. No funds in this Act may be used to support any Federal, State, or local projects that seek to use the power of eminent domain, unless eminent domain is employed only for a public use: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section, public use shall not be construed to include economic development that primarily benefits private entities: *Provided further*, That any use of funds for mass transit, railroad, airport, seaport or highway projects as well as utility projects which benefit or serve the general public (including energy-related, communication-re-

lated, water-related and wastewater-related infrastructure), other structures designated for use by the general public or which have other common-carrier or public-utility functions that serve the general public and are subject to regulation and oversight by the government, and projects for the removal of an immediate threat to public health and safety or brownfields as defined in the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act (Public Law 107-118) shall be considered a public use for purposes of eminent domain.

SEC. 408. None of the funds made available in this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government, except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in, this Act or any other appropriations Act.

SEC. 409. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available to pay the salary for any person filling a position, other than a temporary position, formerly held by an employee who has left to enter the Armed Forces of the United States and has satisfactorily completed his or her period of active military or naval service, and has within 90 days after his or her release from such service or from hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than 1 year, made application for restoration to his or her former position and has been certified by the Office of Personnel Management as still qualified to perform the duties of his or her former position and has not been restored thereto.

SEC. 410. No funds appropriated pursuant to this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the assistance the entity will comply with sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a-10c, popularly known as the "Buy American Act").

SEC. 411. No funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act shall be made available to any person or entity that has been convicted of violating the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10a-10c).

SEC. 412. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for first-class airline accommodations in contravention of sections 301-10.122 and 301-10.123 of title 41, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 413. None of the funds made available under this Act or any prior Act may be provided to the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN), or any of its affiliates, subsidiaries, or allied organizations.

SEC. 414. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation that was convicted of a felony criminal violation under any Federal law within the preceding 24 months, where the awarding agency is aware of the conviction, unless the agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and has made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 415. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in furtherance of the implementation of the European Union greenhouse gas emissions trading scheme for aviation activities established by European Union Directive 2008/101/EC.

SEC. 416. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation that has any unpaid Federal tax liability that has been assessed, for which all judicial and administrative remedies have

been exhausted or have lapsed, and that is not being paid in a timely manner pursuant to an agreement with the authority responsible for collecting the tax liability, where the awarding agency is aware of the unpaid tax liability, unless the agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and has made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 417. None of the budget authority made available by this Act may be used to reduce funding or otherwise alter the implementation of a program, project or activity as proposed for elimination in the President's fiscal year 2015 budget request until the proposed change is enacted in an appropriation Act, or unless such change is made pursuant to the reprogramming and transfer provisions of this Act or in accordance with sunset or termination dates previously enacted in law.

SEC. 418. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Secretary of Transportation shall each submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, at the time that the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2015 is submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a comprehensive report compiled in conjunction with the Government Accountability Office that details updated missions, goals, strategies, and priorities, along with performance metrics that are measurable, repeatable, and directly linked to requests for funding, as described in the accompanying report.

SEC. 419. It is the sense of the Congress that the Congress should not pass any legislation that authorizes spending cuts that would increase poverty in the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. Are there any amendments to that section of the bill? The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 420. The amount by which the applicable allocation of new budget authority made by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 exceeds the amount of proposed new budget authority is \$0.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BROUN of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Ms. FOXX, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2610) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2027

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be removed as a cosponsor to H.R. 2027.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE OPEN WORLD LEADERSHIP CENTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 313 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2001 (2 U.S.C. 1151), as amended by section 1601 of Pub L. 111-68, and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Board of Trustees of the Open World Leadership Center:

Mr. MORAN, Virginia

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER TO ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 491 of the Higher Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1098(c)), and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, and upon the recommendation of the minority leader, of the following individual on the part of the House to the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance for a term of 4 years:

Mr. Fred Hurst, Flagstaff, AZ

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO CONGRESSIONAL-EXECUTIVE COMMISSION ON THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6913 and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following Members on the part of the House to the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China:

Ms. KAPTUR, Ohio

Mr. HONDA, California

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO THE JAPAN-UNITED STATES FRIENDSHIP COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2903, and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Japan-United States Friendship Commission:

Mr. McDERMOTT, Washington

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO HOUSE COMMISSION ON CONGRESSIONAL MAILING STANDARDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 501(b), and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following Members to the House Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards:

Mrs. DAVIS, California

Mr. RICHMOND, Louisiana

Mr. SHERMAN, California

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of bronchitis.

Mr. HORSFORD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of medically mandated recovery.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1092. An act to designate the air route traffic control center located in Nashua, New Hampshire, as the "Patricia Clark Boston Air Route Traffic Control Center".

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 31, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2402. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Colonel James E. McClain to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2403. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of six officers to wear the authorized insignia of the grade of brigadier general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2404. A letter from the Secretary, Army, Department of Defense, transmitting notification to Congress of the Permanent Reduction of Sizable Numbers of Members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2405. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a supplemental update of the Budget for Fiscal Year 2014, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1106(a); (H. Doc. No. 113-52); to the Committee on the Budget and ordered to be printed.

2406. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Priority—National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research—Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers [CFDA Number: 84.133B-8] received July 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2407. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Coverage of Certain Preventive Services Under the Affordable Care Act (RIN: 1210-AB44) received July 1, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2408. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products; Test Procedures for Residential Furnaces and Boilers [Docket No.: EERE-2013-BT-TP-0008] (RIN: 1904-AC96) received July 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2409. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Strategic Integrated Management Plan for the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (CDER), the Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research (CBER), and the Center for Devices and Radiological Health (CDRH); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2410. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Exclusion of Orphan Drugs for Certain Covered Entities under 340B Program (RIN: 0906-AA94) received July 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2411. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Distribution of Reference Biological Standards and Biological Preparations [Docket No.: CDC-2013-0013] (RIN: 0920-AA53) received July 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2412. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Coverage of Certain Preventive Services Under the Affordable Care Act [CMS-9968-F] (RIN: 0938-AR42) received June 28, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2413. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Summit, Mississippi) [MB Docket No.: 12-84] (RM-11627) received July 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2414. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Sections 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Roaring Springs, Texas) [MB Docket No.: 12-236] [RM-11671] received July 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2415. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Closed Captioning of Internet Protocol-Delivered Video Programming: Implementation of the Twenty-First Century Communications and Video Accessibility Act of 2010 [MB Docket No.: 11-154] received July 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2416. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's "Major" final rule — Inflation Adjustments to the Price-Anderson Act Financial Protection Regulations [NRC-2013-0072] (RIN: 3150-AJ25) received July 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2417. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the national emergency declared with respect to the actions of certain persons to undermine the sovereignty of Lebanon is to continue in effect beyond August 1, 2013,

pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); (H. Doc. No. 113-51); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2418. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a Report on Proposed Obligations for the Cooperative Threat Reduction; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2419. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablock Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2420. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2421. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Advancing Freedom and Democracy"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2422. A letter from the President, House of Representatives of Morocco, transmitting a strategic plan for upgrading and enhancing the work of the House of Representatives of Morocco; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2423. A letter from the Chairman and Vice Chairman, U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, transmitting notification of a public hearing held on "Macau and Hong Kong"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2424. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2425. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting two reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2426. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting three reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2427. A letter from the Clerk, Court of Appeals, transmitting an opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, *United States of America v. John Natale*, No. 12-3231, (June 11, 2013); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2428. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Transition Relief for Employees and Related Individuals Eligible to Enroll in Eligible Employer-Sponsored Health Plans for Non-Calendar Plan Years that Begin in 2013 and End in 2014 [Notice 2013-42] received July 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2429. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Application of Section 108(i) to Partnerships and S Corporations [TD 9623] (RIN: 1545-BI99) received July 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2430. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social

Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Mailing of Tickets Under the Ticket to Work Program [Docket No.: SSA-2011-0034] (RIN: 0960-AH34) received July 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2431. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Extension of Sunset Date for Attorney Advisor Program [Docket No.: SSA-2013-0006] (RIN: 0960-AH56) received July 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2432. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Extension of Effective Date for Temporary Pilot Program Setting the Time and Place for a Hearing Before and Administrative Law Judge [Docket No.: SSA-2013-0016] (RIN: 0960-AH58) received July 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROYCE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 850. A bill to impose additional human rights and economic and financial sanctions with respect to Iran, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-177, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2226. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 relating to State consultation on removal and remedial actions, State concurrence with listing on the National Priorities List, and State credit for contributions to the removal or remedial action, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-178, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2279. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act relating to review of regulations under such Act and to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 relating to financial responsibility for classes of facilities; with an amendment (Rept. 113-179, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2318. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 with respect to the applicability of the Act to Federal facilities, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-180, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 698. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish safeguards and standards of quality for research and transplantation of organs infected with human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) (Rept. 113-181, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2094. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the preference given, in awarding certain asthma-related grants, to certain States (those allowing trained school personnel to administer epinephrine and meeting other related requirements) (Rept. 113-182). Referred to the

Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ISSA: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 313. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to institute spending limits and transparency requirements for Federal conference and travel expenditures, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-183). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ISSA: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 2711. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to establish certain procedures for conducting in-person or telephonic interactions by Executive branch employees with individuals, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-184, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. GRANGER: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2855. A bill making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-185). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 698 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on the Judiciary, Financial Services, Oversight and Government Reform, and Ways and Means discharged from further consideration. H.R. 850 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2711 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILLS

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII, the following actions were taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 2226. Referral to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure extended for a period ending not later than November 1, 2013.

H.R. 2279. Referral to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure extended for a period ending not later than November 1, 2013.

H.R. 2318. Referral to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure extended for a period ending not later than November 1, 2013.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. NEAL, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 2847. A bill to establish a grant program to encourage the use of assistance dogs

by certain members of the Armed Forces and veterans; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 2848. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 2849. A bill to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to establish an Office of the Privacy Advocate General; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. STEWART, and Mrs. LUMMIS):

H.R. 2850. A bill to require certain procedures in the conduct by the Environmental Protection Agency of its study of the potential impacts of hydraulic fracturing on drinking water resources; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CHU, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FARR, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 2851. A bill to eliminate racial profiling by law enforcement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. CLARKE, and Mr. LOEBSACK):

H.R. 2852. A bill to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 and other laws to clarify appropriate standards for Federal employment discrimination and retaliation claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 2853. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the public disclosure of charges for certain hospital and ambulatory surgical center treatment episodes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (for himself, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CONAWAY, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FINCHER, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. HALL, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. KILMER, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. RADEL, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 2854. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the de-

duction of State and local general sales taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. FARR, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 2856. A bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to prohibit importation, exportation, transportation, sale, receipt, acquisition, and purchase in interstate or foreign commerce, or in a manner substantially affecting interstate or foreign commerce, of any live animal of any prohibited wildlife species; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 2857. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide the interest rate for certain disaster related loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 2858. A bill to implement reforms to the Federal land management agency fire programs in order to address the complexities of 21st century wildfires in a more cost-effective and efficient manner; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

H.R. 2859. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to extend the interest rate limitation on debt entered into during military service to debt incurred during military service to consolidate or refinance student loans incurred before military service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD (for himself and Mr. LYNCH):

H.R. 2860. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that the Inspector General of the Office of Personnel Management may use amounts in the revolving fund of the Office to fund audits, investigations, and oversight activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 2861. A bill to require the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to retain and redistribute certain amounts collected as fines; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MATHESON:

H.R. 2862. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a temporary dividends received deduction for 2013 or 2014; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SIREN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois):

H.R. 2863. A bill to amend the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994 to provide assistance to small businesses providing low-income individuals with green jobs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 2864. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to improve oversight of nursing facilities under the Medicare and Medicaid programs by preventing inappropriate influence over surveyors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California,

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. NADLER, Ms. CHU, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. WATT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. COHEN, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 2865. A bill to provide safeguards with respect to the Federal Bureau of Investigation criminal background checks prepared for employment purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TERRY (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. MICA, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 2866. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 2867. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the recognition of attending physician assistants as attending physicians to serve hospice patients; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 2868. A bill to amend the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 to provide guidance and limitations regarding the integration of unmanned aircraft systems into United States airspace, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. Con. Res. 46. Concurrent resolution urging the Government of Taiwan to grant former President Chen Shui-bian medical parole to ensure that he receives the highest level of medical attention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. HECK of Washington):

H. Con. Res. 47. Concurrent resolution calling for a democratically elected government for the people of the Federal Democratic Republic of Nepal; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. WATT, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. MOORE, Ms. HAHN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. POCAN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H. Res. 319. A resolution recognizing Bayard Rustin for his lifelong leadership in the civil rights, labor, and lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) rights movements and for his exemplary dedication to realizing true equality and freedom in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in

each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H. Res. 320. A resolution celebrating the West Linn Centennial; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H. Res. 321. A resolution celebrating the Molalla Centennial; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

H.R. 2847.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 12: To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 13: To provide and maintain a Navy.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14: To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 2848.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 2849.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 2850.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 2851.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, Congress shall have the power to enact appropriate laws protecting the civil rights of all Americans.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California:

H.R. 2852.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 2853.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States grants the Congress the power to enact this law.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 2854.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 7: "All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives . . ."

Article I, Section 8: "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, . . ."

Amendment XVI (16th Amendment): "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect

taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration."

By Ms. GRANGER:

H.R. 2855.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . ." In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 2856.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 2857.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution Clause 18. This is the necessary and proper clause, which allows Congress to enact laws pursuant to the Constitution that will benefit the nation as a whole.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 2858.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

H.R. 2859.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority to enact this legislation can be found in:

General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 sec. 8 cl. 1)
Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 sec. 8 cl. 18)

Constitutional analysis is a rigorous discipline which goes far beyond the text of the Constitution, and requires knowledge of case law, history, and the tools of constitutional interpretation. While the scope of Congress' powers is an appropriate matter for House debate, the listing of specific textual authorities for routine Congressional legislation about which there is no legitimate constitutional concern is a diminishment of the majesty of our Founding Fathers' vision for our national legislature.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 2860.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 2861.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8

By Mr. MATHESON:

H.R. 2862.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 2863.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 2864.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 2865.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 & Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 2866.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 5, which provides, "To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;"

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 2867.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The authority comes from Art. I, Sec. 8, cl. 1, the "tax and spend clause." This clause provides, "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; . . ."

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 2868.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 32: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 107: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 129: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.

H.R. 198: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 241: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 280: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 281: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 301: Mr. COTTON.

H.R. 313: Mr. LANKFORD.

H.R. 352: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 419: Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 494: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 495: Mr. TERRY, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 523: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 594: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 647: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. HOLDING.

H.R. 676: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 683: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

R. 685: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr.

- RUSH, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. WALZ, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 688: Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 708: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 713: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. WALDEN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SHUSTER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 719: Mr. MCCLINTOCK and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 733: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 741: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 755: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 792: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 794: Mr. POCAN and Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 809: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 818: Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 845: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 846: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 850: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 924: Ms. EDWARDS and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
H.R. 938: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 946: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. RIGELL, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 961: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 975: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 984: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 997: Mr. HUELSKAMP.
H.R. 1000: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 1020: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. LUMMIS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 1024: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. VARGAS, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1027: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 1074: Mr. FORBES and Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 1077: Mr. MCHENRY and Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 1091: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. ROONEY, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 1125: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 1146: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 1179: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GARCIA, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 1199: Mr. WELCH, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 1217: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. GARCIA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. CHU.
H.R. 1250: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. LATTA, and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 1252: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 1278: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1281: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 1339: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 1346: Mr. MEEKS and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1354: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. BONNER.
H.R. 1395: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1416: Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 1427: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 1428: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 1431: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 1461: Mr. BARTON, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 1518: Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 1528: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. TERRY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HURT, and Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 1541: Mr. LANKFORD.
H.R. 1563: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 1590: Mr. HECK of Washington and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 1616: Mr. COOPER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 1620: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 1634: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 1660: Mr. LANKFORD.
H.R. 1666: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 1690: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 1692: Mr. CROWLEY and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 1699: Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 1717: Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 1721: Mr. TIBERI, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 1726: Mr. NADLER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 1727: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 1728: Mr. FARR, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HOYER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. CLARKE.
H.R. 1731: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 1756: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 1761: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 1763: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1764: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 1771: Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 1775: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 1779: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1812: Mr. PIERLUISI.
H.R. 1814: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1816: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 1827: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1830: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 1843: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 1861: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 1869: Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 1875: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 1882: Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 1887: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 1892: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 1893: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 1920: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. KILDEE, and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 1957: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 1991: Mr. SALMON, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 1999: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 2000: Mr. RIBBLE and Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 2009: Mr. COOK, Mrs. BLACK, and Ms. JENKINS.
H.R. 2016: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 2019: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 2037: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2044: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2053: Mr. HURT.
H.R. 2079: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 2086: Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 2099: Mr. BROUN of Georgia and Mr. KINGSTON.
H.R. 2101: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 2110: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2111: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2116: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 2128: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 2137: Mr. JEFFRIES.
H.R. 2138: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 2149: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2151: Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 2153: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2178: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 2182: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2194: Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 2195: Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 2249: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2278: Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 2295: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 2300: Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 2309: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCHENRY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. JEFFRIES.
H.R. 2315: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2328: Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 2352: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 2358: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 2368: Mr. CONYERS and Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 2387: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2408: Mr. LABRADOR.
H.R. 2415: Mr. BONNER, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. ALEXANDER.
H.R. 2434: Mr. RANGEL and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 2440: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 2456: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 2457: Ms. CLARKE.
H.R. 2458: Mr. LONG.
H.R. 2464: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2465: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 2468: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 2480: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 2485: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 2500: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2502: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 2504: Ms. TITUS, Mr. NUNNELEE, and Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 2509: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 2520: Mr. ELLISON and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2527: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 2530: Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 2531: Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 2532: Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 2533: Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 2535: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2536: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 2542: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 2548: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. STOCKMAN, and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 2559: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2565: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. FORBES, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 2575: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. MASSIE.
H.R. 2579: Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. ROKITA, and Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 2581: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 2591: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 2633: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HOLT, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 2638: Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 2646: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 2647: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2648: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2663: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 2679: Mr. LONG.
H.R. 2682: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. GRIMM, Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 2692: Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2711: Mr. LONG and Mr. REED.
 H.R. 2717: Mr. DENT, Mr. COTTON, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. KINGSTON.
 H.R. 2720: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 2730: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 2743: Ms. KAPTUR.
 H.R. 2745: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
 H.R. 2765: Mr. GOHMERT.
 H.R. 2768: Mr. STEWART, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. SALMON, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. REED, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. PERRY.
 H.R. 2769: Mr. STEWART, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. SALMON, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. REED, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. PERRY.
 H.R. 2770: Ms. TITUS and Mr. TAKANO.
 H.R. 2772: Ms. HAHN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 2773: Ms. MOORE.
 H.R. 2775: Mr. LONG, Mr. LAMALFA, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. TERRY, Mr. DESANTIS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. LATTA.
 H.R. 2776: Mr. WOMACK.
 H.R. 2789: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H.R. 2794: Mr. LANCE and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
 H.R. 2802: Mr. VISCLOSKY.
 H.R. 2805: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
 H.R. 2807: Mr. LATTA and Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 2809: Mrs. BLACK.
 H.R. 2810: Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. BUCSHON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GOSAR, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. OLSON, and Mrs. ELLMERS.
 H.R. 2812: Mr. MEEKS.
 H.R. 2820: Mr. MULVANEY.
 H.R. 2821: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
 H.R. 2824: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 2825: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 2826: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 2837: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. CRAWFORD.
 H.R. 2839: Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SIREs, Mr. MEEKS, and Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
 H.R. 2840: Mr. LATTA.
 H.R. 2844: Mr. HARPER.
 H.J. Res. 1: Mr. HUDSON and Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.J. Res. 2: Mr. HUDSON and Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.J. Res. 34: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.J. Res. 41: Mr. HUDSON.
 H.J. Res. 43: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. KIND.
 H.J. Res. 44: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.J. Res. 51: Mr. HURT.
 H. Con. Res. 41: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SHERMAN, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
 H. Res. 30: Mr. BARLETTA.
 H. Res. 86: Mr. DESANTIS.
 H. Res. 97: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
 H. Res. 104: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H. Res. 112: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York and Mr. GRIMM.
 H. Res. 208: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H. Res. 222: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
 H. Res. 227: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. ENGEL.
 H. Res. 250: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
 H. Res. 254: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H. Res. 280: Mr. PERRY.
 H. Res. 281: Mr. COTTON, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HARRIS, Ms. TITUS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. STIVERS.
 H. Res. 284: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
 H. Res. 293: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. COOK, and Mr. CRAMER.
 H. Res. 302: Mr. JOYCE, Mr. SCHOCK, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
 H. Res. 307: Mr. BARBER and Mr. JOYCE.
 H. Res. 308: Mr. DIAZ-BALART and Mr. SIREs.
 H. Res. 318: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. CAMP

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 2009, "Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act of 2013," do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 693: Mr. DOYLE.
 H.R. 2027: Ms. SINEMA.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2610

OFFERED BY: MR. HANNA

AMENDMENT No. 5: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following: SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the final rule published by the Department of Transportation in the Federal Register on December 27, 2011, titled "Hours of Service of Drivers" (76 Fed. Reg. 81134).

H.R. 2610

OFFERED BY: MR. BARBER

AMENDMENT No. 6: Page 68, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,500,000)".
 Page 69, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,500,000)".
 Page 71, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".
 Page 80, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

H.R. 2610

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT No. 7: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following: SEC. 421. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any offeror or any of its principals if the offeror certifies, pursuant to the Federal Acquisition Regulation, that the offeror or any of its principals—

(1) within a three-year period preceding this offer has been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against it for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) contract or subcontract; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers; or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, tax evasion, violating Federal criminal tax laws, or receiving stolen property; or

(2) are presently indicted for, or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity with, commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (1); or

(3) within a three-year period preceding this offer, has been notified of any delinquent Federal taxes in an amount that exceeds \$3,000 for which the liability remains unsatisfied.

H.R. 2610

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT No. 8: Page 9, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$250)".

H.R. 2610

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT No. 9: Page 2, line 13, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$500,000)".

Page 3, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$500,000)".

Page 10, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$500,000)".

Page 11, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$500,000)".

H.R. 2610

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT No. 10: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following: SEC. _____. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to establish or collect tolls on Interstate 4 in the State of Florida.

H.R. 2610

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT No. 11: Page 9, line 7, before the period, insert "or that are located within 50 miles of a commercial service airport".

H.R. 2610

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT No. 12: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following: SEC. _____. None of the funds made available under this Act may be made available to any airline that reduces the benefits of its frequent flyer program without 180 days prior notice.

H.R. 2610

OFFERED BY: MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

AMENDMENT No. 13: Page 68, line 11, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$3,000,000)".

Page 68, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$3,000,000)".

Page 69, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$3,000,000)".

H.R. 2610

OFFERED BY: MR. MCCLINTOCK

AMENDMENT No. 14: Page 8, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$100,000,000)".

Page 150, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$100,000,000)".

H.R. 2610

OFFERED BY: MS. NORTON

AMENDMENT No. 15: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce subpart V of part 93 of title 14, Code of Federal

Regulations, regarding special air traffic rules for aircraft operating in the Washington, DC metropolitan area.

H.R. 2610

OFFERED BY: MR. TURNER

AMENDMENT No. 16: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to establish, issue, implement, administer, or enforce any prohibition or restriction on the establishment or effectiveness of any occupancy preference for veterans in supportive housing for the elderly that (1) is provided assistance by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and (2)(A) is or would be located on property of the Department of Veterans Affairs, or (B) is subject to an enhanced use lease with the Department of Veterans Affairs.

H.R. 2610

OFFERED BY: MR. LARSEN OF WASHINGTON

AMENDMENT No. 17: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 129(c)(3) of title 23, United States Code.

H.R. 2610

OFFERED BY: MR. GOSAR

AMENDMENT No. 18: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION RELATING TO USE OF OFFICIAL TIME

SEC. 421. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to pay a Federal employee for any period of time during which such employee is using official time under section 7131 of title 5, United States Code.

H.R. 2610

OFFERED BY: MS. BROWN OF FLORIDA

AMENDMENT No. 19: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 421. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to close or consolidate any offices in the Office of Field Policy and Management of the Department of Housing and Urban Development that were in existence as of June 1, 2013, or any field offices of the Office of Multifamily Housing Programs of such Department that were in existence as of such date.

H.R. 2610

OFFERED BY: MR. AL GREEN OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT No. 20: Page 108, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$12,500,000)”.

H.R. 2610

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT No. 21: Page 108, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$150,000)”.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 30, 2013

No. 111

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Sovereign Master of the Universe, Your kingdom cannot be shaken for You are King of kings and Lord of lords. We praise You that more things are wrought by prayer than this world can imagine.

Lord, thank You for inviting us to ask and receive, to seek and find, and to knock for doors to open. Forgive us when we have forfeited Your blessings because of our failure to ask. Forgive us also when we have lacked the humility to turn from evil, to seek Your face, and to pursue Your paths. May this prayer that opens today's session be a springboard for intercession throughout this day. Help our Senators to pause repeatedly during their challenging work to ask You for wisdom and guidance.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following the remarks of Senator McCONNELL and me, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider Calendar

No. 223, the nomination of Kent Yoshiho Hirozawa, of New York, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board and immediately have a cloture vote on that nomination.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 2218

Mr. REID. I am told H.R. 2218 is at the desk and is due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for a second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2218) to amend subtitle D of the Solid Waste Disposal Act to encourage recovery and beneficial use of coal combustion residuals and establish requirements for the proper management and disposal of coal combustion residuals that are protective of human health and the environment.

Mr. REID. I now object to any further proceedings at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. REID. Mr. President, for the first time in 3 years the Senate is poised to confirm members of the National Labor Relations Board. Although too few Americans are aware of the important job this Board does, the NLRB looks out for rights of millions of U.S. workers every day and remedies unfair practices by private companies. This Board is an important safeguard for workers in America, regardless of whether the employees are union or nonunion. Without the work of the NLRB, employees who have been cheated and treated unfairly would have no entity to address the wrongs. Union elections would be meaningless to employers and employees. Labor abuses and unfair employment practices could go unchallenged.

I am glad the Senate is moving forward as agreed under this process, set forth at the beginning of this Congress, to confirm five nominees to the NLRB, two Republicans and three Democrats.

The Senate will consider three Democratic nominees and two Republican nominees for the NLRB today. Once they are confirmed, the NLRB will have five Senate-confirmed members for the first time in a decade.

The five nominees are all eminently qualified.

For example, Mark Pearce has served on the National Labor Relations Board for 3 years, since 2010. He has served as chairman since 2011.

Mr. Pearce was a founding partner of a Buffalo, NY law firm, where he practiced employment law.

He previously worked in the Buffalo, NY regional office of the NLRB.

Mr. Pearce received his Bachelor's degree from Cornell University and his law degree from SUNY Buffalo.

Kent Hirozawa, whose nomination we will also consider today, is currently chief counsel for the National Labor Relations Board.

Before joining the NLRB staff in 2010, Mr. Hirozawa was a partner at a New York law firm, where he worked on Federal and State and labor and employment law.

Mr. Hirozawa also served as a field attorney for the NLRB from for 3 years prior to entering private practice.

He received a Bachelor's degree from Yale and his law degree from NYU.

Nancy Schiffer, the third Democratic NLRB nominee we will consider today, served as associate general counsel for the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

She has also worked for the United Auto Workers and served as a staff attorney in the NLRB's Detroit regional office.

Ms. Schiffer received her Bachelor's from Michigan State University and her law degree from the University of Michigan.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S6029

Once we vote on the 3 Democratic nominees, I expect we will consider the 2 Republican nominees by consent.

The first Republican nominee, Harry Johnson, is a partner at a Los Angeles law firm and practices labor and employment law.

Mr. Johnson received his Bachelor's degree from Johns Hopkins University and his law degree from Harvard.

The other Republican nominee, Philip Miscimarra, is a partner in a Chicago law firm, where he also practices labor and employment law.

Mr. Miscimarra received his Bachelor's degree from Duquesne University, and his M.B.A and J.D. from the University of Pennsylvania.

These nominees will be responsible for ensuring fair compensation and working conditions for American workers.

Look at the résumés of these people. They are pretty impressive.

They are experienced and dedicated public servants, and I have no doubt that they will perform their duties on this crucial board with distinction.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, today, the President will continue his campaign road tour in Chattanooga. We hear he plans to make an announcement about corporate taxes. And while I understand he is looking for headlines here, reports indicate that the policy he intends to announce doesn't exactly qualify as news. It is just a further-left version of a widely panned plan he already proposed 2 years ago—this time with extra goodies for tax-and-spend liberals.

The plan, which I just learned about last night, lacks meaningful bipartisan input, and the tax hike it includes is going to dampen any boost businesses might otherwise get to help our economy. In fact, it could actually hurt small businesses. And it represents an unmistakable signal that the President has literally backed away from his campaign-era promise to corporate America that tax reform would be revenue neutral to them.

Not only is this a rebuke to one of his party's most senior Senators—the Finance Committee Chairman—it also represents a serious blow to one of the best chances for true bipartisan action in Washington. I truly hope the President reconsiders this plan and consults with Congress before moving any further.

Two summers ago, Republicans and Democrats came together to agree on a set of spending caps for the following decade. President Obama agreed to it, as did the leaders of both parties in the Senate and the House.

It was essentially a promise made to the American people that Washington would reduce spending by \$2.1 trillion, and I was happy to help lead the effort.

Well, 2 years later Democrats are now trying to find ways to walk away from it.

They are pressing to abandon the 2011 agreement in favor of higher spending, as evidenced by appropriations bills like the one we're considering this week—which hikes up spending by double digits. And the President is now actually threatening to veto bills that live up to that commitment we all made.

Let me repeat that: The President of the United States who, during the campaign, took credit for the very savings Democrats now want to walk away from, is threatening to veto spending bills that would actually follow the law and live up to the commitment he himself signed.

This represents a stunning shift for Democrats, who just recently were warning against breaking the agreement. The Chairwoman of the Budget Committee said last year that we have to be able to count on agreements that have been made, instead of threatening a Government shutdown. Yet that is just what she and her party are now threatening to do—to shut down the Government unless an agreement we all made is torn up and thrown away.

So if Democrats want to shut down the Government because they can't wiggle their way out of a deal they agreed to, I guess there is not much we can do to stop them. But Republicans intend to stick by the commitments made to our constituents.

That said, there is also this to remember: Republicans have always said that there may be more effective ways to achieve comparable spending reductions. If Democrats want to propose smarter spending cuts that achieve the same kind of savings they committed to in 2011, we are ready to listen. Comprehensive Government spending reforms would be a good place to start.

Because Republicans understand that America's largest fiscal challenges stem from the fact that programs our fellow Americans hope to rely on in their most vulnerable years are going bankrupt. And Republicans are saying that the only way to avert the kind of panicked, poorly thought out spending cuts and tax increases we have seen in Europe is to implement forward-looking reforms today. That is why it is always so amusing when the President and his allies try to brand the kind of innovative government spending reforms we favor as "European-style austerity," as he implied again this weekend.

Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, what the Europeans are doing in response to the threats from their creditors is essentially the opposite of the approach favored by Republicans. The type of long-term spending reforms we envision are often the only antidote against the kind of austerity we see in Europe. Because European austerity is not about protecting future generations from spending cuts, it is about staying afloat today. And the

tax increases Europeans enact under duress—and the kind of pain Detroiters experience under bankruptcy—these are exactly the things Republicans aim to avoid. And we aim to avoid those things by acting intelligently today, while we still have time.

Unlike Democrats, Republicans are not looking for some colorless discussion about raising taxes here or snipping there or moving numbers around on a budget chart. We would rather have a more holistic, forward-looking conversation, one about modernizing Government to meet the challenges of the 21st Century.

Where we ask questions like:

How do we modernize entitlement programs so they'll actually be accessible to Americans when they need them?

Which government programs should be reformed, updated, or no longer make sense in a 21st Century economy? How can services be delivered in the most efficient and technologically savvy way?

And what structural reforms can we implement to ensure the most robust economic growth and job creation for this generation and those to come?

By addressing the big questions now—by identifying and implementing forward-looking reforms today—we can do a lot more than just reduce the deficit in the short term. We can also create jobs now, grow the economy now, make Government work better now, and eliminate the threat of a debt crisis everyone knows is coming, a debt crisis that would usher in the very kind of European-style austerity Democrats claim not to like, but keep accelerating towards.

But in order for this to happen, Democrats need to work with us.

As a first step, they should step back from the brink with their plan to shut down the Government. And they need to stop threatening to tear up agreements we all previously assented to. The Budget Control Act might not be perfect, but at least we were able to secure important spending control for the American people. And if Democrats want to trade some savings for innovative reforms that can serve our country even better over the long term, then there are policymakers ready to talk.

But Republicans are not going to just give up on the commitments made to our constituents. Not only would that be a betrayal of a promise we all made, but we have already seen where the Democrats' left-leaning policies and European-inspired ideas lead.

More of that is the last thing our country needs right now.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF KENT YOSHIHO HIROZAWA TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Nomination of Kent Yoshiho Hirozawa, of New York, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Kent Yoshiho Hirozawa, of New York, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board.

Harry Reid, Tom Harkin, Jack Reed, Sheldon Whitehouse, Christopher A. Coons, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Benjamin L. Cardin, Patrick J. Leahy, Joe Manchin III, Elizabeth Warren, Debbie Stabenow, Carl Levin, Angus S. King, Jr., Richard J. Durbin, Charles E. Schumer, Amy Klobuchar, Richard Blumenthal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Kent Yoshiho Hirozawa, of New York, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of 5 years, expiring August 27, 2016, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CHIESA).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 64, nays 34, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 189 Ex.]

YEAS—64

Alexander	Coons	King
Ayotte	Corker	Klobuchar
Baldwin	Donnelly	Landrieu
Baucus	Durbin	Leahy
Begich	Feinstein	Levin
Bennet	Flake	Manchin
Blumenthal	Franken	Markey
Blunt	Gillibrand	McCain
Boxer	Graham	McCaskill
Brown	Hagan	McConnell
Cantwell	Harkin	Menendez
Cardin	Heinrich	Merkley
Carper	Hirono	Mikulski
Casey	Johnson (SD)	Murkowski
Collins	Kaine	Murphy

Murray	Schatz	Warner
Nelson	Schumer	Warren
Pryor	Shaheen	Whitehouse
Reed	Stabenow	Wicker
Reid	Tester	Wyden
Rockefeller	Udall (CO)	
Sanders	Udall (NM)	

NAYS—34

Barrasso	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Burr	Heller	Roberts
Chambliss	Hoeven	Rubio
Coats	Inhofe	Scott
Coburn	Isakson	Sessions
Cochran	Johanns	Shelby
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Crapo	Kirk	Toomey
Cruz	Lee	Vitter
Enzi	Moran	
Fischer	Paul	

NOT VOTING—2

Chiesa	Heitkamp
--------	----------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 64, the nays are 34. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Cloture having been invoked, pursuant to S. Res. 15 of the 113th Congress, there will now be up to 8 hours of postcloture consideration of the nomination equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I understand we are now in postcloture debate on this nominee. I understand there is up to 8 hours that can be consumed for that purpose, if I am not mistaken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HARKIN. I certainly hope we don't have to take that much time. For this nominee and the other four to follow, I am hopeful we can get through them today and get the nominees to the President before we leave here this evening.

Today is a day that I and many of my colleagues have long waited for. Because of the bipartisan deal reached on the President's nominees, it looks as though we finally have a path forward to confirm a full slate of nominees to the National Labor Relations Board. A fully confirmed, fully functional board will be a huge step forward for workers and employers in our country, and this will be the first time in over a decade this has happened.

Over 75 years ago Congress enacted the National Labor Relations Act, guaranteeing American workers the right to form and join a union and to bargain for a better life. For both union and nonunion workers alike, the act provides for essential protections. It gives workers a voice in the workplace, allowing them to join together and speak out for fair wages, good benefits, and safe working conditions. These rights ensure that the people who do the real work in this country see the benefits when our economy grows and aren't mistreated or put at risk on the job.

The National Labor Relations Board is the guardian of these fundamental rights. Workers themselves cannot enforce the National Labor Relations Act; the Board is the only place where

people can go if they have been treated unfairly and denied the basic protections the law provides. Thus, the Board plays a vital role in vindicating workers' rights. In the past 10 years the NLRB has secured opportunities for reinstatement for 22,544 employees who were unjustly fired. It has also recovered more than \$1 billion on behalf of workers whose rights were violated in the last decade.

The Board does not just protect the rights of workers and unions; it also provides relief and remedies to our Nation's employers. The Board is an employer's only recourse if a union commences a wildcat strike or refuses to bargain in good faith during negotiations. The NLRB also helps numerous businesses resolve disputes efficiently. For example, when two unions picketed Walmart in 2012, Walmart filed a claim with the NLRB, and the NLRB negotiated a settlement. So by preventing labor disputes that could disrupt our economy, the work that the Board does is vital to every worker and every business across the Nation.

Earlier this year I received a letter from 32 management-side and 15 union-side labor attorneys from across the country who made this point particularly well. It urged the swift confirmation of a full package of five NLRB nominees and said:

While we differ in our views over the decisions and actions of the NLRB over the years, we do agree that our clients' interests are best served by the stability and certainty a full, confirmed Board will bring to the field of labor-management relations.

I could not agree more. Confirming these nominees swiftly is vitally important because the National Labor Relations Board must have a quorum of three Board members to act. If there are less than three Board members at any time, the Board cannot issue decisions and essentially must shut down. Although the Board currently has three members, Chairman Pearce's term expires on August 27—next month. At that point the Labor Board would be unable to function unless we confirm additional members. Now, that is more than just an administrative headache. It would be a tragedy that denies justice to working men and women across the country. So it is imperative that we act to avoid this and keep the Board open for work.

Up until recent times, all of us in Congress agreed that the Board should function for the good of our country and our economy, but in the last few years that understanding has broken down. As I said, it has been a decade since the Board has had five Senate-confirmed members. It is not that qualified people have not been nominated, because they have. The problem is that a few of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—I am not saying everyone, but a very vocal minority—have been trying to use the nomination process to undermine the mission of the National Labor Relations Board.

They, first of all, do not like the National Labor Relations Act, but they

know they could never repeal it outright. So what is their solution, this vocal minority on the Republican side? Keep the NLRB inoperable by refusing to confirm nominees regardless of their qualifications. In this case, one of my Republican colleagues announced his intention to filibuster the NLRB nominees 6 days before the nominations were announced, and he openly admitted his intention was to shut down the agency.

We have seen lots of nominees deemed unacceptable simply because they have worked on behalf of workers or unions and they support our system of collective bargaining. These nominees have been accused of being biased and called unfit to serve because they worked for labor unions or were lawyers for labor unions. But I would like to point out what the National Labor Relations Act—the law—actually says. I have often quoted from the National Labor Relations Act on this point, and I will do so again right now. Here is what the law says:

It is declared to be the policy of the United States to eliminate the causes of certain substantial obstructions to the free flow of commerce and to mitigate and eliminate these obstructions when they have occurred by encouraging the practice and procedure of collective bargaining and by protecting the exercise by workers of full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of their own choosing, for the purpose of negotiating the terms and conditions of their employment or other mutual aid or protection.

That is what the law says. The purpose is, again, to encourage “the practice and procedure of collective bargaining” for the good of our workers, for the good of our economy, and for the good of our Nation.

So if we have a nominee who comes up for the Board who supports collective bargaining, I would think that nominee would be more qualified, not less qualified, to serve on the Board because that nominee understands what the law says. So we should be seeking nominees who are, in the words of one of the nominees before us today, not pro-union, not pro-worker or pro-management, but “pro-Act”—“pro-Act.” If you are pro-act, the act says that we should be “encouraging the practice and procedure of collective bargaining and by protecting the exercise by workers of full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of their own choosing.” That is what the law says.

I am optimistic that the nominees before us today will bring this perspective to their work at the Board. All five nominees have diverse backgrounds and are deeply steeped in labor and employment law. While I certainly do not agree with the politics or perhaps the ideology of each nominee, it cannot be disputed that this is a competent and experienced group of lawyers. Given their diverse backgrounds and qualifications, there is no reason this package of nominees should not be confirmed with strong bipartisan support.

All five of these nominees have been thoroughly vetted. For the two most recent nominees—Kent Hirozawa and Nancy Schiffer—the vetting process has been quick, but it has been thorough. They have submitted all of the paperwork that we receive for our nominees. They have appeared before our committee in a hearing, answered any questions. They have met with staff for both sides, and they have answered all the written questions posed by members of my committee. They have demonstrated themselves to be impressively qualified and capable, and I look forward to their future service on the Board.

So I believe the time has come to start a new chapter for the NLRB. It is time to ratchet down the political rhetoric that has recently haunted this agency and let the dedicated public servants who work there do their jobs. Indeed, I hope today’s votes mark a new beginning for the Board, with a new energy and vitality, a new spirit of collaboration. A revitalized NLRB is a critical part of our continued efforts to build a strong economy and a strong middle class. It is long past time to put the Board back in business and to tone down the rhetoric.

I say to my friends on the other side—again, a vocal minority—certainly they can vote against the nominees. That is their right. That is their privilege. But do not use the nomination process to try to shut down the Board or to thwart the implementation of the National Labor Relations Act.

I am sure there were times when a majority of the Board was appointed by Republican Presidents and they were probably more promanagement. I cannot think of one right now, but I am sure they probably made some decisions that I would not be in favor of. But they did it openly. There are also times under a Democratic President when the Board would probably have three members who would be more from the labor side than management side. But that is the ebb and flow.

Quite frankly, for most of the times in the past, even though Republican Presidents had put nominees on the Board who were probably more promanagement or came from the management side—they would have three of those and then two from the worker or labor side—they still ran the Board in a nonpartisan fashion and reached agreements in an open fashion that were implementing the National Labor Relations Act. I would be hard pressed to think of a time when the Board acted in contradiction to what the act actually says.

Until recently—and this has just broken down in the last few years when President Obama’s nominees to the Board, in the first instance, were filibustered when the President had to give recess appointments to nominees. Of course, a recess appointment can only last so long, and then that person has to leave the Board. As I said, there was a threat by a Member on the Re-

publican side to filibuster nominees before they were even sent down. That means the Board would have been unable to operate. So the President then gave a recess appointment to two nominees to keep the Board functioning. That then found its way into the courts.

We have a couple of courts that decided the President did not have the power to do a recess appointment the way he did it. Other courts have taken different pathways. So that set of facts in that case is winding its way to the Supreme Court. It probably will be decided some time next year. But that is what happens when people do not let nominees who are fully qualified—fully qualified—come to the floor to get an up-or-down vote.

So I am very pleased this agreement that was reached a couple weeks ago to not filibuster nominees included the National Labor Relations Board. So we have an agreement from the Republican side that they will not filibuster these nominees. We have five of them. This is the first, Mr. Hirozawa. I am hopeful that, again, since they have been thoroughly vetted, we can move ahead expeditiously to vote on them and that we will not take the full 8 hours to debate these nominees and that each one of them—each one would have 8 hours. But, hopefully, we can collapse that and have the votes on the nominees at some time later this afternoon, and, as I said, turn a new chapter in the NLRB. Put them down there on the Board and let them do their work, and tone down the political rhetoric a little bit on the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that time during all postcloture quorum calls on the Hirozawa nomination be charged equally to both sides.

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

Mr. HARKIN. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHANNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. JOHANNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for 5 minutes as in morning business.

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

BUDGET CONTROL ACT

Mr. JOHANNIS. Mr. President, as we begin our final week of legislative activity prior to the August work period, I rise today to discuss the fiscal challenges that will await us on our return. When the Senate gavels back into session on September 9, we will be only 3 short weeks away from the end of the fiscal year. We will have only 15 business days to reach an agreement on all 12 appropriations bills and avoid a government shutdown.

Unfortunately, our progress toward reaching this goal has been less than stellar. The transportation-housing appropriations bill we are currently considering is the first of 12 bills that has even been brought to the Senate floor. Consider this: We cannot even agree to comply with the spending limits mandated under current law. We are headed for a big multitrain pileup.

Last Congress, the Senate and the House made a promise to the American people—made a promise about a basic level of fiscal constraint on our appropriations process; not enough, but a step in the right direction. As a part of the Budget Control Act, which passed with bipartisan support and was signed by the President, we committed to capping appropriations spending at certain levels for each of the next 10 years.

Less than a year ago, the majority leader emphatically proclaimed them binding when he said:

We passed the Budget Control Act. We have agreed to all of those numbers. They are done. They are agreed to.

In only the second year of this 10-year schedule, the 12 appropriation bills are mandated to spend no more than \$967 billion. That is a huge number to almost everyone. It is simply a whole lot of spending, almost \$3 billion a day. But my colleagues on the other side want to spend even more. In fact, they want to spend well over \$1 trillion this year.

You see, they want to pretend the Budget Control Act never passed and was never signed into law. They want to keep on spending as if there is some kind of alternative reality. But sadly that is not the case. Our Nation's deficit is still too large. We are still miles away from a balanced budget. The national debt continues on a course toward disaster. Yet, apparently, we are going to ignore the appropriations caps we all agreed to 2 years ago—not by an insignificant amount, an additional \$91 billion above the legal limit in the next fiscal year alone.

As a new member of the Appropriations Committee, I have been surprised to watch week after week bills being advanced that simply ignore current law. With a \$17 trillion national debt, we cannot simply imagine our way out of this crisis. But by ignoring the Budget Control Act, that is exactly what we are attempting to do.

I continue to believe very strongly that we should be preparing bills that are consistent with current law, abiding by the spending caps we voted for and were signed by the President. I think we should even do more than that, but complying with the current law is the bare minimum.

What does all of this mean? Who gets hurt if we ignore the BCA caps? Well, ignoring the BCA spending levels is not free money we can print down at the Treasury Department. Spending over the BCA caps simply sets the stage for yet another round of sequester cuts. We all remember how popular that was beginning this year. The administra-

tion officials claimed our health, our safety, our well-being, were in the balance as they traveled the country, threatening services such as Head Start, food safety inspectors, and massive delays at airports because of the indiscriminate, across-the-board spending cuts.

That is exactly what we are going to see in a few weeks because the majority would rather wash their hands of the responsibility to honor the caps and continue spending as though actions do not matter. But that is exactly the Senate's plan, spend \$91 billion over what the law allows. When \$91 billion worth of across-the-board cuts kick in, they hope the outcry from the American people is loud enough to convince us here in Congress to add the additional spending to our national debt. In my judgment, that is no way to run a railroad, but that seems to be the plan: keep spending us right into another sequester, ignore the consequences, and hope for the best.

It simply boggles the mind, especially when you consider all but two Senate Democrats on the Appropriations Committee supported—I emphasize supported—the increased level of spending restraint in the BCA.

Instead, we should have been using this time as an opportunity to more thoughtfully reduce spending before the end of the fiscal year. That is exactly what President Obama says he wants, when he says Congress should use a scalpel to tame our budget problems, not an axe, in across-the-board spending cuts. We can responsibly meet the \$967 billion spending target in current law, but we have to try. But instead of seizing the opportunity, we are once again shirking our responsibility in the hopes that no one will notice. That is disappointing to the American people. By exceeding the caps, we are violating yet another commitment we have made to them to get our fiscal house in order. You see, the American people figured this out long ago. Washington simply spends too much and, most importantly, spends too much of their own money. As their elected representatives, we should not ignore this. I am hopeful we can change course, take this opportunity and ensure that our spending bills total no more than what we promised months ago.

Come October 1, the American people will have the opportunity to see whether we have met that challenge. I hope for the sake of the country they get better news than what appears today.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business.

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

PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, this week the Senate is voting on five of the President's nominations for membership on the National Labor Relations Board. I expect all five to receive up-or-down votes, as they generally do, and I expect all five to be confirmed. The Board will then have a full complement, with a Democratic majority of three and two Republican members.

I would like to review for a moment what has happened and how we got to this spot because it is an important moment in the history of our ability as a country to maintain the checks and balances and certain separations of power among the various branches of government and especially to restrain the Executive, which has been an important part of our country's history.

In January 2012 the President nominated two individuals to be members of the National Labor Relations Board using his recess-appointment power. He has that power in the Constitution. The only problem was that the Senate wasn't in recess—at least that was our view. The Senate was in a 3-day pro forma session. A 3-day pro forma session is a device that was employed by Senator REID, the distinguished majority leader, when Bush was President, and he did it to keep President Bush from using his recess-appointment power when the Senate was in recess.

Most of our Presidents have chafed under the restraints we have placed upon our Executive. President Bush didn't like that, but he respected it, and President Bush never made recess appointments while the Senate was in session. But President Obama did—on January 4, 2012. Senate Republicans objected strongly to that. After a great deal of discussion, we decided to support a lawsuit challenging the appointments. That lawsuit went before the DC Circuit Court of Appeals, and the Circuit Court of Appeals agreed with our position and said in effect that the President could not make a recess appointment when the Senate itself had determined it was in session.

Since then there have been two other decisions by other federal courts of appeals that have said what the President did on January 4, 2012, was unconstitutional. The case will come before the Supreme Court this next term. No one knows what decision the Supreme Court will make, but my sense would be that the Supreme Court will say to this President or to any President that, Mr. President, you can't use your constitutional power to make a recess appointment at a time when the Senate is not in recess.

I said earlier that Presidents have chafed under these restraints on the executive branch. That has been true ever since the days of George Washington. George Washington imposed his own modesty and restraint upon the American character when he resigned

his commission after the Revolutionary War, when he stepped down after two terms as President and went back to Mount Vernon, when he asked to be called Mr. President instead of Your Excellency. Ever since then we have had many strong Presidents. They haven't all liked the idea that Washington also helped write a constitution that created a congress and a bill of rights, and the whole purpose of that was to restrain the Executive. After all, our revolution was against a king, and most of our Founders—not all of them, but the majority of the drafters of the Constitution didn't want a king of the United States, they wanted a president of the United States.

One of the most important checks upon the power of the Executive is the Senate's power to advise and consent, the power to review. About 1,000 Presidential nominations come to us, and it takes a while to confirm them. Sometimes it takes longer than the nominees think it should. I have repeated many times on this floor that when the first President Bush nominated me to be Education Secretary and the Senator from Ohio held up my nomination for 3 months, I didn't think that was such a good idea, but the Senate had the power to do it because the Constitution restrains the Executive. Unfortunately, this President didn't seem to read that chapter in American history because we have seen during this President's time repeated efforts to circumvent the constitutional checks on the Executive.

This administration has appointed more czars than the Romanovs had. That is the way you get around the nomination process. This administration's excellent Education Secretary has used a simple waiver authority in effect to create a national school board. When Congress says we don't want to appropriate money to implement ObamaCare, the Health and Human Services Secretary says: Well, if Congress won't do it, I will do it anyway; I will just go out and raise private money and do it. Then we have recess appointments being made when the Senate is not in recess. That is unconstitutional. If that could happen, the Senate could adjourn for lunch and come back and we would have a new Supreme Court Justice because the President said we were in recess.

So what is happening this week with these National Labor Relations Board nominees has a special significance in our constitutional history because not only did Republicans support a lawsuit challenging the appointments, which we are winning and the case has been won in two other Federal courts—but the President, after much discussion, has withdrawn his two unconstitutionally appointed nominees.

I suggested that he do this in May when we had a markup of the five nominees the President sent. I voted for three—the Democratic Chairman and the two Republicans—and I voted against the two who were unconsti-

tutionally appointed. They were well-qualified people. That wasn't the issue. The issue was that the Senate needed a way to express its objection to this unconstitutional action by the Executive.

I suggested that what the President should do is withdraw those two nominees and send us two new ones in the normal process—people who had not stayed on after a Federal court decided they were unconstitutionally there. These two unconstitutionally appointed nominees have participated in more than 1,000 cases. These cases are all subject to being vacated because there was no constitutional quorum.

It leaves quite a mess in our labor laws. But the President withdrew those two and now we are, this week, doing what the Senate normally does. We are considering in the normal process his new nominees.

I am voting, as I said, for the two Republicans and the Chairman. The Chairman was not unconstitutionally appointed. He did not continue to serve as an unconstitutionally appointed person, since he was not so appointed, so I voted for him in committee. I do not agree with the Chairman and his view of labor laws, but I will have to take that up during the next election. Elections have consequences, and when we elect the President of the United States, he normally appoints people who agree with him.

I am also voting for having an up-or-down vote. We almost always do that with the President's nominees. There have only been a few times in our history when we have not. We have never failed to have an up-or-down vote on a Supreme Court Justice after they have come to the floor. We have never failed to have an up-or-down vote on a district court judge after they have come to the floor; the same in terms of circuit courts. We never did, until Democrats started filibustering President Bush's judges about 10 years ago when I came to the Senate. We all know that story.

But normally we have an up-or-down vote, and we will be doing that this week on the President's five nominees. I am voting against two of the nominees when that up-or-down vote comes, and I wish to explain why.

One is Mr. Hirozawa and the other is Ms. Schiffer. Both of them have excellent legal backgrounds. But the problem is I am not persuaded—I hope I will be proven wrong—that they will be able to transfer their positions of advocacy to positions of adjudication; that they can be impartial when employers come before them.

Employers as well as employees have a right, when they come before the National Labor Relations Board, to expect that all five members, whether Republicans or Democrats, from whatever background they might have, will look at the case and decide it in an impartial way. It may be possible that Mr. Hirozawa and Ms. Schiffer can do that, but I am not persuaded that is true, and so while I am voting that

they have up-or-down votes, I am not voting for them.

The President has nominated for the Board three different individuals who were employed directly by major labor unions. The first was Craig Becker, who was counsel for two unions, and whose nomination was rejected by a bipartisan vote in 2010. The second was Mr. Griffin. The third is Ms. Schiffer.

I asked Ms. Schiffer at her hearing if she could remember other examples of an administration stocking the National Labor Relations Board with organized labor employees and she could not think of examples and I could not either. Over the last several years, the National Labor Relations Board seems to have veered away from impartiality. Instead of preserving a level playing field and protecting the carefully balanced rights of all parties, it has shown favoritism toward organized labor leadership and very little interest in the rights of individual employers or individual employees who want to exercise their rights not to join a union.

In fairness, I have to admit this politicization of the National Labor Relations Board has occurred both under Republican and Democratic administrations, but I think appointing a person directly from a high level job within a major labor union is not an example of trying to move away from that trend.

The trend is causing confusion. One labor law professor at a nationally recognized law school recently said she cannot even use her labor law textbook anymore. She has to resort to handing out NLRB decisions to explain the law because they are changing it so much. The NLRB has ventured into rule-making with two new efforts, both of which have been stalled by the Federal courts.

In August 2011, the Board issued a new rule requiring employers to post a biased employee rights poster in the workplace and making it an unfair labor practice to fail to do so. Two separate Federal courts have struck down the rule because it exceeded statutory authority.

In December 2011, the Board issued a new rule shortening the time in which a union election is held, otherwise known as the ambush elections rule. The DC Circuit Court struck down this rule on the grounds it lacked a quorum, and the NLRB is appealing the decision.

So far, this administration's NLRB has sought to change the rules for determining bargaining units, the process for certifying a representation election, the legal obligation of employers to withhold dues from employees' paychecks, even when there is no valid collective bargaining agreement in place, the validity of arbitration provisions in employment contracts, the legality of numerous well-intentioned employee handbook provisions, the rules governing employee discipline when there is no valid collective bargaining agreement in place, the rules governing the

confidentiality of employee witness statements given during a legitimate investigation, the policy against forcing nonunion member employees to pay for union lobbying expenses, the rules governing employers' rights to limit access to their property, and attempting to create an entirely new employer obligation and unfair labor practice through the poster requirement struck down by multiple Federal appellate courts.

The effect of all of these changes seems to me to tilt the playing field in favor of organized labor instead of impartiality, which is the directive of the statute. So fairness and impartiality is what I am looking for in any NLRB nominee. These two nominees do not pass this test. That is why I plan to oppose their nominations.

But the most important message from this week's debate is this: The Senate is saying, not just to this President but to any President, Republican and Democrat, that you may not abuse your constitutional power of recess appointments by making appointments when the Senate itself determines it is not in recess. To do so is an affront to the separation of powers. It undermines checks and balances that were placed upon the Executive at the beginning of our country as a way of preserving our liberties. That is an important step in the history of constitutional law in this country, and I am glad to see it has been done in this way.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENRICH). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP PROGRAM

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, over the last few years, I have spoken on the floor about how the Department of Defense procures major weapons systems—a system that is, to a large degree, broken, unfortunately. It is now even more important. With defense funding likely to be constrained to reduced levels in the coming years, our role as legislators overseeing major defense acquisition programs to make sure they are efficient and effective is as important today as it has ever been—indeed, even more so.

A recently released Government Accountability Office—GAO—report that is highly critical of the Navy's Littoral Combat Ship Program brings me to the floor today. On that program, the Navy plans to spend over \$40 billion to buy a total of 52 seaframes and 64 so-called "plug-and-play" mission modules. These are modules that would be

moved on and off, depending on the mission in which the Littoral Combat Ship is engaged. The combined capability of those modules with the seaframes is supposed to give these ships their intended lethality.

Until recently, my main concern with this program has been the unbridled growth in the cost to build the seaframes of the lead ships: the Freedom—the steel hull version—and the Independence, which is an aluminum trimaran version. The Navy appears to have addressed that problem. While the cost to build the seaframes for the follow-ships is still about double the program's original, overly optimistic cost estimate—which is not unusual—the cost to complete the construction appears to have stabilized at about \$450 million each.

Today I am concerned about another very serious problem: that the Navy will buy too many of these ships before the combination of their seaframes, with their interchangeable mission modules, has been proven capable of performing the missions these ships are supposed to perform. In other words, the Navy will not know whether this Littoral Combat Ship meets the combatant commanders' operational requirements until after it has procured more than half of the 52 planned ships. This is particularly troubling inasmuch as the Littoral Combat Ship fleet will comprise more than one-third of the Navy's surface combatant ships.

The Littoral Combat Ships' stated primary missions are antisubmarine warfare, mine countermeasures, and surface warfare against small boats, especially in the littorals. These three primary missions appear oriented toward countering, among other things, some of the littoral or coastal anti-access/area-denial capabilities that have been fielded in recent years by potential adversaries.

The Navy took delivery of the first of two ships—the Freedom and Independence—more than 3 years ago. But the ship called Freedom actually deployed, albeit with limited capability, to Singapore in March and has experienced many of the technical challenges normally associated with a prototype ship. The decision to deploy the ship Freedom prior to the completion of critical developmental and operational testing may be good salesmanship on the part of the Navy, but the current plan to buy more than half of the total Littoral Combat Ship fleet prior to the completion of operational testing plainly contradicts defense acquisition guidelines and best procurement practices—and amounts to a case of "buy before you fly," to borrow a phrase from aircraft acquisitions.

It also increases the risk that the program will incur additional costs to backfit already built Littoral Combat Ships with expensive design changes identified through late testing and evaluation or, worse, operational use.

As is the case in several other major defense acquisition programs, the prob-

lem here is "excessive concurrency"—that is, an overlap between development and production that exposes the program to a high risk of costly retrofits to earlier units in the production run. It sounds simple, but this is the problem that for years rendered the Joint Strike Fighter Program effectively unexecutable and that led to the terminations of the Army's multibillion-dollar Future Combat Systems Program and the Air Force's Expeditionary Combat Support System Program.

As to the Littoral Combat Ship, the General Accountability Office spelled out this problem in the report it released just a few days ago. According to the GAO:

There are significant unknowns related to key LCS operations and support concepts and the relative advantages and disadvantages of the two variants. The potential effect of these unknowns on the program is compounded by the Navy's aggressive acquisition strategy. By the time key tests of integrated LCS capability are completed in several years, the Navy will have procured or have under contract more than half of the planned number of ships. Almost half of the planned ships are already under contract, and the Navy plans to award further contracts in 2016, before the Department of Defense makes a decision about full rate production of the ships. The Navy will not be able to demonstrate that mission packages integrated with the seaframes can meet the minimum performance requirements until operational testing for both variants [the Freedom and the Independence] is completed, currently planned for 2019.

I repeat: 2019.

I again voice my concern that the Navy plans to purchase many, if not most, of the Littoral Combat Ships in the program before knowing whether the ships will work as advertised and as needed.

The GAO report's bottom line recommendation is to limit future seaframe and mission module purchases until the LCS Program achieves key acquisition and testing milestones that would help make sure that the program delivers required combat capability. I agree completely with the GAO. GAO's concerns are shared by the Pentagon's independent chief tester and even the Navy itself, in an internal report called the "OPNAV Report" or "Perez Report." I highly recommend that anyone who has an interest in the Littoral Combat Ship read these reports.

In terms of the costs to national security and to the taxpayer, we simply cannot afford to continue committing unlimited resources to an unproven program that may eventually account for more than one-third of the surface combatant fleet. The LCS seaframe and mission modules are at different points along the acquisition life cycle. We need to put a pause on additional ship purchases and synchronize the plans for testing the seaframes and the mission modules to make sure the Navy is executing a coherent acquisition strategy that will deliver combat capability responsive to what our operational commanders actually need.

Also, the Navy has to lay out a clear top-level plan on how these ships will be used in response to reasonably foreseeable, relevant threats around the world. In other words, it needs to decide the concept of operation—or CONOPS—that this ship class will support. According to a declassified internal Navy report released last Tuesday, “There are two options: Building a CONOPS—that means concept of operations—to match LCS’ current capabilities or modifying the ship to better meet the needs of the Theater Commanders.”

The report goes on to say: “The ship’s current characteristics limit operations to a greater extent than envisioned by the CONOPS. . . .” The second option is to “modify the ship to support the warfighting requirements. Our review identified opportunities to modify several of the ships’ characteristics to more closely align with the intent of the original CONOPS.”

Right now, it seems as though whatever combat capability LCS can muster is driving its mission, not the other way around, as in most ships. In other words, the Littoral Combat Ship appears to be a ship looking for a mission. But just to perform its three currently intended primary missions, the Navy is looking at significant design changes and increasing Littoral Combat Ships’ crew size, even though it has already bought about 30 percent of all of the LCS ships it intends to buy. That could increase its procurement and life cycle operation and support costs well beyond current estimates and strain its affordability. Given how many frigates, minesweepers, and patrol crafts the Navy currently plans to retire over the next 5 years in favor of Littoral Combat Ships, this is particularly troubling.

Notably, the Government Accountability Office also reports: “Current LCS weapon systems are underperforming and offer little chance of survival in a combat scenario.”

In this regard, the Government Accountability Office appears to agree with the Pentagon’s chief independent weapons tester. As this top Pentagon official has noted, before proceeding beyond early production, this program should complete initial operational testing and evaluation to determine that it is effective, suitable, and survivable. But LCS is not doing so. Why not? We need an answer to that. If, for whatever reason, the Navy believes it must deviate from that practice, what plan will it put in place to mitigate the resulting concurrency risk?

Let me be clear. To justify the purchase of the remaining 32 ships in the program, the Navy must first provide credible evidence based on rigorous, operationally relevant and realistic testing and evaluation, that this ship will in fact be able to adequately perform its primary stated missions and meet combatant commander requirements. Congress must, at a minimum, thoroughly review this program before

authorizing funding in fiscal year 2015 to buy the next four LCS’s and require the Secretary of the Navy to certify, on the basis of sound written justification arising from sufficient initial operational testing and evaluation, that the LCS ships will be able to adequately perform their intended missions and provide our operational commanders with the combat capability they need.

The American people are—quite rightly—tired of seeing their taxpayer dollars wasted on disastrous defense programs such as the Air Force’s failed ECSS Program or the Army’s Future Combat System Program or the Navy’s VH-71 Presidential Helicopter Replacement Program. LCS must not be allowed to become yet another failed program in an already unacceptably long list of amorphous acronyms that—after squandering literally billions of taxpayer dollars—have long since lost meaning.

On the LCS program, the Navy must right its course—today.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

RECESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly caucus meetings and that the time during the recess be counted postcloture, with the time charged equally to both sides.

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

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:40 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

NOMINATION OF KENT YOSHIHO HIROZAWA TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, I would like to be recognized for the purpose of making brief remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACT

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, I am pleased to come to the floor—and I will be joined shortly by Senator MURRAY from the State of Washington—to announce that tomorrow in the HELP Committee—the Health, Education, Labor & Pensions Committee—we will be introducing the reauthorization of the Workforce Investment Act.

Quite honestly, the Workforce Investment Act was passed in 1998 and has not been reauthorized in the last 15 years. During that period of time, our country—particularly in the last 6 years—has gone through a sustained period of high unemployment. We also have periods where employers cannot find the match of workers who are actually trained for the jobs they have.

Workforce investment and training is important for those with disabilities, those without jobs, those with skill sets that need to be improved, and this bill addresses all of those areas.

Senator MURRAY has been a tireless Senator in working to find common ground on issues that have been critical to both the Democratic Party and the Republican Party but, more important, to the workers of the United States of America.

I wish to pay tribute to her staff who has worked tirelessly with my staff, and I wish to thank Tommy Nguyen on my staff, in particular, for his dedication and hard work.

This bill represents a real step forward, and I am pleased that this morning the Business Roundtable issued a release of their endorsement of the base bill we are putting forward tomorrow in the committee. Hopefully, it will be on the floor this fall when we return from the summer recess and we can move forward on job training, job opportunity, and lowering the unemployment rate in the United States of America.

In particular, I am very pleased this bill provides flexibility to our Governors in terms of transferability of funds. It provides for business majorities on the board and a business member to be a board chairman and the State chairman could also be a businessperson, which means those who are doing the employing will be those who will be guiding the Workforce Investment Act in their State.

I am also particularly proud of the fact that we focus on a regional approach to workforce investment. So often times, you get so many workforce investment boards in one metropolitan area that you have a very individualized focus and not a regional focus. A regional focus is important for workers. It is important for all of us.

So I am pleased to announce today on my behalf—Senator ISAKSON on the HELP Committee—that along with Senator MURRAY, today we are introducing and tomorrow we will mark up in committee the reauthorization of the Workforce Investment Act.

I look forward to the support of all Members of the Senate to help us do a better job providing jobs for working Americans.

I yield back my time and—no, I do not yield back my time. I can brag about Senator MURRAY while she is here now because I have been saying nice things while she was on her way.

I thank Senator MURRAY for her cooperation, the spirit of cooperation she has given us, and the fact that we are

finally reaching an agreement between ourselves and our staffs. I met with my side this morning. I know the Senator has done the same. We have a good platform to move forward on the first reauthorization of the Workforce Investment Act since 1998.

I defer to the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I thank the Senator. Senator ISAKSON has been absolutely great to work with. We have been spending a lot of time on this.

Let me make a few remarks.

Over the past several weeks and months, we have spent a lot of time in the Senate debating everything from the Federal budget to separate spending bills, and throughout those debates Members of both parties have agreed it is absolutely critical that we are working to write laws and policies that put hardworking Americans back to work, help our businesses grow and invest, and position our economy to compete and win in the 21st century.

We have had some disagreement on how to achieve those goals, but as our Nation now recovers from the recession, our first priority has to be getting Americans back on the job. So I wish to join with Senator ISAKSON to talk about the tremendous progress we have made in the HELP Committee; that is, the work to reauthorize the Workforce Investment Act—and to do just that: put Americans back to work.

Before I get to the importance of the bill itself, I do wish to take some time to talk about the bipartisan process we have had at the committee level to move this forward.

From the very beginning of this process I have worked very closely with my Republican cosponsor Senator ISAKSON, whom you just heard from, and though I know we represent very different States with different industries and different issues, we have each remained very committed to writing a bill that works for all American businesses and workers.

This process has never been about scoring political points or pitting interests against each other. I think it has been a rare and needed example of true bipartisan legislating, and I thank my friend Senator ISAKSON, again, for his hard work and commitment throughout this process.

I also wish to thank our committee chairman and ranking member—Senator HARKIN and Senator ALEXANDER—who have both worked extensively on this legislation and have now signed on as cosponsors as well.

It has been 15 years since we first passed the Workforce Investment Act or WIA. But perhaps more important, it has been a full decade since the legislation was due to be reauthorized. So this law—which was first written in the late 1990s—was designed to be changed and updated back in 2003. Since then, as we all know, our country and our economy have changed a lot.

In the late 1990s, the Internet was changing the way we do business and driving our economy, and the housing sector was as strong as ever. But as we all know, unfortunately, both of these industries went bust.

But back then, we in Congress were willing to take the long view and make meaningful commitments to and investments in our workforce development systems. So back in 1998, we wrote and passed the Workforce Investment Act to help our workers and educators and businesses respond to an economy that was changing faster than ever before.

Lately, we have not done much of that, but I am very optimistic that by improving and reauthorizing WIA, we can get back on track. This is the very law that was written to help us respond to a changing economy and provide the framework for our Nation's workforce development system. But it is still written to address the issues we faced more than 10 years ago.

So working with Senators from both sides of the aisle and the business, labor, and education communities, we are bringing to our committee tomorrow a very strong reauthorization bill that brings WIA into the 21st century.

This bill puts more than a decade of experience and data to use by doing a few things. It requires a single unified workforce plan in each State and replaces all the overlap and confusion between separate State agencies.

It recognizes that we need data and analysis to understand which workforce programs are working well, what makes them work well and how to improve them and, just as important, which programs are underperforming, why, and how to fix them. It makes changes to align our workforce systems with regional economic development and labor markets.

This bill is focused on using real-world data to measure the returns we get on our workforce investments, and getting good return on the Federal dollars we invest is exactly what Americans are calling for today.

So while we are making important changes to the existing version of WIA, I wish to finish my remarks with an example of the incredible success this law has already had in helping our economy.

Last year, the WIA adult and dislocated worker programs produced some remarkable statistics. Over 1 million adults and dislocated workers were placed in jobs. Those workers earned more than \$12 billion over just the first 6 months of their employment. In that same period, WIA funds spent on those programs came to about \$2 billion.

Let me say that again. In just 6 months, an investment of \$2 billion yielded a return of more than \$12 billion. So the investments we make through WIA programs are having an incredible impact on our economy. The important point is we can do more.

That is why a lot of organizations across the country have called for a

modernized 21st century version of the Workforce Investment Act—organizations such as the National Business Roundtable, the National Metropolitan Business Alliance, labor and education leaders, and the Greater Seattle Chamber of Commerce in my home State. All of these organizations are supporting the efforts we have put together.

We are here today to announce to our colleagues that tomorrow we are going to begin marking up our reauthorization bill in committee, and I look forward to continuing working with my colleagues from both sides of the aisle.

In a time when bipartisan legislation has become difficult to achieve, I hope we can set an example of what we are still capable of doing together to strengthen our country and our economy.

I again want to thank Senator ISAKSON and all those who have worked very hard to put this bill together. I am proud of what we have accomplished and look forward to working with him as we move through this process.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I rise today to talk about an epidemic in the American workforce that has wreaked havoc on our labor markets and caused undue hardship for millions of our Nation's workers. I am talking, of course, about the eradication of the 40-hour workweek wrought by the so-called "Affordable Care Act."

As a result of this poorly named law, businesses around the country are instituting hiring freezes, downsizing their workforces or reducing worker hours. The President's health law requires employers with 50 or more full-time employees to offer health coverage of a minimum value or pay a penalty. One of the unintended but not unforeseen consequences of the law is that a number of employers are opting to unilaterally limit the number of full-time employees in order to escape this burdensome mandate.

The Affordable Care Act defines "full-time employees" as those working at least 30 hours a week. As a result of this odd definition, not every employer seeking to avoid paying penalties is laying off workers. Instead, an increasing number of businesses have opted to simply cap workers' hours. This is happening everywhere. For example, a recent Reuters survey of 52 Walmart stores found that half of the stores were only hiring temporary

workers—something the stores typically only do during the holiday shopping season. According to a recent article in the *Washington Times*, Walmart has overall increased the share of its temporary staff from between 1 and 2 percent last year to 10 percent this year. Keep in mind that Walmart is our Nation's largest employer. Although the company has denied that this change in policy is as a result of ObamaCare, it is hard to believe this is all just a coincidence.

Small businesses are also being impacted. For instance, there is the example cited recently in the *Wall Street Journal* where Rod Carstensen, an owner of several Del Taco restaurants in the Denver area, was forced to shift the majority of his workforce from full time to part time as a result of ObamaCare. Mr. Carstensen previously had 180 full-time employees and only 40 part-time workers. But providing benefits for those workers would have imposed as much as \$400,000 a year in additional costs. As a result, he is now in the process of switching to 80 full-time and 320 part-time workers, none of whom will work more than 28 hours per week.

As I said, this is happening everywhere. It is stupid. According to a survey conducted by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, 71 percent of small businesses say the President's health law makes it harder to hire new employees. Among small businesses that would be impacted by ObamaCare's employer mandate, 50 percent say they will either have to cut the hours of workers currently employed full time or replace their full-time employees with part-timers in order to avoid this vicious mandate.

But it is not just happening in the private sector. Public schools, States, and municipalities are also limiting employees to part-time work in order to avoid paying costly benefits. For example, the second largest school district in my home State of Utah recently implemented a policy limiting part-timers to 29 hours a week. According to the *Washington Post*, this impacted roughly 1,200 employees—mostly substitute teachers. That is 1,200 employees in a single school district who will see their hours and their wages capped as a result of ObamaCare. Likewise, the State of Virginia recently enacted a policy reducing the hours for as many as 10,000—10,000—part-time employees who until recently worked more than 30 hours a week. Offering coverage to these workers would have cost the State as much as \$110 million a year. Understandably, rather than paying those crippling costs, Virginia was forced to reduce workers' hours and therefore their pay thanks to the demands and the viciousness of ObamaCare.

As I stated, this is reaching epidemic levels. It makes you wonder what is in the brains of those who support ObamaCare.

Nationwide, employers have added far more part-time employees in 2013—

averaging 93,000 a month—than full-time workers, which have averaged 22,000. Last year the reverse was true.

It is not just businesses that are noticing this epidemic. Labor unions—some of the largest supporters of the law when it was originally drafted—have also weighed in on the matter. As was widely reported earlier this month, the leaders of three prominent labor unions sent a letter to the Democratic leaders in both the House and the Senate expressing their concerns about some of the unintended consequences of the "Affordable Care Act." One of their major concerns was that, in their own words:

The law creates an incentive for employers to keep employees' hours below 30 hours a week. Numerous employers have begun to cut workers' hours to avoid this obligation, and many of them are doing so openly. The impact is two-fold: fewer hours means less pay while also losing our current health benefits.

According to these union leaders, ObamaCare threatens to "destroy the foundation of the 40-hour work week that is the back bone of the American middle class." I could not agree more with that.

President Obama is apparently starting to feel some of this pressure. Indeed, despite his recent efforts to paint a rosy picture of the impact of the health care law, I think President Obama knows full well that the "Affordable Care Act" is not living up to its name. Why else would he decide to delay the implementation of the employer mandate, as he did earlier this month? Obviously, there are political considerations. The recently announced 1-year delay on the employer mandate conveniently puts the implementation of the mandate past the 2014 midterm elections, so from that perspective I guess it makes perfect sense.

Setting aside the politics, this delay also makes some sense in terms of policy. The epidemic of employers reducing workers' hours is taking a huge toll on the American workforce. Indeed, the policies established under the health law are killing jobs, reducing wages, and stagnating growth. That being the case, the bigger question is, Why is the President only delaying the employer mandate for a single year? Does he really believe these problems will simply go away if businesses have 1 additional year to prepare or is he just thinking to get to the next election and getting his people through who have voted for this?

Regardless of when this mandate goes into effect, it is going to send shock waves throughout the business community. It is going to eliminate jobs. It is going to weaken our recovery—weak though it is today. That is why, despite the announcement of the 1-year delay, employers throughout the country are refusing to reverse course when it comes to downsizing their workforces and limiting employees' hours. Most news reports surrounding this issue are showing that this is pre-

cisely the case. That is likely the case for the State of Virginia. It is definitely the case for my home State of Utah and Utah's Granite School District, just to mention one aspect of our problems in Utah.

If the President is serious about getting our economy back on track, he should work with Congress to ensure that this mandate never goes into effect. While we are at it, we should also permanently delay the individual mandate. For the life of me, I cannot see why President Obama would extend his limited lifeline to the business community and at the same time leave individuals and their families out in the cold. This is from a President who claims he is for the families and for the individuals and for the poor and for those who are middle class. They are being left out in the cold.

If businesses are currently facing enough difficulties to necessitate delaying the employer mandate, shouldn't we assume individuals are going to face similar difficulties complying with the individual mandate? Isn't it only fair that we extend the same benefits to individuals and families that are being offered to businesses and employers? Why not get that beyond the next year's election too? Not according to the Obama administration. As it stands today, American businesses will get a 1-year reprieve from the job-killing employer mandate—American businesses. But the American people are still squarely in the sights of ObamaCare, as the individual mandate for them remains in place. This is the height of unfairness. It needs to be rectified.

The House of Representatives for its part has acted responsibly. Two weeks ago the House passed two pieces of legislation—two pieces relating to ObamaCare. The first bill would simply codify President Obama's 1-year delay of the employer mandate. The second would provide similar relief to individuals and families struggling to comply with the individual mandate. Not surprisingly, President Obama has threatened to veto both bills—even the one that would simply put his own administration's policy into statutory form.

Still, that should not stop us in the Senate. If we are serious about helping the business community as well as individuals and families, we should work to delay permanently this catastrophic law. If President Obama wants to officially deny the American people the same type of relief he has given to the business community by not working with Congress, then so be it. The Senate needs to act responsibly. If the President is refusing to do the same, we ought to at least act responsibly.

Make no mistake—I do not think a 1-year delay on the employer and individual mandates is enough. We ought to get rid of them both. I am the author of two Senate bills that would repeal both of these egregious provisions of ObamaCare. In light of the President's recent recognition that the employer mandate should be delayed, I

have publicly called for a permanent delay of the implementation of the entire law.

Given what we know about the problems associated with ObamaCare and, quite frankly, given what we do not know, the sensible approach is to delay it permanently and to work together on reform that will actually lower health care costs—not just promise to do it but actually do it. I believe we can fix these problems for everyone, for employers and for individuals alike, but only if the law is permanently delayed to give us a chance to do so. It would give us a chance to be bipartisan for a change around here and work together for the good of this country. That is what makes sense. That is what fairness dictates. If we are serious about avoiding what even some of my Democratic colleagues have called a train wreck, that is the least we can do.

I am really concerned about our country. We have increased taxes \$1 trillion in ObamaCare. We have increased taxes \$600 billion in the fiscal cliff legislation. Last week the majority leader and others—the President, Senator SCHUMER, and others—called for almost \$1 trillion more in tax increases. It would be one thing if all of that money would go to reduce spending or if all of that money would go to balance our budget. But no, they are going to spend every dime of it. Here we are, headed toward problems that we have plenty of illustrative information on, problems like Greece has gone through and is going through and other countries as well that just are profligate when it comes to their economic wherewithal.

I like the President personally, but for the life of me, as bright as he is, I do not see why he does not see all of this.

I don't see why my colleagues on the other side don't see it—or should I say they ought to see it. They ought to know this is not what the American people want. They would like to have health care, there is no question, but this is going to diminish health care all over the country. We can see the high percentage of doctors who are giving up on Medicaid patients. They will not take them anymore. Only this week a high percentage of doctors are giving up on Medicare patients. They don't wish to take them anymore.

What is the administration's answer to all of these spending programs? They are going to cut the providers. Already the providers—the doctors, the hospitals, and the health care providers—are complaining they can't deliver the services that ObamaCare requires at the low-level costs that ObamaCare gives.

We have to come up with a better system. We have to work together. We can't keep going down this pathway.

I hope my friends on the other side will wake up and realize: Hey, this game is over.

We have to find some way to solve these problems because they are just

too large. They are going to wreck our country if we don't.

What is worse, they are going to hurt the health care of millions and millions of people who will not be able to afford it.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, sitting here listening to the distinguished senior Senator from Utah Mr. HATCH, who in many ways I consider my mentor in the Senate, I couldn't help but reflect on what we were all doing on Christmas Eve at 7 o'clock in the morning of 2009.

We were on the floor of the Senate casting a historic vote on the President's Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare. Sadly, that piece of legislation became a partisan exercise in power. All the Democrats voted for it and all the Republicans voted against it. It was an inauspicious way to start such an important part of reform of our health care system.

The President pretty well got what he wanted. The 2,700-page piece of legislation was made into law with \$1 trillion-plus tax increases, with promises that if you like what you have, you can keep it, and he promised that even families of four could see a reduction in their health care costs of roughly \$2,500 a year.

Whether you were against ObamaCare from the beginning, as I was, because you never believed it would actually work, or you were for it and you actually believed that it would perform as advertised and as promised, I think everyone has to now acknowledge it has not turned out the way that even some of its most ardent supporters had hoped it would.

The first indication, perhaps, was when the Secretary of Health and Human Services began to issue waivers, in excess of 1,000 waivers, from having to comply with the law itself. There were many questions about the basis upon which these waivers were issued. Were they given to friends of the administration and denied to adversaries of the administration?

This is what happens when you pass a sweeping piece of legislation such as this and then cherry-pick who it applies to and who it does not apply to. This started with the granting of waivers.

We found that most recently even the President of the United States has determined the employer mandate—the mandate on employers with more than 50 employees, that they provide this government-designed insurance policy or else they get fined—that even the President has acknowledged by his action that delaying the implementation of the employer mandate for a year is having a devastating effect on unemployment in America. The reason we know this is because many employers are simply shedding jobs so they can get beneath the 50-person threshold for the employer mandate or they are tak-

ing full-time jobs and making them into part-time jobs. This is causing a lot of people who wish to work and want to provide for their families—it is creating an inability for them to do so according to their needs.

We know the individual mandate—the House of Representatives has passed a piece of legislation that says: If you are going to delay the employer mandate for businesses, shouldn't you show the same consideration for individual Americans who, unless they buy this government-approved insurance, will have to pay a penalty? The President hasn't accepted that delay in the implementation of the law.

There is another important piece of legislation that I filed in the Senate that the House is also considering this week; that is, given the scandals associated with the Internal Revenue Service, the fact that clearly the IRS has more on its plate than it is capable of adequately performing, we ought to get the Internal Revenue Service out of the implementation of ObamaCare.

With everything else it has to do, especially given the scandals that are currently under investigation in both Houses of Congress, we ought to be delaying the implementation of that individual mandate. We ought to be delaying the implementation of the employer mandate. We ought to be cutting the IRS out of the implementation process for ObamaCare.

I confess, I voted against ObamaCare from the very beginning. I voted to repeal it every chance we could possibly have, and I voted to cosponsor legislation that would defund it.

I wish to echo some of the words of the distinguished senior Senator from Utah. At some point those of us who were against it from the very beginning, who would like to repeal it and defund it, have to work together with our colleagues—who perhaps hoped that it would actually work as advertised—realizing now that even organized labor is writing letters to us saying: Please protect us from the provisions of this law because it is hurting our jobs. It is making it impossible for to us keep the insurance we have.

We need to work together to try to come up with a solution at some point. As the distinguished ranking member and the distinguished Finance Committee chairman said: The implementation of ObamaCare is clearly becoming a train wreck. We don't want to visit the pain of that train wreck and that failure on the American people but provide them a reasonable alternative which will provide people access to high-quality care at a lower cost. There are plenty of great ideas out there.

THUD APPROPRIATIONS

I wish to turn to the appropriations bill that is pending before us. Last week, in one of the President's much publicized pivots, the President turned his attention back to the economy. Of course, most Americans don't have the luxury of pivoting to or from this sluggish economy, which is growing at the

most sluggish rate in the history of the American economy since the last depression, the Great Depression. The American people don't have a luxury of pivots. They have to live with this sluggish economy and high unemployment day after day.

We should welcome the President back to this conversation. He has talked a lot about middle-class families, who, as we all would agree, are the backbone of our country and a source of immeasurable strength. That said, the President hasn't been a member of the middle class for some time, and I think he, along with some of our colleagues, could use a refresher.

American families set their budgets, and they have to stick with them. In lean times they trim their budgets, and in times of plenty they set money aside for the future should they need it. Astonishingly, this basic principle seems to have been lost on both the President and the author of this legislation.

This bill, this underlying appropriations bill, takes the first step toward violating the Budget Control Act, which President Obama himself signed into law in 2011. That law sets very clear limits on spending levels, which the Democratic majority, by bringing this bill to the floor, has chosen to ignore.

They ignored it when they wrote their budget earlier this year, and they are ignoring it today with this proposed appropriations bill, which is 11 percent above the Budget Control Act numbers and 4 percent above the President's own proposed budget itself. That is \$54 billion. That is how much this bill would appropriate in discretionary spending and is more than \$5 billion above the current level of spending for this particular appropriations bill.

As I said, it is more than the President himself has requested. It is more than \$10 billion above the House bill which, unlike this bill, was written in accordance with the existing law.

I understand, as a negotiating tactic, why our Democratic friends might think highballing the House bill is a good negotiating tactic, but it is a total charade. It violates the Budget Control Act, and the American people simply will not go along with it.

The American people can't understand why Congress and the Federal Government are having such a difficult time doing with 2.4 percent less than we spent before the Budget Control Act went into place—2.4 percent. Yet here inside the beltway you will hear people talk about the so-called sequester and the Budget Control Act as if it were the end of the world.

It is not. It is called living within your means, and that is what we tried to do when the law was passed and when President Obama signed it. I think it is also telling that the majority leader, who basically controls the agenda on the Senate floor, chose to bring this particular bill to the floor before the August recess. We could have passed any one of a number of

other appropriations bills to fund our veterans hospitals or to pay our Border Patrol agents.

The House and Senate aren't very far apart on the appropriations bills that would do that. Conceivably, we could have had them on the President's desk by the end of this week. Instead, the majority leader would rather leave them in limbo while attempting to pass this bloated bill which has zero chance of becoming law.

My hope is that as we proceed through this next round of fiscal debate, our friends on the other side of the aisle would demonstrate a willingness to operate within the law and the Budget Control Act. Unfortunately, they are not off to a very good start with this particular appropriations bill.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

FOR-PROFIT COLLEGES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, Jennifer Kerr was a single mom who wanted to improve her family's future. In 2009, she signed up at Vatterott College. She thought that was the best way to improve her skills and training and do a better job for her family.

She went to the local campus. She told the admissions representative that she wanted to study to become a nurse. The admissions official told her that although the school did not offer a nursing degree, it did offer a medical assistant's degree that would allow her to earn \$15 to \$17 an hour and put her on a fast track to becoming a nurse.

After securing more than \$27,000 in loans and being in the program for more than a year, Jennifer Kerr learned she wasn't even enrolled in the medical assistant's program—she was in the preliminary medical office assistant's program. If she wanted to continue and pursue the medical assistant's degree, she would need another 30 weeks of study and another \$10,000 to be paid in tuition.

In a gutsy move, Jennifer Kerr sued Vatterott Education Centers for misleading her, even though there was a clause in her contract with the school that said if she ever sued the school and lost, she would be responsible for Vatterott's legal costs.

A jury in Missouri decided the school did deceive Jennifer Kerr and ordered the company to pay back the \$27,000 she borrowed for tuition and fees. The jury then ordered the company to pay Kerr an additional \$13 million in punitive damages. The punitive amount the

jury awarded far exceeded the maximum under Missouri law, but it showed the sympathy of the jury for situations like Jennifer Kerr's. She borrowed tens of thousands of dollars to earn a certificate—not even a degree—at a for-profit school that turned out to be virtually worthless.

After she left Vatterott, she tried for 6 months to find full-time employment. Earning her medical office assistant's diploma not only put her in debt, but it couldn't land her a job anywhere.

Taking away the court victory, Jennifer Kerr's story is common to an industry—the for-profit school industry—that frequently uses unscrupulous tactics to deceive people who are trying to get an education.

Some trade schools provide quality training for reasonable prices. I acknowledge that. But throughout the for-profit college industry, abuses are well documented. Admissions offices at for-profit schools are often a guise for aggressive sales operations targeting students from low-income families. They end up enrolling, with inflated expectations for their employment and salary prospects upon graduating from for-profit colleges.

Because 96 percent of the students who enroll in for-profit colleges take Federal student loans, nearly all the students who leave these for-profit schools have student debt even when they don't have a degree or a diploma that can lead to a job. Most for-profit colleges charge significantly more in tuition and expenses than similar programs at community colleges or even State universities.

In 2008 and 2009, more than 1 million students started at schools owned by for-profit companies that were examined in an investigation by Senator TOM HARKIN in the Senate HELP Committee. By mid-2010, 54 percent of those students who started at these for-profit schools had left school, without a degree or a certificate. Among associate degree students, 63 percent dropped out without a degree.

Vatterott made national news itself in 2009 and early 2010 when three of the top employees of this for-profit school in the Midwest, including Kevin Earl Woods, the former director of the Kansas City campus, pleaded guilty to a conspiracy to fraudulently obtain Federal student grants and loans for students who were ineligible for these loans.

The Senate HELP Committee looked at Vatterott in the course of Chairman HARKIN's investigation of the for-profit industry. What they found was discouraging. In 2009, 88 percent of the revenue going to this for-profit school was Federal money. Of the money it took in, Vatterott spent 12.5 percent on advertising and marketing and took out 19 percent of this Federal money in profit.

Here is another way to look at it: Vatterott, a for-profit school, spent \$2,400 per student on instruction in 2009, but it spent \$1,343 on marketing, and \$2,000 it took out in profit for each student.

In contrast, public and nonprofit schools generally spend a higher amount per student on actual instruction. By comparison, St. Louis Community College spent \$5,000 per student on instruction; Vatterott, \$2,400.

Jennifer attended the Vatterott campus in Independence, MO, which is now closed, but the company continues to operate a Kansas City campus. The default rate on loan repayment for students who attended Vatterott in Kansas City is 25 percent. One out of four students who went to this for-profit school defaults on their student loans. The national average is 15 percent.

Jennifer Kerr fought back and won, but the for-profit college industry won't be cleaned up in the courtroom. Not every student with a bad experience has a strong legal case. Most are victims of a system that allows unscrupulous schools to collect Federal loan and grant money from students regardless of outcomes, heaping debt on these students. Many of those students will carry that debt for a lifetime.

When the programs and the schools don't deliver and jobs don't materialize, the student gets the debt, the Federal Government bears the risk, and the school takes the money and runs. The for-profit sector took in \$31 billion in U.S. Department of Education money in 2011. About one-fourth of all the Federal aid went to these for-profit schools, even though they only enroll 12 percent of all the students coming out of high school.

I might add one other statistic. The for-profit schools account for 47 percent of all the student loan defaults in America—12 percent of the students, 25 percent of the Federal aid to education, 47 percent of the student loan defaults.

Federal U.S. Department of Education regulations state that schools that engage in substantial misrepresentation about a program, its fees, or its job placements can be denied Federal money, and yet Vatterott is not the first or the only school to substantially mislead these students.

Abuses in the for-profit college industry will continue until Congress steps up and does something. It is about time for us to establish some standards of accreditation that apply to all schools across the board. How can you expect a student or a student's family to know whether this school that is advertising on the Internet or in the buses or on the billboards is a real school or a phony operation to lure kids into debt, have them drop out or end up with a worthless diploma?

I have worked with my colleagues who feel as I do on this issue. Senators TOM HARKIN and JACK REED, among others, will continue to tell these stories here on the floor of the Senate in the hopes that when the Senate has its higher ed reauthorization bill we will finally tackle this for-profit school industry.

Last Congress, Senator TOM HARKIN joined me in introducing a bill that would include military education bene-

fits in the calculation that limits how much of a school's revenue is derived from Federal funding. Today I announced the VA and Defense appropriations bill for the next fiscal year. It was reported out of my subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee. We called in the representatives of the major services and asked them what is going on with the training of our active servicemembers and their families. What they told us is more than half of those active servicemembers and their families are going to these same for-profit schools. Some are good. Most are awful.

These military men and women and their families are not only wasting their time, they are wasting a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity we give them for the proper training and education to prepare them to be even better in the military or to have success in civilian life. Because they are lured into these for-profit schools, they end up wasting their time, wasting their money, many of them deeply in debt.

Senator HAGAN of North Carolina has proposed banning schools for using Federal education dollars for marketing. She is right. Many for-profit schools literally take the Federal money to bombard students with messages that entice them to enroll, bringing the schools more Federal money.

I also want to take a look at the system of accreditation. Our current system provides a seal of approval for too many schools, many of them for-profit colleges, that is little more than a license to rake in the Federal dollars as opposed to truly educating and training students. I hope Jennifer Kerr's court victory can serve as a wake-up call to Congress so we can work together to correct the worst abuses of this system. On behalf of the taxpayers, we need to be better stewards of Federal education money. On behalf of the students, we have to improve a system that may or may not prepare them for a career and may or may not lead to a degree, but almost in every case leads to debt.

DIETARY SUPPLEMENTS

Mr. President, last week USA Today published an article that highlights the stories of people and families hurt by taking a dietary supplement containing the chemical DNP. It is a hazardous pesticide that was used as a weight-loss drug before 1938. Then the FDA declared it to be toxic for humans—in 1938, 75 years ago.

The article in USA Today featured Matt Cahill, a dietary supplement manufacturer with a high school education and no chemistry training, who illegally added this toxic pesticide, DNP, to exercise and weight-loss supplements. Some people who used his product suffered liver failure; some died. Cahill was arrested, criminally prosecuted, and served time in prison, but he is back selling dietary supplements that raise more health concerns.

The article in USA Today raises serious questions about whether we can do

better to protect the American public. Dietary supplements have become a common health aid in medicine cabinets. More than half of Americans use dietary supplements, and you may be one of them. Most supplement makers are ethical and responsible. I take a multivitamin every day and believe it is safe. But most people assume that supplements on the shelves in stores have been tested by the Federal Government. How could they get on the shelf without a test? Most people think, like drugs that are prescribed, these supplements are tested for safety and effectiveness. That is not true.

Unlike more traditional supplements such as calcium and vitamin C, there are now many new and complex supplements on the market promising to help people lose weight, find energy, bulk up, prevent disease—you name it. Consumers need to be careful. If a product is promising something too good to be true, they need to make sure the product and its ingredients are safe. We need to know the information on the label is not misleading. The FDA, the Federal Drug Administration, needs to know more about these products.

This week Senator RICHARD BLUMENTHAL of Connecticut and I are reintroducing the Dietary Supplement Labeling Act. Listen to what this bill would require. This bill would require more information on labels of dietary supplements and it would help ensure that the FDA has the information it needs if it turns out any of these products are dangerous.

Many people would be surprised to learn that the FDA does not know—does not even know—how many dietary supplements are being sold in this country. The USA Today article clearly states that when this Cahill character first sold his harmful dietary supplement tainted with DNP, he sold it on line. The FDA had no idea it was even on the market.

How does FDA learn when a product is on the market? People get sick and they die.

Another example is kava, a root whose extract people take to alleviate anxiety. But now that we know that kava is associated with severe liver damage and death, it would be useful for the FDA to have information readily available about the products on the market in America today containing kava. Our bill would require dietary supplement makers to give the FDA the name of each supplement they produce, along with a description of the product, a list of ingredients, and a copy of the label. Is that too much to ask? If you are going to sell this dietary supplement in stores across America, shouldn't the Food and Drug Administration at least have a copy of the label and ingredients? With this information, the FDA would know what products are on the market, what ingredients are in them, and be able to work with supplement manufacturers to address any problems.

This is a commonsense provision. It is supported by the Consumers Union

and already practiced by many responsible supplement makers. Let's ask all the companies to provide FDA this basic information.

In addition to asking manufacturers to tell the FDA when a product goes on the market, this bill would require more information on the label of these products. Some ingredients may be safe for the general population but not for kids or pregnant women or perhaps those who have a compromised health condition.

St. John's wort is used safely by many people, but it can cause serious side effects in people who have ADHD or people who are bipolar, or people who are undergoing surgery. Information like that should be clearly listed on the label. This bill would help to ensure the information necessary to make an informed decision by consumers.

We have all seen claims in supplement stores. I was in Olney train station Saturday night with my wife and went into one of these dietary supplement stores and the shelves were packed with all of these products claiming all of these things. Some of them promised they will boost your immunity, enhance your athletic performance or make you a better husband. This bill would give the FDA the authority to require the manufacturer to provide upon request the evidence to support claims such as "promotes weight loss."

Consumers should be skeptical of any product making big claims and they should take the time to learn if the product is safe and effective. But we need to give the FDA the authority to request evidence to support any claims made on these labels.

The bill would also help curb the growing practice of foods and beverages with potentially unsafe ingredients masquerading as dietary supplements by directing the FDA to establish a definition for "conventional foods."

I will challenge you, whether it is West Virginia or Illinois or Washington, DC, or your home State, go to the cash register at a gas station. What is the first thing you see next to the cash register? Energy supplements, those little red bottles. They are everywhere. Products such as energy drinks, the huge one in 24- and 32-ounce cans, and baked goods, such as Mellow Munchies brownies, that contain unapproved food additive melatonin are marketed as dietary supplements that are safe ways to get a boost of energy or to relax. In reality, they are foods and beverages taking advantage of the more relaxed regulatory standard for dietary supplements.

Here is a quiz. Did you know the Federal Drug Administration regulates a food product known as cola? You pick it, Pepsi, Coca-Cola, you name it. Did you know the Food and Drug Administration, in regulating that product, regulates how much caffeine they can put in each bottle? They do. But when it comes to the monster energy drinks.

And you ask what are the limitations on caffeine in monster energy drinks? None, nada.

A sad case here, recently, in Virginia, a girl, 15 or 16 years old, two 24-ounce high-powered energy drinks in a 24-hour period of time, and she died. She died from two energy drinks. Way too much caffeine for a person her age and her size.

I am working with Senator BLUMENTHAL to try to get the FDA to establish some standards here. These are not benign products. They are certainly not benign products for young people. If they are consumed in quantity, they are dangerous. People get sick and people die. I have had press conferences in Chicago with emergency room physicians. You would be shocked to know how many people show up having taken these energy drinks, consumed too much caffeine, and are worried they are about to die. That is a reality. It is time for us to establish some standards to protect consumers and families.

Most dietary supplements available today are safe and are used by millions of Americans as part of a healthy lifestyle. As I said, and will repeatedly, I take my fish oil, I take my multivitamin. I do not believe I should have to get a prescription to buy them. But we also need to recognize how the regulation of supplements can be improved to protect the public in America. In the USA article, a representative from the U.S. Antidoping Agency, a nonprofit designated by Congress to oversee testing of those who participate in the Olympics, said that companies like Matt Cahill's ". . . are not fringe players. These are mainstream dietary supplement companies and products that are in your mainstream health and nutrition stores. . . . It's not there are a few bad actors. There are a lot of bad actors."

Ensuring the health of consumers from these bad actors will take cooperation from the responsible people in the dietary supplement industry, the Federal Drug Administration, and Congress in both political parties.

Senator BLUMENTHAL and I have put in a bill which includes commonsense steps to make sure risks for supplements are on the label, products are registered with the FDA, and manufacturers can be forced to back up their big claims. I look forward to working with my colleagues to enact that legislation.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence much a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

I also ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business and to be permitted to engage in a colloquy with my Republican colleagues.

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

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I don't intend to object, I would like to modify his unanimous consent request and ask that I be permitted to speak for 15 minutes after his colloquy.

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

OBAMACARE

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I rise in support of parents, families, students, employees, taxpayers, and other hard-working Americans, who, as of January 1, 2014, will find themselves unfairly impacted by ObamaCare. ObamaCare is an ill-conceived, poorly crafted, and economically damaging piece of legislation.

We have known for some time now that ObamaCare would create a set of circumstances that would make health care unaffordable. It is unaffordable from several standpoints: No. 1, for the country and for the U.S. Government. The Congressional Budget Office, a nonpartisan entity, recently reported that this law is likely to cost the U.S. Government about \$1.8 trillion over the next 10 years. That is significantly more—some would say roughly double—than the initial estimates given to Congress when this law was passed.

This is an enormous amount of money. It is an especially enormous amount of money for a government that is now \$17 trillion in debt and is adding to that debt at a rate of about \$1 trillion every single year. It is not as though we have an overabundance of money within the Federal Government. It is not as though we can afford to take on newer, more expensive programs, such as this one, especially when they run pricetags that are substantially above and beyond what was presented to us.

It is also proving to be unaffordable for American families. There are a number of studies that have been conducted in recent months which tell us that premiums are going to become more expensive. The name of the law, of course, was the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. This implies, of course, this would protect patients and make health care more affordable, not less. What we found is that this is a misnomer. What we have found through the studies that have been released recently is that it is going to make health care less affordable for American families, not more affordable.

The interesting thing about these studies is that they are all over the map. We don't know exactly how much health care is going to cost us. We don't know exactly how much less affordable health care will become under the Affordable Care Act because there are so many uncertainties created by this law. The 2,700-page bill that became ObamaCare has been modified and will continue to be modified by countless pages—tens of thousands of pages of regulations.

This act has also been modified in significant ways on a couple of occasions, which we will get to in a minute. All of these modifications have created additional uncertainty that is a source of a lot of concern to a lot of Americans. What we do know is that it is likely to result in premium increases.

One study concluded that even on the low end, the increased premiums families would be paying in a small group premium context would go up between 13 and 23 percent, on average. Other studies—including one that was conducted in the State of Indiana—suggested that premiums would go up in that State by 72 percent for those with individual plans. I am told Maryland's biggest health insurance provider has proposed raising premiums for individual policies by an average of 25 percent next year.

In many instances, these numbers are even worse for young people. There are also numbers which suggest that there is a lot of uncertainty, and we truly don't know. It is almost impossible to know. An analysis of more than 30 studies has shown that premiums are likely to increase between 145 and 189 percent for young people seeking health insurance. In Utah, my State, there is a study suggesting that for young people seeking health insurance, their premiums are likely to increase between 56 and 90 percent with respect to individual policies.

This law is also bad for America's workers. Businesses are cutting hours, moving workers to part-time, and in many cases they are not hiring at all.

According to a recent U.S. Chamber of Commerce survey, 74 percent of businesses will fire employees or cut hours; 61 percent will not hire next year.

Daniel Kessler, who is a professor of law and business at Stanford University, has predicted that 30 to 40 million Americans will be directly harmed by ObamaCare through higher premiums, stiff penalties, cutbacks in hours, and job losses.

We have known for some time—as a result of these studies—that ObamaCare was going to make health care unaffordable. We now know it is also going to be fundamentally unfair. The President recently admitted the law is not ready for prime time. He admitted he is not ready to implement the law as it has been written. Because ObamaCare was so poorly crafted, he simply is not going to enforce it the way it was crafted. He is going to selectively enforce its provisions.

Most important, the President of the United States has said that while he is going to require hard-working Americans, individuals, to comply with the law's individual mandate. According to one recent study, only 12 percent of the American people actually support that provision today. However, he is going to implement and enforce that provision, but at least for the first year of the law's full effect next year, he will not be implementing or enforcing the employer mandate. So hard-working

Americans have to comply but big business does not have to comply.

This is significant because the law doesn't give the President of the United States the power to rewrite the law. The law sets forth a specific set of timelines, a specific set of deadlines that cause the law's various provisions to kick in. This did not give the President the authority or the discretion to decide which among the law's several provisions could be favored or disfavored by the President of the United States.

So we have hard-working Americans, individuals, and families on the hook, and we have big business being thrown a big bone. This is not fair. This is not something that is consistent with the rule of law. This is not something the American people ought to tolerate.

The Affordable Care Act, as it is called, will shatter not only our hard-earned health benefits, but in many instances it will destroy the foundation of the 40-hour workweek that has become the backbone of the American middle class. It will do all of this in a way that will contribute to or be part of a system of selective unfair enforcement.

The American people deserve better. The American people demand better. The American people deserve not to have this law implemented and enforced if, as the President of the United States has told us, it is not ready for prime time. Then it is not ready to be implemented.

I ask of my friend and colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Florida, how he feels about this and how the people in the State of Florida feel about the selective implementation and enforcement of a law that Americans already knew would be unaffordable and a law they know will also be unfair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Utah for organizing this effort.

Let me answer that question by coming up with a couple of things we can find consensus on. First of all, I think all of us agree the American middle class is one of the things that make us exceptional. All the countries in the world have rich people. Unfortunately, every country in the world has people who are struggling. But what has made America unique and different from all of these other countries is that we have a vibrant middle class. We have people who work hard, make enough money to own a home, take their kids on vacations, save for college expenses, and kind of fulfill many of their dreams.

I grew up in that environment. I tell people all the time I didn't have everything I wanted, but we always had everything we needed. Through hard work and sacrifice my parents became part of that great American middle class—working-class Americans who had the opportunity to give us the life they never had.

I think we can all agree the middle class is very important for America because it is one of the things that makes us exceptional, unique, and sets us apart from the rest of the world. Quite frankly, one of the reasons why people want to live here and love being in America is because it creates those opportunities.

What strengthens the middle class? We are having a debate about that in this country. Is it a bunch of government spending? Is it a bunch of government programs? Is it the Senators? Is it the President of the United States? The answer is no. What rationally makes the middle class possible and vibrant is jobs that pay middle-class salaries. What makes it possible is that we have jobs that pay that kind of money so people can join the middle class and give their kids a better life.

Where do those jobs come from? Do they come from the government? Do they come from the White House? Do they come from the Senate or from our laws? They don't. They come from a vibrant private economy that is creating those jobs. How those jobs are created is not that complicated. People have to start new businesses or grow a business that already exists. Those are the two primary ways in which middle-class jobs—in fact, most jobs—are created outside of government. That is the only place where we will find the kind of growth we need for a vibrant middle class. We should analyze every issue before this body through the lens of the middle class and through the lens of whether it makes it easier or harder for someone to start a business or grow an existing one.

Let's examine what the Senator from Utah just asked about ObamaCare in the context of what I just explained. The answer is that it is clear ObamaCare makes it harder for people to start a business or grow an existing business for a number of reasons the Senator has pointed out. No. 1, it has an incentive for businesses not to grow. It tells a business owner that if they have more than 50 full-time employees, they will have to meet a set of rules which will make it very expensive for them to start a business or grow an existing business.

The other thing it creates is a tremendous amount of uncertainty. It goes back to the point the Senator from Utah raised. These laws are being canceled on a whim. The President is deciding to enforce one part of it but not another part of it. That creates confusion.

Imagine if a person has a business and some money set aside to grow, that business owner doesn't know how much it is going to cost to grow. You know what they do? They don't grow the business. As a result, those jobs are not created.

How about the cost of that insurance, which is an issue the Senator from Utah talked about a moment ago. Yesterday in Florida the commissioner of insurance said that in the individual

marketplace in Florida next year—because of ObamaCare—rates are going up 30 to 40 percent. Ask yourself: Does that make it easier to start a new business or does it make it harder? Does it make it easier to grow an existing business or does it make it harder?

Think about the impact all of this uncertainty is going to have on middle-class workers. Add to that the following: Right now there is an incentive to have part-time workers. That is why we are reading everyday in the newspapers that company X is moving people from full-time to part-time. Companies are moving employees to less than 30 hours so they can avoid the penalties in this bill.

How about insurance? Let's say a person works somewhere that has insurance and they are happy with it. This law might require the employer to put that person on a new insurance or move that person to a government exchange, which means that doctor that worker has been dealing with for 10 years who knows their case history might not be their doctor next year because of ObamaCare. The result is we have a holding pattern.

Businesses in America, the people who create the middle-class jobs, are in a holding pattern and waiting to see which direction this goes, but they are all headed in a poor direction because of this.

So when the Senator from Utah talked about this and asked the question: What impact is the Senator hearing, that is what I am hearing. I am hearing that this law makes it harder for people to create jobs. This bill is going to make it harder on the middle-class jobs. It is going to make it harder for middle-class jobs to be created because it makes it harder to start a business and makes it harder to grow an existing business.

I imagine the Senator from Utah has heard similar concerns in his own State. The Senator from Texas has joined us, and he is from a State even larger than mine. I am sure he will share his input on what he is hearing from his home State and from people across the country.

I say to my colleague that is what I have been hearing from my constituents everywhere I have been going in Florida for the last 6 months.

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield for a unanimous consent request? I understand the Senator has the floor until 4:30 p.m.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized at 4:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I understand the leader is going to make a request.

I wonder if the Senator would withhold his request for a couple of minutes.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I withdraw my request. I am willing to use time perhaps tomorrow.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I see we have been joined by my friend and colleague, the Senator from Texas. I wish to ask him if his observations from his interactions with his constituents in Texas have been similar to those that have been shared today by the junior Senator from Florida.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Utah for his leadership on this issue.

I am proud to stand with Senator LEE, Senator RUBIO, and with so many others. I can tell my colleagues that in the State of Texas, Texans overwhelmingly understand that ObamaCare isn't working, that this legislation is failing and it is hurting the American people.

When we look at jobs, there is no legislation currently in effect that is damaging the economy more or damaging jobs more than ObamaCare. In direct response to the law, 41 percent of small business owners have held off plans to hire new employees. Thirty-eight percent said they pulled back on plans to grow their businesses. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce reports that 71 percent of small businesses say ObamaCare makes it harder to hire workers.

Beyond that, one of the most pernicious aspects of this law is that it is forcing more and more employees to be moved to part-time employment, to be moved to working 29 hours a week or less to get out of the ObamaCare 30-hour threshold.

In 2013, employers have added more part-time employees, averaging 93,000 a month, seasonally adjusted, than full-time workers. And it is important to understand who it is that is moved to part-time work, who it is that is hurt by ObamaCare. It is the most vulnerable among us. It is not the CEOs. It is not the wealthy. It is young people, Hispanics, African Americans, single moms. According to the most recent census data, in 2011 the poverty rate for those who worked full-time was only 2.8 percent. The poverty rate for those working less than full-time year-round was 16.3 percent.

I am reminded of earlier this year when we were debating the issue of ObamaCare and I read from a newspaper article out of the State of Oklahoma that quoted a single mom who is working in a fast food restaurant. She and all of her coworkers had their hours forcibly reduced to 29 hours a week or less. This single mom said: I have two little kids at home. I can't feed my kids on 29 hours a week, and neither can the other single moms who are struggling to make ends meet.

Beyond the impact on jobs, on the economy, and beyond those being forced into part-time work, we also have the compliance costs. According to Federal agency estimates, ObamaCare will add paperwork burdens totaling nearly 190 million hours or more every year. To put that in perspective, Mount Rushmore, which took

14 years to build, could be constructed 1,547 times with the paperwork ObamaCare requires in 1 year.

Not only do we see jobs being hurt, the economy being hurt, workers being hurt, hours being reduced, paperwork going up, but we are seeing premiums going up—premiums going up far too high—and it is hitting those who are suffering the most.

On Monday, Florida's insurance commissioner told the Palm Beach Post that insurance rates will rise by 5 to 20 percent in the small-group market and by 30 to 40 percent in the individual market. As those who are at home in Florida watching what is happening, as they are seeing their insurance rates go up—they are going up because of the impact of this failed law.

The Ohio Department of Insurance announced that ObamaCare in Ohio will increase the individual market health premiums by 88 percent. If a person in Ohio right now is seeing their premiums go up, they can thank the men and women of the U.S. Congress.

According to the Wyman Firm, looking at young people, young people in particular are hurt by ObamaCare. The Wyman Firm estimates that 80 percent of Americans age 21 to 29 earning more than \$16,000 will pay more out-of-pocket for coverage under ObamaCare than they pay today. If young people at home are watching this today and wondering how they are going to get a job, how they are going to climb the economic ladder, how they are going to achieve the American dream, ObamaCare is driving up their health care premiums right now.

We all know that at the time ObamaCare was being debated, the President promised the American people: If you like your health care plan, you can keep it. The facts have conclusively proven that wrong. According to a February 2013 report by the Congressional Budget Office, 7 million people will lose their employer-sponsored insurance. McKinsey & Company, a very well-regarded consulting firm, found that 30 percent of employers will definitely or probably stop offering health insurance in the years after 2014.

This bill isn't working, and I would note there is growing bipartisan consensus on that front. As the facts have come in, the American people have kept an open mind, have looked at this bill, and have seen that as it is being implemented, it is not working, it is hurting the economy, and it is hurting jobs. According to an ABC-Washington Post poll, in 2010, 74 percent of moderate conservative Democrats—there are a significant number of Democrats who describe themselves as moderate or conservative—in 2010, 70 percent of them supported ObamaCare. Yet, in July, just 46 percent supported ObamaCare.

Not only that, we have seen the lead Senate author of ObamaCare—a senior Democrat in this body—describe ObamaCare as headed toward a “huge train wreck.” We have seen unions—

which initially supported ObamaCare—over and over turning as they realize the consequences. In April the United Union of Roofers, Waterproofers and Allied Workers called for “repeal or complete reform of the Affordable Care Act to protect our employers, our industry, and our most important assets, our members and their families.” If we listen to the voices of unions, unions are saying ObamaCare is failing; it is not working. The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers released a white paper in July explaining that ObamaCare “threatens to harm our members by dismantling multiemployer health plans.” And then—really quite striking—James Hoffa, Jr., the president of the Teamsters Union, wrote a letter to HARRY REID and NANCY PELOSI stating that ObamaCare “will destroy the very health and well-being of our members along with millions of other hard-working Americans.” Why? Well, Mr. Hoffa explained that ObamaCare is destroying the 40-hour workweek that has been the backbone of the American middle class.

If we trust the voices of unions, if we have a concern for the American middle class, then listen to the bipartisan voices that are rising up saying that ObamaCare isn’t working.

Most strikingly, we have President Obama himself, who just a few weeks ago was forced to unilaterally and without legal authority delay implementation of ObamaCare for large corporations, for companies with more than 50 employees—he unilaterally moved the employer mandate until after the next election. I would suggest there are at least two things we can derive from President Obama’s decision to do that:

No. 1, if ObamaCare were a good thing, if it were working, we can be sure President Obama would want it to go into full effect before the next election. He would want to take credit with the American people for the benefits of this signature bill. The fact that the President was forced to concede that the wheels are coming off and to move the employer mandate until after the next election I would suggest is highly revealing.

No. 2, it raises the obvious followup question: Why is President Obama willing to grant a waiver for giant corporations but not for hard-working American families, not for the men and women who are struggling to make ends meet, who are climbing the economic ladder, who want, like their parents and grandparents before them, to achieve the American dream? ObamaCare is standing in their way.

So what are we to do about it? Well, the most important constitutional check and balance that Congress has on an overreaching Executive is the power of the purse. The Framers of the Constitution wisely gave authority over expenditures of money to the Congress, and that is why the Senator from Utah, the Senator from Florida, and I, among many others, are standing to-

gether and saying: This isn’t working, and Congress should defund it.

In 62 days the continuing resolution that funds the Federal Government will expire. Each of the three of us, along with a number of others, has publicly stated that under no circumstances will we support a continuing resolution that funds one penny of ObamaCare. If 41 Members of this body stand together and make that same statement or if 218 Members in the House of Representatives stand together and take that same position, we can do something different than we have seen this year.

Over the past couple of years we have seen 39, 40, 41 votes to repeal ObamaCare, all of which have been effectively symbolic because none of them had a real chance of passage. With the continuing resolution, we have a chance to successfully defund ObamaCare. Right now we don’t have the votes in this institution. If the vote were held today, we would not hold 41 Senators to defund ObamaCare. But we have 62 days until September 30, and every one of us takes very seriously our obligation to represent our constituents. If in the next 62 days we see what I believe we are going to see, which is the American people rising up en masse—hundreds of thousands, millions of Americans standing up and saying: It isn’t working, it is hurting our jobs, it is hurting our economy, it is hurting our health care, it is making our lives worse, and we need to defund it—if enough Americans speak out and demand of their elected officials that we do the right thing, I am confident we will. I am confident that Republicans will, and I am hopeful that Members of the Democratic Party will as well, that every one of us will.

I believe the American people should hold their elected officials accountable, and that most assuredly includes me. It includes all of us. We should be held accountable by our constituents. The American people know this bill isn’t working. There is bipartisan agreement on it. We have the potential in the next 62 days to show real leadership—not to give a speech, not to give a meaningless, symbolic vote, but, if we stand together, to actually defund it.

Let me make one final point. Those who disagree with the position that is being taken by Senator LEE and Senator RUBIO and me and say that taking this stand will mean Republicans will be blamed for a government shutdown, let me be clear on what I think should happen. I believe the House of Representatives should pass a continuing resolution to fund the entirety of the Federal Government except for ObamaCare and should explicitly prohibit further funding of ObamaCare and should adopt the legislation I have introduced as a condition to the continuing resolution.

Now, the next step. There will be partisan critics who immediately charge Republicans with threatening to shut down the government. I would suggest

that we then take the argument to the American people. The American people should decide. If there are Members of this body who are willing to shut down the Federal Government in order to force ObamaCare down the throats of the American people, in order to say President Obama will grant a waiver to giant corporations but not to hard-working American families, let’s take that argument to the American people because I think the American people want economic growth back. That should be our top priority. Nothing is killing jobs more. Nothing is hurting the American economy more than ObamaCare. There is bipartisan agreement on that.

I am hopeful that Members of this body will stand and lead. I thank the Senator from Utah for taking the lead on what I believe is the most important battle this Congress will confront.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, those of us who share this position feel strongly that it is indisputably, constitutionally the prerogative of the Congress to exercise the power of the purse. This means we don’t have to vote to fund something with which we fundamentally disagree.

Some have suggested that because this was passed by Congress 3 years ago, we somehow have an obligation to fund it. Well, I would remind my colleagues who might make that statement that the Congress as it existed then is not the same Congress as it exists today. That was two Congresses ago. The Congress that enacted that law was fundamentally changed in part because it enacted that law.

The law has not been popular. It has not been good to those who voted to enact it. Ever since the majority party in the House of Representatives changed hands after the 2010 election—due in large part to ObamaCare—there have been a lot of people who have suggested that the Republicans in Congress need to defund ObamaCare’s implementation and enforcement. For a variety of reasons, that has not happened.

We have continued to pass continuing resolutions with no restrictions on ObamaCare’s implementation and enforcement, at least as it relates to the ultimate implementation and enforcement of the exchanges, of the individual mandate, and so forth. Republicans have had reasons for doing this. Some of those reasons have included the statement to the effect that, well, the Supreme Court is going to knock it down. It will strike it down. It will invalidate ObamaCare because it is unconstitutional. Of course it is, and a majority of the Supreme Court concluded that it was unconstitutional as written. But the Supreme Court, rather than invalidating it, instead rewrote the law not just once but twice in order to save it. Some Republicans have also justified continuing to vote for funding

bills that contain ObamaCare implementation funding because they believed a Republican would be elected President in 2012 and would stop ObamaCare. Well, that did not happen either.

We have one last opportunity to defend the implementation of this law before these provisions I just mentioned kick in on January 1—one last opportunity—and that is in connection with our current spending bill, our current continuing resolution that is set to expire on September 30—just 62 days from right now.

So what we are saying is that if you agree with us, if you agree with the President that this law is not ready to be implemented as it was written, as it was enacted by Congress, if the President is not going to follow the law, then the American people should not have to fund it. If you do not like it, if you agree it is not ready, do not fund it. We can and we should and we must fund government but not ObamaCare.

So I would ask the Senator from Florida if these are sentiments that are consistent with what he has been thinking, sentiments that are consistent with what he has been hearing from his constituents in Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, in response to the Senator from Utah, I would say I have because I think there is a pretty clear understanding growing every day, as evidenced by the Senator from Texas a moment ago, who went through all these groups out there, including labor unions that have now turned on ObamaCare because of what it means to their members. So it is increasingly established how much damage this law is doing.

The question I get, I say to the Senator from Utah, is, What can we do about it? There is almost this resignation by people that, well, what can we do about it? It is already in place. Is there anything we can do?

So I think there are three things we should be able to do, and I will summarize those fairly quickly.

The first thing we should do is not continue to double and triple down on these things.

I think both the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Utah grew up at the same time as I did, so they will remember something that a lot of the younger people here probably do not remember. There was a time when Coca-Cola came out with something called New Coke. It was a new Coca-Cola formula. After about 100-some years, they changed the formula of Coca-Cola and they came out with something called New Coke. It was a disaster. Everybody hated it. In fact, they hated it because—they said: If we want to drink something that has that kind of sweetener, there are other options on the market. We like old Coke.

What did Coca-Cola do when New Coke began to flounder? They did not say: Well, we are just going to continue

to make more of it. They backed away from it. They went back to the original formula. They learned from their mistake, and they did not double down. That is the way it is in the real world. That is the way it is in our lives, and that is the way it is in the private sector—but not government, not Washington. In Washington, if something is going wrong, here they double and triple down. It is like an invitation to move forward. We should not do that. That is the first thing I would say.

The second thing I would say is that we have to stop this from moving forward. The implications of this law are already being felt, but the regulations around this law—the mandates in this law, the fees and the costs and the new rate increases in this law, those things, you are only going to start to feel that right now. In the next few months you are going to really start to feel what this new law means to your life, to your business, to the place where you work.

Now is the time to act. People ask me: What can we do about it? Let me tell you what is probably not going to work in the short term. You are probably not going to get President Obama to sign a bill that repeals ObamaCare, and you are not going to get the votes in the Senate to do that. So these repeal votes—I will vote for every single one of them, but the problem is that our chances of getting that accomplished are probably minimal so long as President Obama is the President of the United States. So truly our last option is to stop paying for this thing. Why would we continue to pour billions and hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars into a disaster? Why would we double down with your hard-earned money on a program that is going to hurt you?

We will have a chance to do that in September because in September, in order for the government to continue to function, we have to pass something called a short-term budget. I wish it were a permanent budget, but it is supposed to be a short-term budget. All we are saying is, in that short-term budget, fund the government, keep the lights on, pay the military, make sure Social Security checks go out. The only thing you should not do is you should not fund and pay for ObamaCare.

The pushback we get from that from some people is, well, that is crazy because that means you are willing to shut down the government over ObamaCare. That is not the way I see it. The way I see it is that if we pass a budget that pays for everything except for ObamaCare and the President says he will veto that, it is he who wants to shut down the government, it is he who is basically saying: I will shut down the government unless it pays for ObamaCare. That is an unreasonable position. It is unreasonable because this law is so bad. His own allies are coming to him and saying: Please stop this from moving forward. Well, we are

going to give you a chance, Mr. President, by refusing to fund it.

Here is my last point: To my colleagues in the Republican Party—I know every single one of the Senate Members here in the Republican Party is against ObamaCare—this is our last chance, our last best chance to do something about this. When this thing starts to kick in and starts to take root, it is going to be very difficult to undo major portions of this despite the damage it is going to create.

Now, I only speak for myself, although I think I can speak for the other two Senators who have joined me here today in this effort. I want to be able to go back to Florida, no matter how this thing turns out, and say to the men and women who sent me here in 2010: I did everything I could to keep this from happening to you.

When someone comes to me and says: I just got moved to part time because of ObamaCare, I want to be able to look them in the eye and say that I did everything I could.

When someone says to me: I just lost the insurance I was happy with; I now have this new insurance plan I am not that familiar with, and my doctor, whom I have had for 30 years, is not on that plan, I want to be able to say to them that I did everything I could.

When someone comes to me and says: I have a pretty successful business; I have set some money aside; I was going to open a new business or grow this one, but I am not because of ObamaCare, I want to be able to say that I did everything I could.

If we pass a budget in September that funds ObamaCare, you did not do everything you could. You paid for this. You doubled down on it in ways that will have irreparable harm to our economy and to our country.

This is our last best chance.

To those who say they are against ObamaCare, I believe you. But let me tell you something. If we are not willing to draw a line in the sand on this issue, then on what issue are we willing to draw a line in the sand? If we are not willing to go to the limit on this issue, then what issue is there? Is there an issue on which we are prepared to say: We will not move forward because of this? Is there an issue on which we are willing to do everything we can and lay it all on the line? Is there such an issue? And if it is not this one, which one is it?

That is the choice before us. I truly believe you cannot go back home and say you did everything you could to stop ObamaCare if you vote for a budget that funds it.

I would ask the Senator from Texas if he too shares those thoughts and those feelings?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I do indeed share those thoughts and feelings and the obligation we owe to our constituents to honor our word and put action behind our words.

I would ask the Senator from Utah if he would yield for a series of three short questions?

Mr. LEE. Surely.

Mr. CRUZ. The first question is, There has been much talk of a shutdown. Am I correct that we do not have to hypothesize what a shutdown would look like, that we, in fact, saw that in 1995 with two temporary, partial shutdowns that occurred when Republicans in the House stood up to President Clinton?

When that occurred in 1995, we saw several things. No. 1, we saw that the parade of horrors that was brought out did not occur. Social Security checks continued to flow, the military continued to be funded, interest on the debt continued to be paid, planes did not fall out of the sky.

Indeed, what occurs—if Democrats decide to block a continuing resolution and force a temporary shutdown in order to force ObamaCare on the American people—is a partial, temporary shutdown where nonessential government services get suspended for a period of time, not a shutdown of essential services, such as paying for the men and women who are fighting in the military and providing Social Security checks. We have seen that in the past; is that correct?

Mr. LEE. That is correct. That is correct, and it is how it has happened in the past. This is not something we want. This is not something we have threatened. This is something we think can and should be avoided and we want to avoid. In the unfortunate, completely avoidable event that did happen, it would be largely as the Senator described it.

Mr. CRUZ. A second question I would ask is this: This week we saw the rather stunning news that the IRS employees union—the men and women at the IRS charged with enforcing ObamaCare are asking not to be made subject to ObamaCare. Indeed, the union leaders have said to their union members: Draft letters to send to Members of this body, saying that we, the IRS employees union, do not want to be subject to ObamaCare.

Likewise, ObamaCare subjects Members of this body and their staffs to ObamaCare. I am not aware of a single Senate office that is not deeply concerned about that, that is not facing the prospect of staff quitting the congressional offices because the arms of ObamaCare are so significant, and there have been many a panicked discussion among Democrats and Republicans about what to do about subjecting Members and their staff to ObamaCare.

My second question of three short questions is, What does it say to the Senator that the IRS employees union is asking: Let us out from ObamaCare, and that Members and congressional staff are deeply concerned about the harms ObamaCare is going to do to them?

Mr. LEE. Well, first of all, that tells me that those who are part of that

union do not want to be subject to the same provisions of the same law they will be enforcing.

What it also tells me in the bigger picture is that above all, this law creates uncertainty. That is why we see so much angst among people right here on Capitol Hill who are facing the very real prospect, the very real future in the next few months of going onto these exchanges because nobody knows what this is going to look like. Nobody has any idea.

One thing Americans really do not like, in this world of a lot of unavoidable uncertainties, is more uncertainties heaped upon them by dictate of the Federal Government. We have enough uncertainties in life. We do not know when somebody is going to get sick. We do not know when accidents are going to happen. So we should be able to avoid those things that government thrusts upon us.

This is one of the many reasons why there is so much angst within the IRS and within the ranks of the Capitol Hill workforce. People do not want to go onto these exchanges because they have absolutely no idea what this is going to look like.

Mr. CRUZ. My third brief question is, For those in this body who have campaigned at home, who have told their constituents they are opposed to ObamaCare, on January 1 the exchanges go up and running, the subsidies begin. And the history of the modern entitlement state is that anytime a subsidy has been put in place, it has proven to be politically virtually impossible to undo. Indeed, no major entitlement that has been implemented in modern times has ever been undone.

For those who say they oppose ObamaCare, what is the alternative to defunding ObamaCare with a continuing resolution? Let me ask it a separate way. If we do not defund it, am I correct that come January 1, Republicans will essentially be surrendering that in all likelihood ObamaCare will be a permanent feature of the economy, hurting the economy, hurting jobs, hurting low-income workers, hurting our health care system? And if that is correct, has any reasonable alternative been proffered by anyone on this side of the Senate to stop that harm other than what you and Senator RUBIO and I and others are trying to do?

Mr. LEE. Based on historical precedent, we have every reason to believe that once this new entitlement program kicks in, it is not going away. It is a one-way ratchet. You have death, taxes, and entitlements. Once created, they do not go away.

To answer the second part of that question, I am not aware of any plan among any Republicans—aside from this one; aside from the plan that says: Do not fund ObamaCare, fund government but not ObamaCare—that would address this issue. I am not aware of any plan. The only other plan I am

aware of would be one that says: Let's just wait and see what happens. Let's just wait and see what a horrible disaster this will be. Let's wait and see how awful this will be for the American people, how utterly intolerable they will find it. And let's just hope that will provide enough political momentum for us perhaps to win elections at some unknown point in the future. This is not a good way to run a government. This is not a kind thing to do to an unsuspecting public who hopes and expects that we have their best interests at heart.

So to all those in this body who support ObamaCare, this argument might not be all that persuasive to you, although you ought to look at the fact that the President, who signed this into law, has said he himself is not ready, is not willing, is not able to enforce and implement the law evenhandedly as it was written. So maybe that ought to give you pause as to whether you should fund it.

But for those of you in this body who are, in fact, opposed to ObamaCare, I ask you: How can you oppose it, be against it, and yet fund it? So I would invite you to consider the possibility that what you are doing in thinking about funding it is not really where you want to go. Consider what might be said about this. Defund it or own it. If you fund it, you are for it.

This law was enacted without a meaningful opportunity for the Members voting on it to read it. It is 2,700 pages long. After it was enacted into law, it was rewritten a total of four times: twice by the Supreme Court of the United States, twice more by the President of the United States. The President's rewrite came just a few weeks ago, the Supreme Court's rewrite was over a year ago.

But what the President did was acknowledge that this law is not ready for prime time. This law is not ready to implement. This law is not one that he is willing to implement as written. He is going to implement and enforce it selectively, holding hard-working Americans, individuals and families to the fire, while throwing a big bone to big business.

This is not acceptable. This is un-American. This is not something that those of us who purport to be against ObamaCare can support by funding it. So I invite my colleagues to join me in this cause to vote to fund government but not ObamaCare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, even though I disagree with my three friends, I appreciate their sincerity, their advocacy. They are all three very intelligent men, good Senators. But I am going to move on to another subject.

I ask unanimous consent that following Senator COBURN's remarks, which are 15 minutes as I understand it, that all postcloture time on Calendar No. 223 be yielded back, and the

Senate proceed to vote on confirmation of the nomination with no intervening action or debate; further that following disposition of Calendar No. 223, the Senate proceed to consider the following nominations en bloc: 224, 104, 102, and 103; further that there be 2 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form prior to cloture votes on Calendar Nos. 224 and 104; that if cloture is invoked on the nominations, all postcloture time be yielded back and the Senate proceed to vote on confirmation of the nomination with no intervening action or debate; further that if Calendar Nos. 223, 224, and 104 are confirmed, the Senate proceed to vote with no intervening action or debate on Calendar No. 102 and 103, in that order; that if cloture is not invoked on Calendar Nos. 224 or 104, Calendar Nos. 102 and 103 be returned to the calendar; further, that if a nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table, with no intervening action or debate and no further motions be in order; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; further, that upon confirmation of Calendar No. 103, the Senate resume legislative session and that all after the first vote be 10 minutes in duration.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 1243

Mr. REID. Mr. President, finally one last unanimous consent. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate resumes its consideration of S. 1243 on Wednesday, July 31, the pending amendments be set aside and Senator PAUL be recognized to offer amendment No. 1739; that there be 60 minutes of debate equally divided between the proponents and opponents; that upon the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the Paul amendment; further, that no points of order or second-degree amendments be in order to the Paul amendment prior to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. LANDRIEU. Reserving the right to object, I am not going to object, but I wanted to ask the majority leader, as you know, we have lost a great American, Ambassador Lindy Boggs. Senator BEGICH and I just wanted 10 minutes on the floor sometime today or tomorrow to honor her. Could we include that in some agreement for tomorrow?

Mr. REID. If we are not able to get it done today, we will do it in wrap-up tonight.

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

The Senator from Oklahoma.

THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I appreciate having the opportunity to talk about this subject. I also appreciate my colleagues. They are absolutely right in everything they said in terms of the effect of ObamaCare. I was here when

that debate took place. But there are two contentions on which I disagree with them. I thought I would voice them on the floor.

One is one of the quotes from the Senator from Texas: You can thank the men and women of the Congress for ObamaCare.

I would just say you can thank the Democrats for ObamaCare because there was not one Republican who voted for it. So it is not the Congress that did this; it is the President and his allies who created this mess that we are about to experience.

The other thing I disagree with is the fact that you can design a piece of legislation that will defund ObamaCare, because the vast majority of it is mandatory spending. So no matter what we did in terms of a continuing resolution, and according to the CRS—which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD after I finish what I am talking about—all of the things would continue in terms of the implementation of the Affordable Care Act if we carried out the strategy that is outlined by my colleagues.

Now, their motivations are absolutely pure. I have never voted for a continuing resolution since I have been in the Senate. My American Conservative Union rating is 99 percent. I would love to defund it. I want somebody to show me a mechanism where we can do that because the vast majority of the money being spent today is mandatory spending that does not come under a spending bill associated with appropriations. It was passed by a law. So the only effective way to truly stop ObamaCare—and I think we ought to do it. To stop it would be to totally reverse it. We do not have the votes to do that, but we do have the votes to delay it.

When you go out and talk about the fact that they are not going to implement the employer mandate but implement the individual mandate, we can have a vote on that in the Senate. Then we can have our colleagues go home and say why they think it is fair to do that. We can actually add that.

The fact that they are not going to do a check on the claims for eligibility under the exchanges, 88 percent of Americans think that is wrong. Why do they think it is wrong? Because they know right now, with the earned-income tax credit, between 25 and 34 percent of it is fraud. On the child tax credit it is the same thing. They know exactly the same thing will happen when it comes to credits and payments in the exchanges.

They also know the Independent Payment Advisory Board is going to ration care for the vast majority of the Americans. We can have a vote on that again. A good portion of my colleagues on the other side would like to get rid of that. So we can have a strategic method of delaying ObamaCare by putting the votes up. But there is no way, according to the Congressional Research Service, that the vast majority

of funding can be stopped unless you totally reverse the whole bill.

As my colleague said, they did not think President Obama would sign that. So you would have to have 67 votes to let that happen. I spent hours on this floor trying to defeat the Affordable Care Act. Many of my colleagues on this side came around to other proposals, the Patient's Choice Act, which accomplished many of the same things without large government, without tremendous cost, and without the government getting in between a patient and their doctor.

I do have a little bit of experience on that side of the ledger in terms of caring for people for the last 25 years as a practicing physician. So I would think it would be important that we have a way. I do not disagree with the intent of what my colleagues want to do. I want to defund this bill, but I also want to do it in a way that kills it. There is not a legislative method that we have that is capable of defunding it short of 67 votes in the Senate, short of two-thirds votes in the U.S. House.

Now, can we put some riders on it to say you will not implement a certain section of it? Yes, as long as it is associated with discretionary spending. So what I would ask is that my colleagues look at what the Congressional Research Service has said and what the approach will be based on their analysis of a plan.

I believe the vast majority of Americans want us to get rid of this bill, this law. They want it reversed. There is a dissonance between what Americans want and what Congress is willing to give them, much as my colleague said. It is different. But to claim the fact—and I will be with them on not voting for a CR. However, it will not necessarily be for the same right reasons. There are good reasons. I think that is a terrible way to fund the government, but the fact is, there are a lot of ways that we can delay this bill and accomplish what we need to accomplish.

I don't think we can do the other. I don't believe we can accomplish that. So my colleagues will remember, it was actually 1996 when we had the government shutdown. Everybody was all for it until they were not. I voted against reopening the government. Had we held, much like our colleagues want us to hold today, we would not be \$17 trillion in debt. We would not have a budget deficit of \$800 billion this year. We would not be borrowing \$34,000 a second—a second—in this government.

But I also know human nature. The very people who say they will do things today, when it gets tough, do not do it. So I praise my colleagues for what they are trying to do. They are right in wanting to try to kill the Affordable Care Act: the costs, the lack of effectiveness, the long-term diminution of the doctor-patient relationship, government involved in every aspect of your health care.

To have a litmus test of, if I do not agree with the process then I do not

really want to defund the Affordable Care Act, that is not a claim that settles very well with me, especially spending the last 4 years trying to fight this bill. I would say that the administration is lawless in its implementation of this bill, the fact that they are going to pick and choose—regardless of what the law says, they are going to pick and choose what they will implement and what they will not.

I think it is unacceptable. I think it is unfair to the average American. It is certainly unfair to the middle class. It is certainly unfair to those people who are trying to get a job today and cannot get full-time employment. We had 334,000 part-time jobs created last year. At this time in the economy, we should be creating 800,000 full-time jobs a year.

They are correct in terms of what it is doing to job creation. They are correct in terms of the negatives that it is having on our economy. They are correct about every part of this except whether it will actually solve the problem. In contrast to that is what it is that we have done that we can talk about with the American people that has been positive? We have actually shrunk the size of the Federal Government. For the first time since 1995, the discredited spending of the Federal Government is going to decline—for the first time.

We ought to use the continuing resolution, in my mind, to accentuate that one positive thing, which is that the reach and impact of the Federal Government in everybody's lives should be downgraded, as well as with the Affordable Care Act.

There is no one perfect way to do this. There will be disagreements, but the fact is we have accomplished some great things with the Budget Control Act and with the sequester. What we need to do is improve on that.

When I first came to the Senate, the average individual's debt was \$23,000. It is at \$54,000 today. Every man, woman, and child in this country, if you are born today, by the time you are 20 years of age—if you count unfunded liabilities—you will be responsible for in excess of \$1 million of debt and unfunded liabilities.

Let me say that again. If you are born today, by the time you become a majority citizen, you will be responsible for debt and unfunded liabilities in excess of \$1 million. The Affordable Care Act adds to that, but it doesn't add much compared to everything else we have done.

We need to rein in this President. I agree. We need to rein in spending. We need to rein in the Affordable Care Act. If we could end it, I would be for ending it tomorrow. What we need to do is delay it to where we can get to the point where we can kill it. It does need to be terminated.

There are positive things we need to be doing. There is no question that we ought to make available, without discrimination, health care for people who

have preexisting illnesses. Those are positive things. We can do that. There are ways to do it other than the inefficient, ineffective way this bill does it. They weren't even ever considered for a vote when we had this. There wasn't any real debate on alternatives because we weren't allowed to offer them in the Senate.

My time has expired. I commend to my colleagues the CRS, Congressional Research Study, "Potential Effects of a Government Shutdown on Implementation of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA)."

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Kent Yoshiho Hirozawa, of New York, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board?

Mr. VITTER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CHIESA).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CHIESA) would have voted "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 190 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Baldwin	Harkin	Murray
Baucus	Heinrich	Nelson
Begich	Hirono	Pryor
Bennet	Johnson (SD)	Reed
Blumenthal	Kaine	Reid
Boxer	King	Rockefeller
Brown	Klobuchar	Sanders
Cantwell	Landrieu	Schatz
Cardin	Leahy	Schumer
Carper	Levin	Shaheen
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Coons	Markey	Tester
Donnelly	McCaskill	Udall (CO)
Durbin	Menendez	Udall (NM)
Feinstein	Merkley	Warner
Franken	Mikulski	Warren
Gillibrand	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Hagan	Murphy	Wyden

NAYS—44

Alexander	Enzi	McConnell
Ayotte	Fischer	Moran
Barrasso	Flake	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Chambliss	Heller	Rubio
Coats	Hoeven	Scott
Coburn	Inhofe	Sessions
Cochran	Isakson	Shelby
Collins	Johanns	Thune
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Cornyn	Kirk	Vitter
Crapo	Lee	Wicker
Cruz	McCain	

NOT VOTING—2

Chiesa

Heitkamp

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF NANCY JEAN SCHIFFER, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

NOMINATION OF MARK GASTON PEARCE, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

NOMINATION OF HARRY I. JOHNSON III, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

NOMINATION OF PHILIP ANDREW MISCIMARRA, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to consider the following nominations en bloc, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Nancy Jean Schiffer, of Maryland, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board.

Mark Gaston Pearce, of New York, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board.

Harry I. Johnson III, of Illinois, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board.

Philip Andrew Miscimarra, of Illinois, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Nancy Jean Schiffer, of Maryland, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board.

Harry Reid, Tom Harkin, Jack Reed, Sheldon Whitehouse, Christopher A. Coons, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Benjamin L. Cardin, Patrick J. Leahy, Joe Manchin III, Elizabeth Warren, Debbie Stabenow, Carl Levin, Angus S. King, Jr., Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Amy Klobuchar, Richard Blumenthal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate divided in the usual form prior to a vote on the motion to invoke cloture.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the time be yielded back.

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

By unanimous consent the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Nancy Jean Schiffer, of Maryland, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CHIESA).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 65, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 191 Ex.]

YEAS—65

Alexander	Gillibrand	Murkowski
Ayotte	Graham	Murphy
Baldwin	Hagan	Murray
Baucus	Harkin	Nelson
Begich	Heinrich	Pryor
Bennet	Hirono	Reed
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Blunt	Kaine	Rockefeller
Boxer	King	Sanders
Brown	Kirk	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Landrieu	Shaheen
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Levin	Tester
Collins	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Coons	Markey	Udall (NM)
Corker	McCain	Warner
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warren
Durbin	McConnell	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Menendez	Wicker
Flake	Merkley	Wyden
Franken	Mikulski	

NAYS—33

Barrasso	Fischer	Paul
Boozman	Grassley	Portman
Burr	Hatch	Risch
Chambliss	Heller	Roberts
Coats	Hoeben	Rubio
Coburn	Inhofe	Scott
Cochran	Isakson	Sessions
Cornyn	Johanns	Shelby
Crapo	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Toomey
Enzi	Moran	Vitter

NOT VOTING—2

Chiesa	Heitkamp
--------	----------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas are 65, the nays are 33. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, we have three 10-minute votes. We have a 5-minute penalty time, and we need to start wrapping up these votes. The first vote took 30 minutes, so let's try to stick to what we said we would do. There are Senators who wait around here, so it is not fair to them. As soon as we get enough votes, we will move on. We are moving on whether everyone is here or not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time is yielded back and the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Nancy Jean Schiffer, of Maryland, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board?

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CHIESA).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CHIESA) would have voted "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 192 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Baldwin	Harkin	Murray
Baucus	Heinrich	Nelson
Begich	Hirono	Pryor
Bennet	Johnson (SD)	Reed
Blumenthal	Kaine	Reid
Boxer	King	Rockefeller
Brown	Klobuchar	Sanders
Cantwell	Landrieu	Schatz
Cardin	Leahy	Schumer
Carper	Levin	Shaheen
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Coons	Markey	Tester
Donnelly	McCaskill	Udall (CO)
Durbin	Menendez	Udall (NM)
Feinstein	Merkley	Warner
Franken	Mikulski	Warren
Gillibrand	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Hagan	Murphy	Wyden

NAYS—44

Alexander	Enzi	McConnell
Ayotte	Fischer	Moran
Barrasso	Flake	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Chambliss	Heller	Rubio
Coats	Hoeven	Scott
Coburn	Inhofe	Sessions
Cochran	Isakson	Shelby
Collins	Johanns	Thune
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Cornyn	Kirk	Vitter
Crapo	Lee	Wicker
Cruz	McCain	

NOT VOTING—2

Chiesa	Heitkamp
--------	----------

The nomination was confirmed.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, and pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Mark Gaston Pearce, of New York, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board.

Harry Reid, Tom Harkin, Jack Reed, Sheldon Whitehouse, Christopher A.

Coons, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Benjamin L. Cardin, Patrick J. Leahy, Joe Manchin III, Elizabeth Warren, Debbie Stabenow, Carl Levin, Angus S. King, Jr., Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Amy Klobuchar, Richard Blumenthal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form prior to a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the Pearce nomination.

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call is waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Mark Gaston Pearce, of New York, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of 5 years expiring August 27, 2018, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CHIESA).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 69, nays 29, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 193 Ex.]

YEAS—69

Alexander	Gillibrand	Murphy
Ayotte	Graham	Murray
Baldwin	Hagan	Nelson
Baucus	Harkin	Portman
Begich	Heinrich	Pryor
Bennet	Hirono	Reed
Blumenthal	Isakson	Reid
Blunt	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Kirk	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Carper	Landrieu	Stabenow
Casey	Leahy	Tester
Chambliss	Levin	Thune
Collins	Manchin	Toomey
Coons	Markey	Udall (CO)
Corker	McCain	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	Menendez	Warren
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Flake	Mikulski	Wicker
Franken	Murkowski	Wyden

NAYS—29

Barrasso	Fischer	Moran
Boozman	Grassley	Paul
Burr	Hatch	Risch
Coats	Heller	Roberts
Coburn	Hoeven	Rubio
Cochran	Inhofe	Scott
Cornyn	Johanns	Sessions
Crapo	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Cruz	Lee	Vitter
Enzi	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—2

Chiesa

Heitkamp

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 69, the nays are 29. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Under the previous order, all postcloture time is yielded back and the question occurs on the Pearce nomination.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Mark Gaston Pearce, of New York, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board?

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID), are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CHIESA).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CHIESA) would have voted “nay.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 194 Ex.]

YEAS—59

Alexander	Hagan	Murphy
Baldwin	Harkin	Murray
Baucus	Heinrich	Nelson
Begich	Hirono	Portman
Bennet	Isakson	Pryor
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Reed
Boxer	Kaine	Rockefeller
Brown	King	Sanders
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cardin	Landrieu	Schumer
Carper	Leahy	Shaheen
Casey	Levin	Stabenow
Chambliss	Manchin	Tester
Collins	Markey	Udall (CO)
Coons	McCain	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	Menendez	Warren
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Franken	Mikulski	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murkowski	

NAYS—38

Ayotte	Fischer	Moran
Barrasso	Flake	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Rubio
Coats	Heller	Scott
Coburn	Hoeven	Sessions
Cochran	Inhofe	Shelby
Corker	Johanns	Thune
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Crapo	Kirk	Vitter
Cruz	Lee	Wicker
Enzi	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—3

Chiesa

Heitkamp

Reid

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON NOMINATION OF HARRY I. JOHNSON III

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Harry I. Johnson III, of Virginia, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON NOMINATION OF PHILIP ANDREW MISCIMARRA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Philip Andrew Miscimarra, of Illinois, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate’s action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

The Senator from Washington.

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014—Resumed

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the title of the bill.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1243) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Murray (for Cardin) modified amendment No. 1760, to require the Secretary of Transportation to submit to Congress a report relating to the condition of lane miles and highway bridge deck.

Coburn amendment No. 1750, to prohibit funds from being directed to Federal employees with unpaid Federal tax liability.

Coburn amendment No. 1751, to prohibit Federal funding of union activities by Federal employees.

Coburn amendment No. 1754, to prohibit Federal funds from being used to meet the matching requirements of other Federal programs.

Murphy amendment No. 1783, to require the Secretary of Transportation to assess the impact on domestic employment of a waiver of the Buy America requirement for Federal-aid highway projects prior to issuing the waiver.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1818, 1772, 1800, 1809, 1812, AND 1814 EN BLOC

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask unanimous consent the following amendments be made in order and the Senate proceed to their consideration en bloc: Flake amendment No. 1818, Flake amendment No. 1772, McCaskill-Blunt amendment No. 1800, Blumenthal amendment No. 1809, Menendez amendment No. 1812, and Cochran amendment No. 1814.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, it is with great regret that on behalf of Senator COBURN, I am objecting.

I wish to point out that we have worked very hard to clear this list of amendments, and they include amend-

ments from Members on both sides of the aisle. It is a fair list, and I had hoped we would be able to proceed tonight.

Regrettably, there is an objection on our side from Senator COBURN.

I am, however, optimistic that with further work we will be able to deal with that objection. My hope is that in the morning we will have an agreement that will allow me to agree, as the manager on our side, to this list. Unfortunately, at this time, I do need to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. REID. Madam President, S. 1243 is now pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I have a cloture motion which is at the desk. With the Chair’s permission, I ask that it be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on S. 1243, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Patty Murray, Barbara A. Mikulski, Jon Tester, Tom Harkin, Jack Reed, Dianne Feinstein, Tim Johnson, Tom Udall, Mark Begich, Christopher Murphy, Patrick J. Leahy, Richard J. Durbin, Bill Nelson, Christopher A. Coons, Amy Klobuchar, Mazie Hirono, Richard Blumenthal.

Mr. REID. Madam President, before I go further, I want the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Maine to hear what I am saying; that is, I wish to process amendments. We are going to do one in the morning, which has held up things for some time.

There are other amendments pending. We are going to be voting on those. I have no problem with that. This is a piece of legislation we should pass.

I heard the ranking member speak on the floor yesterday, but I was so impressed because she said what is true. This is what we are, legislators. When we pass this, everyone knows what the number is if we pass it.

We go to conference. What happens in conference? The numbers change. This

is the way things should happen around here.

I would hope we don't have these lines drawn in the sand and we can start being appropriators again. When I came here many years ago, I was so fortunate, only two freshmen were on the Appropriations Committee. I was on it and also Senator MIKULSKI.

I loved that committee all these years. It was so much fun.

It hasn't been much fun lately because we haven't had an Appropriations Committee that has been functioning decently. Senator MIKULSKI and Senator SHELBY are legislators. They wish to do legislation as the two managers of this bill do. I would hope we could move forward.

I have no problem with the Coburn amendments and Paul amendment. Let's vote on them and move on.

The time has come when we have to try to get it passed. The week is coming to a close. We have other nominations. We have to move to things when we get back. We know all the problems we have when we get back. I wish to do some more work on appropriations bills when we get back.

I ask unanimous consent the mandatory quorum required under rule XXII be waived.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture motion be withdrawn and that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, notwithstanding rule XXII, in consultation with Senator MCCONNELL, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 220; that there be 2 hours for debate equally divided between the proponents and opponents; that following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote, with no intervening action or debate on the nomination; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any related statements be printed in the Record; and that President Obama be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

ENDING BULK COLLECTION OF PHONE RECORDS

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. I welcome this opportunity to speak on the floor about the National Security Agency surveillance programs, their effectiveness, and their future.

I am proud to be joined by my colleague from Oregon, Senator WYDEN, who will comment as well after my remarks. He has been a stalwart leader on these issues, and it has been my honor to join forces with him and to draw attention to this very important discussion President Obama recently welcomed.

He called for a public debate on finding the right balance between national security and privacy in the context of NSA's surveillance programs.

His call is long overdue, and it is an opportunity we should not squander. As I have said time and time again to Coloradans and as they have said back to me as well, we owe it to the American people to have an open, transparent debate about the limits of the Federal Government's surveillance powers and how we reconcile the need to keep our families safe while still respecting our hard-won constitutional rights to privacy.

Although I would have preferred that this debate would have been kicked off by more transparent actions by the White House instead of by unauthorized leaks, we are nonetheless presented with a unique opportunity—an opportunity to finally have an open dialog about the limits of our government's surveillance powers, particularly those relating to the vast dragnet of Americans' phone records under section 215 of the PATRIOT Act.

This is a debate in which I feel privileged to take part. It is a debate that Senator WYDEN has been a part of since before I was elected to the Congress and one that I have been engaged in for a number of years now.

I want to be clear. I have acted in every possible way that I could within the confines of our rules that protect classified information to oppose these practices and bring them to light for the American people. I have fought against overly intrusive sections of the PATRIOT Act and the FISA Amendments Act and registered objections repeatedly with the administration. I believe these efforts are critical for protecting our privacy and also ensuring our national security.

I serve on both the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate Intelligence Committee, and in those assignments I focus every day on keeping Americans safe, at home and abroad. I recognize that we still live in a world where terrorism is a serious threat to our country, to our economy, and to American lives. Make no mistake, our government needs the appropriate surveillance and antiterrorism tools to combat the serious threats to our Nation. But it is up to the White House and Congress to ensure that these tools strike the right balance between keep-

ing us safe and protecting our constitutional right to privacy. This is a balance I know we can achieve, but, in my view, the PATRIOT Act's bulk phone records collection program does not achieve that balance. That is why I am here on the Senate floor with my colleague Senator WYDEN to call for an end to the bulk phone records collection program, as we know it today.

Two years ago we were here on the Senate floor considering extending certain PATRIOT Act provisions. At that time I argued that the sweeping surveillance powers we were debating did not contain sufficient safeguards to preserve the privacy rights of Americans. In particular, I argued that the PATRIOT Act's business records provision—or section 215—permits the collection of records on law-abiding Americans who have no connection to terrorism or espionage. As I said at that time, we ought to be able to at least agree that an investigation under PATRIOT Act powers should have a terrorist- or espionage-related focus.

We all agree that the intelligence community needs effective tools to combat terrorism, but we must provide those tools in a way that also protects the constitutional freedoms of our people and that lives up to the standard of transparency our democracy demands. The Bill of Rights is the strongest document we have. Another way to put it: It is the biggest, baddest weapon we have. We need to stand with the Bill of Rights and in this case the Fourth Amendment.

Following Mr. Snowden's actions and the subsequent declassification of information concerning the NSA's surveillance programs, Americans in recent weeks are coming to understand what it means when section 215 of the PATRIOT Act says the government can obtain "any tangible thing" relevant to a national security investigation. That is the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court's way of saying that section 215 permits the collection of millions of Americans' phone records on a daily, ongoing basis. As a member of the Senate Intelligence Committee, I have repeatedly expressed concern that the FISA Court's secret interpretation of this provision of the PATRIOT Act is at odds with the plain meaning of the law. This secrecy has prevented Americans from understanding how this law is being implemented in their name.

In my view and the view of many Americans, this large-scale collection of information by the government has very significant privacy implications for all of us. What do I mean by that? Information about our phone calls—or, as it is known, "metadata"—may sound pretty simple and innocuous, but I believe that when law-abiding Americans call up their friends, family, doctors, religious leaders, or anyone else, the information on whom they call, when they call, and where they call is private information and should be subject to strong privacy protections.

I have heard it said that the bulk phone records program collects nothing beyond what you could find in a phone book. But let's be clear about exactly what this program does. It collects the very personal details of our phone calls—the who, where, when, and how long—and stores them in a database. This doesn't just happen for those who are suspected of having some connection to terrorism; this program collects the phone records of literally millions of Americans. This is a far greater intrusion into our privacy than being voluntarily listed in the Yellow Pages, and it is the reason why I am calling on the White House and Congress to immediately reform this program.

Let me reiterate that it is absolutely possible to have both privacy and security. Yet, in the case of the bulk phone records collection program, Senator WYDEN and I believe we aren't getting enough of either. Not only does this program unreasonably intrude on Americans' privacy, but it also does so without achieving the alleged security gains. For instance, in recent weeks the intelligence community has made new assertions about the value of recently declassified NSA surveillance programs, but in doing so they have conflated two programs: section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act regarding foreigners' Internet communications and section 215 of the PATRIOT Act regarding bulk phone records. It appears, however, that the bulk phone records collection program alone played little or no role in disrupting terrorist plots—I say this as someone who has been fully briefed on these terror-related events—nor has it been demonstrated that this program even provides any uniquely valuable intelligence. Therefore, saying, as the intelligence community has, that “these programs” together have disrupted “dozens of potential terrorist plots” is misleading.

While the intelligence community has been conflating these two programs, some of my colleagues in Congress in recent days have been going even further to say that the phone records program alone has been greatly successful. They have said it has saved lives and prevented dozens of terrorist plots. As someone who has been presented with the same information as my colleagues on the much-discussed 54 terror-related events, I have to say I disagree. Again, I have seen no evidence that the bulk phone records collection program alone has played a meaningful role, if any, in disrupting terrorist plots.

I have yet to see any convincing reason why agencies investigating terrorism cannot simply obtain information directly from phone companies using a regular court order. It may be more convenient for the NSA to collect phone records in bulk rather than asking phone companies to search for specific phone numbers, but convenience alone cannot justify the collection of the personal information of millions of

innocent, ordinary, law-abiding Americans, especially when the same or more information can be obtained using less intrusive methods. A few hundred court orders per year would clearly not overwhelm the FISA Court, and the law already allows for emergency authorizations to get these records quickly in urgent circumstances.

Senator WYDEN and I are not alone in believing there is a more effective and less intrusive way to collect this information. Even before the nature of the bulk phone records collection program was declassified, there was support for narrowing the language of section 215 from many Members of Congress of both political parties. In fact, when the PATRIOT Act reauthorization passed the Senate in 2005 by unanimous consent, it included commonsense language that would have limited the government's ability to collect Americans' personal information unless there is a demonstrated link to terrorism or espionage. That language was designed to, among other things, protect our Fourth Amendment constitutional rights and put a check on government power. While that language did not make it into the final conference bill, it demonstrated that bipartisan agreement on reforms to section 215 is possible.

Let's fast forward to 2011, when the Senate again took up the extension of a number of expiring provisions of the PATRIOT Act. I offered an amendment drawn directly from language in the 2005 Senate-passed bill to narrow the application of this provision. That amendment, unfortunately, did not receive a vote. But this Congress I introduced bipartisan legislation with Senator WYDEN based on that same language and principles, and we are now joined by a strong bipartisan group of our colleagues from across the country and all along the political spectrum, including Senators DURBIN, MURKOWSKI, BEGICH, TOM UDALL, MERKLEY, LEE, and HEINRICH. Our bill will responsibly narrow the PATRIOT Act's section 215 collection authority to make it less intrusive on the privacy of law-abiding Americans. Our legislation would still allow law enforcement and intelligence agencies to use the PATRIOT Act to obtain a wide range of records in the course of terrorism- and espionage-related investigations, but it would require them to demonstrate that the records are in some way connected to terrorism or clandestine intelligence activities—which is not the case today.

This past week there was a strong bipartisan vote in the U.S. House of Representatives to curtail NSA's bulk phone records collection. Although the legislation didn't pass, the American people are demanding action and those who share our concerns are on the march. It is time to take action.

It is common sense that our law enforcement agencies should have reason to suspect a connection between the records they are seeking and a ter-

rorism or espionage investigation before using these broad authorities to collect the private information of Americans. If the government can use these powers to collect information on people who have no connection to terrorism, then where does it end? Is there no amount of information that our government can collect that would be off limits? What is next—our medical records?

We must be able to put in place reasonable measures that allow our law enforcement agencies to pursue enemies who would try to harm us, while protecting our rights as Americans.

That is why I believe if an investigation cannot assert some nexus to terrorism or espionage, then the Government should keep its hands off the phone records of law-abiding Americans. These are the kinds of reasonable, commonsense limits on the Government's powers that Coloradoans tell me are necessary to keep us safe while also respecting our privacy.

That takes me back to the statement I made at the outset. I believe it is time to end the bulk collection program as we know it. Tonight I am calling on the White House to begin to make the administrative changes to end the bulk collection of Americans' phone records and to conduct the program instead through direct queries to phone companies where there is a connection to terrorism or espionage. Under this targeted approach, our Government would retain its broad authorities to investigate terrorism while ordinary Americans will be protected from overly intrusive surveillance activities.

Congress should support the administration's move in this direction by passing our legislation to end bulk collection. Passage of our bipartisan bill would prevent unwarranted future breaches of Americans' privacy rights and focus on the real threats to our national security.

Taking into account the serious privacy concerns raised by the bulk collection program, the lack of demonstrated unique value of the program, and our ability through direct queries to the phone companies to collect the data in the same but less intrusive way, I believe the administration—I hope the administration will see the value in working with Congress to end the bulk collection of phone records conducted under the PATRIOT Act's section 215 authorities. I pledge to work with the administration and all of my colleagues to see this through.

Let me end on this note. We need to strike a better balance between protecting our country against the threat of terrorism and defending our constitutional rights. The bulk records collection program as we know it today does not meet this balance test, and that is why I believe it must end.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, before he leaves the floor, I want to tell

Senator UDALL how much I have appreciated having him in that intelligence room, because he has been a strong advocate for making sure our country can have security and liberty in those classified meetings, just as he has done tonight. It is great to have him on the committee and to have him as a partner in these efforts.

He is so right when he stated tonight that this is a debate that should have begun long ago. It is a debate that should have been started by elected officials and not by a government contractor. I very much appreciate the Senator's remarks. I think he made it clear that we are going to stay at this until we get it fixed, and I very much appreciate his leadership.

As Senator UDALL has made clear, these issues are about as important as it gets. When you are talking about how you can secure these bedrock American values—security and liberty—this is right at the heart of what Americans care about most. For too long, my view is the American people have essentially been presented with false choices. Americans have been told they can have one or the other: They can have security or they can have liberty, but they cannot have both. Suffice it to say, in the last 8 weeks, as this debate has evolved, I think Americans have come to understand that this set of false choices is not what this debate is all about, and they deserve better.

As this debate has unfolded, whether you are in a lunchroom at work or a senior citizens center or you are looking at a political opinion poll, the polls have changed something like 20 points just in the last few weeks, with Americans saying, particularly, that the bulk phone records collection program is an intrusion on the rights of law-abiding Americans. Whether it is what citizens say at townhall meetings or what they say in the company lunchroom or in senior citizens centers, Americans have come to understand that these false choices are not what the discussion is all about. Americans have come to figure it out.

Frankly, a big part of the problem in the past—and I documented it last week—is leaders in the intelligence community have made misleading statements, repeatedly. It is not just a question of keeping the American people in the dark—which was true—but the American people were actively misled on a number of occasions.

Senator UDALL and I have been walking everyone through that. The bulk phone records collection program is often compared to a grand jury subpoena approach. That is about as far-fetched as it gets. Even national security lawyers have made fun of that kind of argument in publications such as the Wall Street Journal.

Very often when I talk to lawyers—the distinguished Presiding Officer is, of course, a particularly illustrious lawyer and has taught in the field. I often say when I am visiting with law-

yers, or I ask for a show of hands: Does anybody know of a grand jury subpoena where you can have the bulk collection of millions of phone records of law-abiding Americans? Come on up to me and tell me after the meeting is over.

I do not exactly get swarmed. The reason is there are not any.

One of the reasons I wanted to touch on these misleading statements is that, just in the last few days—Senator UDALL touched on this—there has been an effort to commingle the two programs. One of them is called the FISA 702 Program, the PRISM Program, which targets foreigners and has useful value. We have made that clear. It can be improved. I came to that conclusion when I was finally able to get declassified a finding from the FISA Court that on at least one occasion the Fourth Amendment had been violated in connection with the use of the 702 Program. But even with that, I am of the view that provides useful value.

But what a number of the leaders of the intelligence community have done is essentially commingled their advocacy of these programs so that 702 and the bulk collection program essentially ride together, when in reality, 702—which Senator UDALL and I have supported—I think we can improve it with these privacy reforms—in effect, 702 does all the work. The bulk collection program, which does intrude on the rights of millions of law-abiding Americans, is essentially along for the ride. But you would not know that when you hear these statements from a number of the leaders in the intelligence community, when they just say “these programs,” of course, are what keeps us safe.

In addition, I thought it was important to briefly start this evening by mentioning that over the last few days there have been a number of comments about whether the PATRIOT Act has violated the rights of Americans with respect to this bulk collection program. A number of commentators and others have said: “Where are the violations? I haven't seen any violations.”

The Director of National Intelligence said last Friday, in a letter to you and me and Senator UDALL and 23 other of our colleagues: Yes, there have been violations of the PATRIOT Act—when he said specifically that the Government had violated court orders on the bulk collection of those phone records.

I am not allowed to discuss the classified nature of that, but I want to make sure those who are following this debate know that from my vantage point, reading those documents that are classified, these violations are more serious than have been stated by the intelligence community, and in my view that is very troubling. So I do hope Senators will go to the Intelligence Committee and ask to see those classified documents because I think when they read them—I think they will come to the conclusion to which I have come that, not only is what was stated

by the Director of National Intelligence in that letter that was sent to you and me and Senator UDALL and 23 other Senators—not only was that correct, but I think Senators who read those classified documents will also come to the conclusion that the violations are more serious than they thought—than the intelligence community portrayed.

Let me, if I might, talk a little bit more about why we spent several years examining this bulk phone records program. First, I think it is important for citizens to know that the ability to conduct this secret surveillance that lays bare the personal lives of millions of law-abiding Americans, coupled with the ability to conjure up these legal theories as to why this is acceptable, and then have such limited oversight through this one-sided adversarial FISA Court, in my view, is an opportunity for unprecedented control over the private lives of Americans. That is why Senator UDALL and I have spent all this time focused on this issue.

I thought also tonight, and having done this before, I will provide a little more history as to how we got to this particular place. When I came to the Senate early on I had a chance to work with a number of colleagues who saw the extent of these problems—early on. One of them was our former colleague, Senator Russ Feingold.

Senator Feingold saw the problems that the PATRIOT Act posed before they were apparent to many Senators. He and his staff took the responsibility to protect both American security and American liberties very seriously. In 2007, the two of us came to understand that the PATRIOT Act was being secretly interpreted to justify the bulk collection of Americans' records, and we made it clear that we thought, first of all, that was something very different from what Americans thought was going on.

We thought it was very different, for example, from the plain reading of section 215 of the PATRIOT Act, and we thought that the language of the PATRIOT Act had been stretched beyond recognition because the language in the PATRIOT Act spoke to relevance and a sense that it was relevant to suspected terror activity, rather than something that created this enormous leap from what was in the statute that called for relevance to collecting millions and millions of records on law-abiding people.

So Senator Feingold and I dutifully set about to write classified letters to senior officials urging them to make their official interpretation of the PATRIOT Act public. We said at the time that for intelligence activities to be sustainable and effective, they have to be based on publicly understood laws and be consistent with Americans' understanding of their own privacy rights. This, in our view, was clearly not the case with the bulk records collection because, of course, the government's official interpretation of the

PATRIOT Act was a tightly guarded secret.

Back then in those early days we were rebuffed when we made repeated requests that the intelligence community inform the public what the government had secretly decided the law actually meant. In fact, there was a secret court opinion that authorized massive dragnet domestic surveillance, and the American people, by that point, were essentially in the dark about what their government was doing with respect to interpreting an important law.

In 2009, as the expiration of the date for the PATRIOT Act approached, Senator Feingold and I began to caution our colleagues and the public that our people were not getting the full story about the PATRIOT Act. At that time, we'd had the good fortune of having our colleague, Senator DURBIN, on the committee, and we all wrote public letters. We authored various articles. We wrote editorial pages for the newspapers and made statements for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We raised issues about this to the extent we could at public hearings. But, of course, the Senate rules regarding the protection of classified information limited what we could say.

One point I have tried to make clear is the intelligence rules—the classification rules don't let a member of the committee tap the truth out in Morse Code. We have to comply with the rules, and they are very laborious. If we don't comply with the rules, we cannot serve on the Intelligence Committee and be a watchdog for some of these efforts that we think goes right to the heart of protecting American security and American liberty.

So we decided—a small group of us who shared these views—if we wanted to have the opportunity to play that watchdog rule, we needed to work within the rules. So we did everything we could—recognizing that we can't tap out classified information in Morse Code—to alert the public about what was going on.

After a series of short-term extensions, the PATRIOT Act came up for a long-term reauthorization in the spring of 2011. By that time, Senator Feingold had been replaced on the committee by Senator UDALL. He, as my colleagues know, shares these concerns about the bulk collection of phone records on millions of law-abiding Americans, and we are lucky he has been a prominent leader in the cause of protecting, security, and liberty.

During the 2011 reauthorization, Senator UDALL and I spoke to colleagues. We invited colleagues to secure settings so we could lay out what was actually happening, and many of those colleagues joined us on the floor to oppose the extension of the PATRIOT Act for 4 more years.

During that debate, I came to the floor and said:

When the American people find out how their government has secretly interpreted

the PATRIOT Act, they will be stunned and they will be angry.

That week the Senate voted to extend the PATRIOT Act until 2015, but those of us who opposed the extension continued the fight in the months that followed.

At that time the NSA was also conducting a bulk e-mail records program in addition to the bulk phone records program that is ongoing today. Senator UDALL and I were concerned about this program's impact on our liberties and our privacy rights, and back in the Intelligence Committee, we spent a big chunk of 2011 pressing intelligence officials to provide evidence of its effectiveness. It turned out that the intelligence community was unable to provide any such evidence. Intelligence agencies have made statements to both Congress and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court that—they had significantly exaggerated the effectiveness of the bulk e-mail program. When Senator UDALL and I pressed them to back up these statements, they couldn't do it. The bulk e-mail records program was shut down that year.

Our experience with the bulk e-mail records program showed us that the Intelligence Agency's assessments about the usefulness of a number of these particular programs, even big ones, are not always accurate. Now, that doesn't mean that intelligence officials were deliberately lying. In a number of instances—as far as I could tell—they believed their claims that the bulk e-mail surveillance program was effective, even though it was actually close to worthless. This was an important reminder that even if intelligence officials are well intentioned, they can be dead wrong, and that any policymaker who simply defers to intelligence officials' conclusions without asking to see their evidence is making a mistake.

As we looked at that evidence, Senator UDALL and I found that the claims about the effectiveness of the bulk phone records program also did not seem well supported by the facts. So in March of 2012, we wrote to the Attorney General expressly with this concern. In our letter we said:

In recent months we have grown increasingly skeptical about the actual value of [this] "intelligence collection operation."

And we added:

This has come as a surprise to us, as we were initially inclined to take the executive branch's assertions about the importance of this "operation" at face value.

The Department of Justice, unfortunately, decided not to respond to our letter, but we continued our efforts to educate the public and to call out senior officials from intelligence agencies and the Department of Justice as they repeatedly made misleading statements about domestic surveillance.

In June of this year, disclosures by the Washington Post and the Guardian newspaper revealed the fact of bulk collection to the American people. This sparked the debate that is now ongoing about whether offering up the personal

records of ordinary Americans is the best way to protect our security and our liberty. This debate—as I indicated when Senator UDALL was on the floor—should have started a long time ago, but I am sure glad it is finally happening now.

The fact is that Americans' phone records can reveal a lot of private information. If you know, for example, that somebody called a psychiatrist three times in a week and twice after midnight, you know a lot about that person. If you are vacuuming up information on whom Americans call, when they call, and how long they talked, you are collecting an astounding amount of information about a huge number of law-abiding Americans.

The intelligence agencies try to emphasize that they have rules about who can look at these bulk phone records and when. There has been a lot said on cable by the talking heads on TV, and I want to emphasize, none of these rules require the NSA to go back to a court to look at Americans' phone records. None of these rules erase the privacy impact of scooping up all of these records in the first place. On top of that, as I indicated in the beginning, there have been a number of serious violations of those rules.

The Senators who got the letter last Friday know that, and I want to tell all the other Senators on both sides of the aisle that the violations—as I have touched on tonight—were a lot more serious than the public has been told. I believe the American people deserve to know more details about these violations that were described last Friday by Director Clapper.

I am going to keep pressing to make more of these details public. It is my view that the information about the details of the violations of the court orders with respect to the bulk phone record collection program—the admission that the court orders have been violated—has not been, I think, fully fleshed out by the intelligence community. I think a considerable amount of additional information can be offered without in any way compromising our national security.

If the impact on America's liberties wasn't bad enough, it is made even worse by the fact that this program—when we asked and asked—does not seem to have any unique value. I will explain briefly what it means.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 7 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELLY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I will see if I can beat the clock because I know colleagues are waiting. In fact, Senator BALDWIN has been a great advocate for liberties and showing that liberty and security are compatible, both when she was a Member of the other body and here when she was part of our group, and I thank her for it.

Intelligence officials can only point to two cases where this program—the

bulk phone records collection program—actually provided useful information about an individual involved in terrorist activity. In both of these cases, the government had all the information it needed to go to the phone company and get an individual court order and emergency authorization for the phone records they needed.

In both of these cases, the individuals who were identified using these phone records were arrested months or years after they were first identified, but if government agents believed that the situation was urgent, they could have used emergency authorizations to obtain their phone records more quickly. I am glad both of these cases resolved the way they did. I am proud that our intelligence agencies and law enforcement individuals were able to identify and arrest those who were involved in terrorist acts.

In one case four men in California were arrested for sending money to a militant group in Somalia. In the other case they arrested a co-conspirator of Mr. Zazi a few months after Zazi's plot was disrupted. These men committed serious crimes. They are now being punished with the full weight of the justice system.

What I don't see, however, is any evidence that the U.S. Government needed to operate a giant domestic phone records surveillance program in order to catch these individuals. I have seen no evidence—none—that this dragnet phone records program has provided any actual unique value for the American people. In every instance in which the NSA has searched through these bulk phone records, it had enough evidence to get a court order for the information it was searching for.

Getting a few hundred additional court orders every year would clearly not overwhelm the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court. The intelligence agencies may argue that collecting Americans' phone records in bulk is more convenient than getting individual court orders, but convenience alone does not justify the massive intrusion on the privacy of ordinary Americans. I believe it is vitally important to protect the safety and liberty of our people. I don't see any evidence that this program helps protect either. That ought to be the standard of any domestic surveillance program. If the bulk collection program doesn't protect privacy or security, then it ought to end—plain and simple.

The executive branch simply has not shown anything close to an adequate justification for this massive dragnet surveillance that has compromised the civil liberties of millions of Americans. I am not sure they ever could, but I am confident that I have not seen it as yet.

Now, let me close by way of saying that over the last few weeks we have seen extraordinary support for reform. Last week over 200 Members of the other body voted to end the bulk phone records collection program, and a number of the Members who voted against

ending it at that time made it clear they have serious concerns they want to address. So there are going to be more votes. Make no mistake about it, there are going to be more votes on whether to end the bulk collection of phone records on law-abiding Americans in the 113th Congress. And there are going to be efforts to reform how the entire U.S. surveillance system works.

One of the most important reforms will be to make the significant rulings of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court public, which is a goal I have been pursuing for several years.

Additionally, I believe Congress needs to reform the process for arguing cases before the court. Right now the government lawyers walk in with an argument for why the government should be allowed to do something, and there is no one to argue the other side. That is not unusual if the court is considering a routine warrant request, but it is very unusual when a court is doing major legal or constitutional analysis.

I believe Congress needs to create a way to advocate for the public—a public advocate to argue cases before the court, because making this court more transparent and more adversarial is a way to ensure that Americans can have security and liberty. Of course, the relevant provisions of the PATRIOT Act itself will be expiring in 2015. I don't think there is any reason for the administration to wait for Congress to act.

The executive branch can take action right now. They can and should continue to obtain the records of anyone suspected of connections to terror or other nefarious activity, and at the same time they can restore protections for Americans' Fourth Amendment rights. I am very interested in working with the administration on these issues, but they can move of their own volition.

One way or another, we are going to stay at this until, at this unique time in our constitutional history, we have revised our surveillance laws so we can have security and liberty. Colleagues are coming to this cause. Senator BLUMENTHAL has particularly recommended a number of constructive FISA Court changes over the last few months. I hope colleagues will support that, and I hope they will see this unique time in our history when it is critically important that these surveillance laws that I and Senator UDALL have talked about tonight can be reformed and we do it so as to protect the bedrock of American values, both security and liberty.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I and Senator BLUMENTHAL from Connecticut and Senator BALDWIN from Wisconsin and, if he is able to join us, Senator MURPHY from Connecticut be allowed to engage in a colloquy.

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

HEALTH CARE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, my colleagues and I have come to the floor to talk about an issue that is at the heart of the discussion of our national debt and deficit; that is, health care spending.

These days around Washington, there is a regular refrain echoing through the hallways: In order to fix our deficit, we must cut Medicare and Medicaid benefits. That is wrong. That idea is, according to the former CEO of Kaiser Permanente—somebody who knows a little something about health care—and I will quote him:

... so wrong it's almost criminal. It's an inept way of thinking about health care.

I could not agree more.

It was put this way by Froma Harrop, who is a columnist for my hometown paper, the Providence Journal. I will quote her: "The dagger pointed at America's economic viability hasn't been the existence of government programs like Medicare, it's been the relentless rise in health care costs that plagues not only Medicare and Medicaid, but everyone who uses health care."

Attacking Medicare and Medicaid ignores the fact that our health care spending problem is systemwide and not just unique to Federal programs. Our colleague Senator ANGUS KING has used the colorful metaphor that to go after Medicare and Medicaid when the problem is our health care system would be like attacking Brazil after Pearl Harbor—wrong target. It ignores the fact that we operate a widely inefficient health care system: 18 percent of our GDP compared to only 12 percent for our least efficient international competitors.

So how can we continue to stem the rise in costs and improve our wildly inefficient health care system?

Thankfully, many of the tools necessary to drive down costs have an interesting collateral benefit. They actually improve the quality of care for patients. The Affordable Care Act included 45 different provisions dedicated to redesigning how health care is delivered for the benefit of patients and taxpayers. These reforms support and encourage an ongoing delivery system reform movement—and there truly is a movement out there—driven by dedicated providers, payers, employers, and even some States that have worked for years to improve the quality and the safety and the effectiveness of health care.

We are not discussing hypothetical improvements. We are not discussing theoretical cost savings. Today I am joined on the floor by colleagues who have seen how delivery system innovators in their States have achieved real improvements to quality, real improvements in patient outcomes, and real cost savings. In Congress, we can't get over yesterday's

quarrels about repealing or defunding ObamaCare, but out there in the real world health care leaders across the country are innovating forward, places such as the Cleveland Clinic in Ohio, Intermountain Healthcare in Utah, Geisinger Health System in Pennsylvania, Gundersen Lutheran in Wisconsin, Palmetto Health in the Carolinas, and in Rhode Island, among other places, our own Coastal Medical.

One Rhode Island practical example: When intensive care unit staff follow a checklist of basic instructions—washing their hands with soap, cleaning a patient's skin with antiseptic, placing sterile drapes over the patient and so forth—rates of infection plummet, and the costs of treating those infections disappear—no infection, no cost.

These reforms have the triple benefit of protecting Medicare and Medicaid, improving patient outcomes, and dialing back health care spending for all Americans. How big is it? The President's Council of Economic Advisers has estimated that we could save approximately \$700 billion—that is billion with a “b”—\$700 billion every year—every year—in our health care system without compromising health outcomes. The Institute of Medicine took a look at the same question. They put the savings number at \$750 billion.

Other groups are even more optimistic. The New England Health Care Institute has reported that \$850 billion could be saved annually. The Lewin Group and former Bush Treasury Secretary Paul O'Neill—who as the CEO of Alcoa is deeply involved in the reform efforts in Pennsylvania that have been very successful and knows a fair amount about this—they estimate an annual savings of a staggering \$1 trillion.

Whatever the exact number is, what is clear is there is huge potential for savings in our health care system while improving or maintaining the quality of care. Since the Federal Government does 40 percent of America's health care spending, when we get that right, taxpayers as well as patients become big winners from these reforms.

I will close with two points: First, many of us are asking the Obama administration to set a hard cost savings target for these delivery system reform efforts. It may be \$750 billion. Pick a number that will be a target to be actually achieved. A target—a measurable goal—will focus and guide and spur the administration's reform efforts in a manner that vague intentions to “bend the health care cost curve” simply cannot.

Second, we need to put the full force of American innovation and ingenuity into achieving that serious cost savings target for our Nation's health care system. It is hard to do that without that target to strive toward.

This is an issue where our Republican colleagues should be able to join us to accelerate these reforms in our health care delivery system and to move forward beyond tired-out calls to repeal

ObamaCare so we can deal with the ongoing reality of health care reform.

Let's give American families the health care system they deserve. Instead of waste and inefficiency, poor outcomes and missed opportunities, let's give them a health care system that is the envy of the world.

I yield for my colleague, Senator BALDWIN.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for convening us and for giving us an opportunity to discuss the important topic of delivery system reform and to highlight some of the innovations that are occurring in our own States.

I heard Senator WHITEHOUSE talking about moving forward. It is actually the motto of the State of Wisconsin. One simple word: “Forward.” Throughout our State's history, that motto has well represented our leadership in extending high-quality and affordable health care.

Our health care providers and payers have pioneered forward-looking reforms that improve the quality of care and lower costs for families and for businesses. We are home to world-class, highly integrated health care systems. We make quality and outcomes data widely accessible to providers so they can measure their success against their peers. We stand at the forefront of using and advancing health care information technology. All of this affords some of the highest quality care in the country at a competitive cost.

Congress has a lot to learn from Wisconsin's health care delivery systems. A recent Institute of Medicine report reinforced what we have known for a long time: that geographic variation in health care spending and utilization is real and that variations in health care spending are not consistently related to health care quality. For every State such as Wisconsin with higher quality outcomes and lower costs, there are five other States faring worse. Even within States, the regional variation in health care spending and quality is troublesome.

Unfortunately, instead of advancing and fostering forward-thinking innovations such as those working in Wisconsin, far too many of my fellow lawmakers are looking backward when it comes to health care. In the House of Representatives, the Republican leadership has scheduled votes to repeal or defund the Affordable Care Act almost 40 times. Some State governments—including, unfortunately, my own—have refused to move forward with America's new health care law and are undermining its effectiveness at every chance possible. Now some of my colleagues in the Senate are threatening to shut down the government if investments in our health care system are not stripped out of our budget entirely.

Families and businesses in Wisconsin and across the country are tired of these political games. For as long as some of my colleagues and some of the Governors across this country remain

glued to the past, waging political fights based on pure ideology, we lose golden opportunities to move health care reforms in our country forward. We should all be focused on building a smarter and more affordable health care system, not trying to tear down the law of the land.

That is why I am so proud to stand on the floor with my colleagues tonight, committed to moving our Nation's health care system forward. By building on the best reforms to our health care delivery system that are embedded within the Affordable Care Act and making new improvements to how we deliver care in our country, we will lower health care costs, improve quality and strengthen our economic security and reduce the deficit. Better yet, we will have more States with health care systems such as Wisconsin's, and Wisconsin's system will be improved as well.

The possibilities are exciting. I think one of the things Senator WHITEHOUSE just mentioned bears repeating: There is widespread agreement that significant savings can be achieved in our health care system without compromising the quality of care. The figures he cited bear repeating: The Lewin Group and the former Treasury Secretary Paul O'Neill have estimated that we could save \$1 trillion per year without affecting health care outcomes by enacting smart, targeted health care delivery reforms. The New England Health Care Institute pegged that number at \$850 billion annually, the Institute of Medicine estimated this number to be \$750 billion, and the President's Council of Economic Advisers foresees savings at \$700 billion a year. No matter the exact figure, these are impressive savings that would strengthen our entire Nation.

The Affordable Care Act has sparked this hard work of transforming health care delivery. The law provides health care practitioners with incentives to better integrate care, increase quality, and lower costs. These efforts are producing impressive results in Wisconsin. For example, the Pioneer Accountable Care Organization Program has offered financial incentives to meet quality and Medicare savings benchmarks. Bellin-ThedaCare Healthcare Partners in northeast Wisconsin has excelled with this program. In its first year of participation, Bellin-ThedaCare earned \$5.3 million in shared savings and lowered costs for its 20,000 Medicare patients by an average of 4.6 percent. While not every pioneer ACO has been as successful, the CMS Office of the Actuary believes this program could save Medicare up to \$1.1 billion over 5 years by simply better coordinating care.

Wisconsin boasts six additional health care providers participating in the law's traditional Accountable Care Organization Program which the Department of Health and Human Services estimates could save up to \$940 million over 4 years. Wisconsin health care providers are also taking part in

the Affordable Care Act's Partnership for Patients to improve health care quality. This public-private partnership engages hospitals, businesses, and consumer groups with the goal of preventing injuries and complications in patient care—including hospital-acquired conditions. The administration estimates that reducing medical errors and preventing conditions will save up to \$35 billion in health care costs.

Another public-private partnership—the Affordable Care Act's Million Hearts Initiative—is preventing heart attack and stroke. Cardiovascular disease costs this country \$440 billion per year in medical costs and lost productivity. The initiative seeks to deliver better preventive care to stop 1 million strokes and heart attacks by the year 2017—in part by utilizing innovative technology. Wisconsin's own Marshfield Clinic designed a winning mobile application for the initiative. The app will encourage patients to get their blood pressure and cholesterol checked and to work with their health care providers to improve their heart health.

Finally, the Affordable Care Act has empowered the CMS Innovation Center to develop new ideas to improve health care quality and lower costs for people enrolled in Medicare, Medicaid, and the Children's Health Insurance Program. A number of the center's projects are currently underway in Wisconsin. For example, the Children's Hospital of Wisconsin, Aurora HealthCare, and the Wheaton Franciscan Healthcare system have created a model to decrease emergency room visits for children. The estimated 3-year savings of that project is almost \$3 million. In addition, the Pharmacy Society of Wisconsin is utilizing a provision in the Affordable Care Act to better integrate pharmacists into clinical care teams. That initiative is set to save over \$20 million in 3 years.

This represents a small sampling of the delivery innovations being promoted through the Affordable Care Act that are saving us money right now. These parts of the law are empowering Wisconsin health care providers to provide higher quality care at reduced costs. Public officials who advocate for repealing the Affordable Care Act would end these impressive initiatives as well. Instead, we must build on these delivery reforms, as so much more can be done.

To name two priorities, Wisconsin cardiologists have developed an innovative integrated network called SMARTCare to deliver better more efficient care for a vulnerable patient population. The Department of Health and Human Services should encourage this coordinated care model by investing in it and measuring its results.

We should improve the law to increase access to Medicare claims data. The Wisconsin Health Information Organization currently holds over 65 percent of health insurance claims data in the State—from private insurers and

from Medicaid. The organization shares that data with health care providers so doctors can compare their performance—in terms of quality and cost—against their peers. This data-sharing promotes competition and it lowers cost. But due to current law, the organization cannot access Medicare data. If we open Medicare claims data, we will further improve quality and we will lower costs.

Lawmakers have a clear choice: Go backward and try for the 40th time to repeal the Affordable Care Act or put progress in our country ahead of politics. We welcome our colleagues to join us in moving our country and our health care delivery system forward.

I now yield for Senator MURPHY.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I thank very much Senator BALDWIN and thank the State of Wisconsin for, in a lot of ways, leading the way and showing us what is possible when it comes to delivery system reform.

It is pretty amazing some of those statistics Senator BALDWIN used when she talked about how much waste there is in the system today. The estimates are from the Council of Economic Advisers, \$700 billion; from the New England Healthcare Institute, \$850 billion. To put that in context, even if the median of the two is right—somewhere in the high \$700 billion range—that is \$100 billion more than we spend every year on the military. That is enough money to provide coverage for 150 million more Americans. That is enough to pay the salaries of every single first responder personnel in the country, including firefighters, police officers, and EMTs for over a decade.

It is an enormous amount of money that we are wasting today because we have a reimbursement system, as Senator WHITEHOUSE said as well, that essentially rewards providers and hospitals and health care systems for providing volume rather than providing quality.

We understand there is not a single health care provider in the country that does not get into this if not for their desire to provide quality health care. There is no malevolent motive involved here. But, ultimately, when you have to keep your doors open—as a medical practice, as a hospital, as a nursing home—and you get paid more the more medicine you practice and the more treatments you order and the more tests you have your patients undergo, then you are going to follow the money. It is time we reorient our reimbursement model under Medicare and Medicaid, and in partnership with our private insurers, so we are reimbursing based on the quality of medicine and the quality of the outcomes you provide rather than on how much stuff you order or prescribe.

Let me talk about three examples of how we have succeeded already when it comes to changing the model of reimbursement.

First, the issue of readmission rates. When you go into a hospital for a sur-

gery, that hospital is going to get a set fee for the surgery and for the amount of time you spend in the hospital afterwards. It is called a bundle payment. Bundle payments are good because what it does is it encourages you to essentially use your resources wisely because you are not going to get paid more if you keep the person in the hospital for 10 days than if you keep the person in the hospital for 5 days.

But here is the problem when it comes to the care people were getting after a particular surgery. Because the hospital got a set payment for that period of time, they had an incentive to push the person out of the hospital as quickly as possible. That was an incentive not only because the payment itself did not get bigger the more amount of time you were in the hospital, but it also was incented that way because if the person went home too early and then they came back again to the hospital, the hospital got a second bundle payment when they came back. And if they came back a third time and a fourth time, they got another payment.

So what was happening is there was an incentive to send people home before they were ready because not only would that save you money on the first bundled payment, but it actually made the hospital or the health system money in the long run because the person came back a second or a third or a fourth time.

I do not think there was a single hospital in the Nation that was deliberately misaligning their care so they would have people coming back to the hospital a second or a third or a fourth time. I am not suggesting people were trying to game the system in that way. But what certainly was happening was that without an incentive that pulls you the other way—get the care right the first time—there was, unfortunately, insufficient care being provided.

So the health care bill says: Listen, we will pay you for maybe the first readmission, maybe for really complicated procedures we will pay you for a second readmission, but at some point there has to be an end to this model. At some point it has to be up to you as the hospital or as the health care provider to get the care right the first or the second time so we are not on the hook for readmissions occurring times three or times four. That is a pretty simple change, but it can save hundreds of millions of dollars.

The second example is accountable care organizations. We set up a bunch of Pioneer accountable care organizations. These are bigger systems of care, where you have primary care doctors networked with specialty care providers, working under one umbrella to coordinate the care of the sickest patients. There are different numbers, but they all tell the same thing, which is that the sickest 5 or 10 percent of patients in the country are taking up about 50 percent of annual medical expenditures. So if you do a better job of

coordinating the care of that small percentage of the medical population, you are going to save a lot of money.

Accountable care organizations can do that. Instead of having siloed care, where a co-morbid patient goes to a primary care doctor over here, then a specialist here, then a specialist there, if they are all under one roof and they are talking to each other, then you can save a lot of money just by coordination. That is the theory. So the health care reform act put that theory into practice. It set up a pilot program by which Pioneer accountable care organizations—essentially, a beginning set of accountable care organizations—would be set up under a model through which Medicare would say: If you save money, we are going to deliver back to you some of those savings so that, in fact, there is not a disincentive to practice less medicine because if you practice less medicine, Medicare will take some of the savings and it will share with you some of the savings.

Well, we have only had a year or so of returns from this model, but the results are pretty stunning. The average increase in costs per beneficiary has been—in the Pioneer ACOs—less than 50 percent of that for non-Pioneer ACO models. That is a pretty significant savings.

In addition, go back to this question of readmissions. In 25 of the 32 Pioneer ACOs, there was a lower risk-adjusted readmission rate than in non-Pioneer ACOs. Coordinated care where you are reimbursing an organization as opposed to just the individual physicians actually saves you a lot of money.

Then third, the issue of outliers. What you find when you look at the data—and it may be that Senator WHITEHOUSE talked about this—is that sometimes 60, 70, 80 percent of the system is practicing good medicine at the right cost, and it is really only a small handful of providers that are way outside of the median and all you have to do, when it comes to some subsets of reimbursement, is bring those outliers back into the median.

Home care was a great example. In the Accountable Care Act, we said that for home care providers that had utilization rates that were far outside the median, we were going to stop reimbursing for those episodes that were far outside the median. CBO was not sure how to score it because they did not really know that was going to change people's practice. But it did. And it is estimated that single change, in controlling for the handful of outliers when it comes to high utilization rates in the home care line item, is going to get us almost \$1 billion in savings over a 10-year period of time.

When you look at home care, actually it is only a handful of areas in which you have these outpaced utilization rates compared to the rest of the country. It is places in Texas, it is places in certain counties in Florida. Most of the country is right where you should be. So part of reforming our de-

livery system is also taking care of these outliers.

We have seen savings, whether it be in controlling readmission rates, setting up accountable care organizations, or taking on outliers within our home care system.

Now it is time to do more because, before I turn it over to my good friend Senator BLUMENTHAL, here is where the rubber hits the road.

In about 10 years, Medicare starts taking in less money than it sends out. It does not go bankrupt all of a sudden, but it starts to become fiscally insolvent. There are only a handful of ways to stop that reality from happening. You can either ask beneficiaries to pay more out of pocket; you can cut their benefits, give them less; you can ask people to pay more into the system while they are working or you can make the system more efficient.

It may be that we have to do a mix of those. But clearly the first three are not that palatable: reducing benefits, increasing copays, or increasing taxes. This is not a partisan issue. Both sides agree that in 10 years we have an accounting problem in Medicare. Both sides agree that we have to make changes today in order to stop that crisis from occurring.

It strikes me that if the most conservative Republican and the most liberal Democrat sat down at a table and looked at those four options—increased copays, reduced benefits, increased taxes, or increased efficiencies—we would all agree. The conservative Republican and the liberal Democrat would agree, along with probably every other Member of this body, that is the first place you should go is to reduce inefficiencies. That is what the delivery system provides. So we have set up a working group here in the Senate which is beginning its work this week, that Senator BALDWIN, Senator WHITEHOUSE, Senator BLUMENTHAL, I, and others will be building over the course of the late summer and fall. We hope it will draw interest from both sides of the aisle so we can start to put some meat on the bones when it comes to the changes in our delivery system that can be made to increase efficiencies so as to forestall the need to balance the Medicare books on the backs of taxpayers, workers, or beneficiaries.

With that, let me yield the floor to my great friend from Connecticut, someone who both as a Senator and our State's attorney general has been fighting for health care consumers for a long time, Senator BLUMENTHAL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague, CHRIS MURPHY. Senator MURPHY has been a long-time champion on this issue. My colleagues may wonder why two Senators from Connecticut, both of our Senators, are here on the floor and part of this working group seeking to lead on this critically important issue of health care delivery.

The answer is we come from a State where it is working. We have seen the future in Connecticut's health care delivery system. It is still a work in progress, a lot of work still to be done, but Connecticut hospitals and providers and insurers and patients know it has to be our future, that cutting cost is essential to preserving and enhancing quality. Let me emphasize how important that basic principle is, because a lot of our colleagues believe there is a choice here between cutting costs and quality, that quality cannot be enhanced if we cut costs.

In fact, the opposite is true. Cutting the cost of health care is key to enhancing and improving quality. It is the way we will reduce premature discharges from hospitals, that we will diminish the number of discharges from hospitals without proper rehabilitation plans, and cut the number of hospital-acquired infections. It is not only possible to do but it is essential. It is a way we avoid the false choice—and it is a false choice—between preserving Medicare on the one hand and avoiding increasing copays, decreasing benefits, or increasing taxes, as my colleague from Connecticut has said.

I reject every one of those options as necessary to preserving Medicare. Increasing copays, decreasing benefits, or increasing taxes is not the way. In fact, increasing efficiencies and avoiding unnecessary wasteful and indeed harmful costs are necessary to preserve Medicare.

My mother taught me a number of things. She said, No. 1, if you don't have something nice to say about someone, don't say anything. So I am not here to say not-so-nice things about the folks who say we ought to cut Medicare benefits. But I would oppose those kinds of cuts as unnecessary and harmful.

She also said an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. In fact, that basic truth is what will help save our health care system. Prevention of costs, prevention of illness, prevention of obesity and smoking, and other kinds of diseases and conditions that lead to increased health care costs are essential to this effort.

My mother said also listen to your younger brother. My brother, Dr. David Blumenthal, has been a pioneer and an expert in this area. As much as it pains me to acknowledge that my younger brother knows a lot more about this subject than I do, in fact, he has been able to enlighten me and many of our colleagues here on this point. I mention him and the others who are experts and pioneers in this effort. He is one of many who have advised and provided that kind of enlightenment.

Because there is no more kind of guesswork as to whether advances can be made in this area by cutting costs and raising quality. It has been documented. There are projections. It can be costed out. It can be scored, in my view. It can be the basis for action by my colleagues here in seeking to cut

costs that are skyrocketing out of control.

I have seen these reforms at work throughout the State of Connecticut. This issue is of national importance, but it hits hospitals and providers in every one of our States. I have seen it and listened to folks who work at places such as St. Vincent's and Bridgeport Hospital, in Bridgeport; St. Mary's Hospital in Waterbury; Yale-New Haven and Greenwich Hospital, Middlesex Hospital. All around the State of Connecticut, I have seen the checklists at work, the protocols for hand washing, the increased attention to quality care that has helped reduce costs. They have helped improve patient care while reducing cost. They reject this false choice between quality and cost cutting. Both are possible. Both are essential.

We hear so much rhetoric about the Affordable Care Act in Washington. But in Connecticut, we see tangible examples of how it is working and making a difference. The implementation of the Affordable Care Act is a historic opportunity for continuing this work and expanding it nationwide. We need to continue our dedication to health care reform.

My colleagues and I have come to the floor today to call for smart reform that helps patients and avoids harm to them, and does not discourage providers from being a part of a Federal health care program. In fact, we need to identify areas of reforms within the health care system that we can address that will strengthen health care in this country and address the serious concerns about the skyrocketing costs of health care.

We have seen a slowdown in the growth of national health care expenditures over the past year. But slow growth certainly does not mean a decrease in overall expenditures. Smart policy decisions require that we address the ongoing problem of health care spending in this country, and turn a corner for the good by reducing the current costs.

I am concerned that there are short-sighted strategies, such as taking money from the Prevention and Public Health Care Fund established under the ACA, which has been a tactic unfortunately used by both parties in financing programs. That tactic will undermine our long-term efforts at reducing health care spending. The Prevention and Public Health Fund is used in Connecticut for programs such as mental health services and substance abuse prevention, as well as public health research and surveillance.

These measures will ultimately result in lower health care spending through prevention and preventive health care. But we need to stay committed and stay the course. What we need to do now is to continue to work toward developing a sustainable health care system, through structural reforms such as the accountable care organizations, health maintenance organiza-

tions, patient-centered medical homes that have provided advances in this area, and have created provider organizations that lead to greater provider acceptance of responsibility for health care outcomes in their patients.

Measuring the success of those organizations requires taking a closer look at whether the savings and outcome improvements actually materialize. We have to be hard-headed and clear-eyed about whether they are working. The metrics must be applied. We need to measure success. Measurements are possible; as I said at the outset, no longer a matter of guesswork. There are scientific-based measurements.

The success of these organizations will have more to do with how they are run than with how they are structured. As sophisticated as many of our health systems are, the development of process goals has only recently become a consideration. The Association of American Medical Colleges recommends, for example, the use of surgery checklists through their best practices program.

Peer-reviewed studies have shown that the use of comprehensive checklists is associated with reductions in complications and mortality during surgery. But they are most successful when health care organizations subscribe to a culture of safety. That culture of safety and prevention is essential.

Some hospitals in Connecticut have been rewarded through the Medicare Program for their commitment to improving quality through the use of process measures: Bridgeport Hospital, St. Mary's Hospital in Waterbury, Middlesex Hospital have all seen increases in reimbursement rates through the Value Based Purchasing Program.

Again, the Federal Government can provide incentives and encourage and support this effort. Manchester Memorial Hospital, Hartford Hospital, and Rockville General Hospital all have avoided Medicare penalties by lowering their readmission rates. While payment differences for these programs represent a small portion of the overall Medicare payment, hospitals should continue to be rewarded for addressing these issues.

I want to conclude by drawing attention to some of the innovative work being done in my State of Connecticut around delivery reform and data collection. I have mentioned the importance of measurements and metrics. Much of the work is supported by grants that were made available through the Affordable Care Act. But it has been the State itself that has decided how exactly to use these funds. While Connecticut has established a working group around innovative reforms which continues to work on specific proposals and recommendations for reforming the health care system, one of the areas of focus has been to ensure integrated clinical data exchange between health care providers.

Connecticut has invested in interoperable health information tech-

nology systems and developing an all payers claims data base to create comparable, transparent information that can be better used to understand utilization patterns and enhance care access.

One of the most basic aspects of reforming any system should be a clear understanding of where the biggest problems lie, and yet we still lack the data necessary in many systems to truly understand where the unnecessary spending is taking place. It is like a diagnosis of any kind of medical condition. Facts are essential. Data is key, and I believe an investment in information technology and data collection activities will help inform payers and consumers about where our health care dollars are being spent, where they are being spent most effectively, and where we can reduce spending that will ultimately enhance health care outcomes.

Connecticut is taking a considered and insightful approach to obtaining and utilizing data while considering the needs of consumers and looking toward developing stronger programs for telemedicine and provider coordination. Technology is advancing. Data collection can help implement technology where it does the most good.

We need tangible goals for long-term reform, and that is part of the work that we have described and we are undertaking as part of our task force.

I know my colleagues this evening all agree with me that we need to continue this work and take advantage of advancing technology, the metrics that are now being sampled, of good practices, leadership of providers, the medical community, and good ideas wherever they are and whoever is willing to offer them.

I wish to thank my colleagues for joining in this effort, and I look forward to returning on this subject.

HOUSING ASSISTANCE

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I wish to express my strong support for the Transportation-HUD appropriations bill and take a moment to explain an amendment that I have filed to this bill that ensures that men and women who have bravely served our country cannot be discriminated against in the housing assistance these appropriations provide.

I wish to thank Senator MURRAY and Senator COLLINS for their leadership, as well as other colleagues.

One of the problems I have heard described to me by veterans relates to discrimination when they return home after serving our country abroad and they become a civilian. One of the first things they often try to do is find a new home, often in a location far from their original home where they may not be known, where they enlisted but now have left. It may also be far from the military installation where they used to call home.

Fortunately, almost all Americans across our country rightly welcome our

heroes home, and they welcome them with open arms. Unfortunately, I have seen reports, and I have heard descriptions of instances where landlords would not rent to veterans simply because they served our country in uniform, and I find this practice absolutely unconscionable.

I wish to tell you about the case of SGT Joel Morgan, a combat veteran who bravely served our country in Iraq. Sergeant Morgan, upon leaving the military, wished to rent an apartment in Boston. He found one that he liked.

Unfortunately, after hearing about Sergeant Morgan's service to our country, the landlord said she wouldn't feel comfortable renting the apartment to Sergeant Morgan because she opposed the war in which he fought.

According to Sergeant Morgan, the landlord said:

I would suggest you do the right thing and look for a place less politically active or controversial.

The place where he wanted to live was Boston. This kind of treatment is simply unacceptable to our veterans who have sacrificed so much.

It is a matter of common knowledge that veterans of these recent wars have high unemployment rates, higher than we should accept, higher than is conscionable for this country to accept. Among younger veterans, that unemployment rate is intolerably high, and many landlords may believe that an unemployed veteran simply isn't a good prospect for paying the rent.

My amendment would prohibit any funding in this bill from going to people or organizations that discriminate against veterans in housing. It would allow anyone who sees a discriminatory practice to report it to the Department of Housing and Urban Development and directly to that agency's inspector general. It also allows HUD to continue its existing programs to support veterans and servicemembers.

This amendment will ensure that those who fight for our freedoms will not have to find or fight for a place to call home. Discrimination against anyone, including men and women who have valiantly served, has no place in our Nation.

I look forward to working with the Department of Housing and Urban Development, which has done so much to protect Americans from discriminatory housing practices, on ways we can ensure that servicemembers and veterans are not the victims of discrimination. As we work for a permanent solution on so many of these difficult problems—providing veterans with counseling, health care, jobs counseling, training, and education that they need and keeping faith with them so that we leave no veteran behind—we should make sure we leave no veteran out of housing because of discrimination.

One of the solutions will be amending the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to ensure that housing protections are extended to all who have served in uniform. I believe this amendment is an

important step forward. Simply put, it will protect all who have protected our country. Protecting them is a matter of keeping faith and making sure that we leave no veteran behind.

I know the Veterans' Affairs Committee is hard at work on many of these issues. I am proud to serve on that committee and thank Chairman SANDERS for his profoundly important leadership on this issue, along with Ranking Member BURR.

I look forward to extending and expanding these protections for our bravest and finest men and women who have helped to protect our Nation.

I yield the floor.

FEDERAL FUNDING PROHIBITIONS OBJECTION

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, consistent with Senate standing orders and my policy of publishing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement whenever I place a hold on legislation, I am announcing my intention to object to any unanimous consent request to pass S. 101 Federal funding prohibitions unless it clarifies that it will not prohibit payments under the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act.

This legislation, as currently drafted, has the potential to impede critical payments to over 700 rural and forested counties all across the United States. Those payments are paid to counties with Federal forest lands under the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act, and they are part of the Federal Government's guarantee to share funding from the Federal forests with the counties in which those forests are located. Declining receipts spurred the creation of this program to compensate for the loss of receipts from Federal forests. Many counties depend on this funding to pay for schools, roads, and other important county services—including funding search and rescue operations on Federal lands. Particularly in tough economic times, these payments have been a lifeline to many counties. It is not an exaggeration to say that some of these counties might face bankruptcy without these payments. Because of the importance of these payments to many county budgets and the fact that many of them might be in a very vulnerable financial situation without those payments—including several counties in my home State of Oregon—this legislation might very well impact them and prohibit these critical payments. I simply cannot let that happen. This program has consistently received bipartisan support, and it should not be arbitrarily be limited by S. 101.

Therefore, I must object to this legislation moving forward until it is explicitly clarified that it will not block any of these critical payments. Until that occurs, I will object to a unanimous consent request to pass the legisla-

TRIBUTE TO ERNEST CARY BRACE

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, today I honor a man whose bravery and sacrifice for this country have had no bounds; a fellow prisoner of war who I am proud to call my friend. This great American hero is Ernest C. Brace, and he was just authorized to be awarded the Purple Heart and Prisoner of War Medal.

Mr. Brace was the longest held civilian prisoner of war in Vietnam, held captive for nearly 8 years. He was captured while serving as a civilian pilot for USAID and assisting Lao Special Forces United, who were organizing the civic action teams for hospitals and supply bases. He was captured by communist forces in Laos in 1965 and held prisoner in the jungle under some of the most horrific conditions imaginable for 3 years until he was moved to a prison camp in North Vietnam. It was there that Ernie and I shared neighboring cells for over a year. Amidst the pain and cruelty of our time together, I also vividly remember our conversations, Sunday night storytelling sessions, and how we kept each other's spirits up during those dark days when our hope never wavered.

After his release, Mr. Brace married a nurse, Nancy, that he met at Naval Medical Center in San Diego, moved to Klamath Falls, OR, and resumed his career as professional aviator. Preceding the Purple Heart and Prisoner of War Medal, Mr. Brace earned the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Air Medal, with 3 stars, Navy Unit Commendation, a Distinguished Public Service Medal, a National Defense Service Medal, a Korean Service Medal, with 2 stars, a United Nations Korea Medal, and the Korean Presidential Unit Citation.

I ask you all to join me in congratulating this incredibly brave man and American patriot, my friend Ernie Brace, on this long overdue recognition.

CONSENT TO DISCHARGE AND REFERRAL

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, last week the leadership sought unanimous consent to discharge S. 1294, a bill to designate as wilderness certain public land in the Cherokee National Forest in the State of Tennessee, from the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee and to rerefer the bill to the Agriculture Committee. I am consenting to this discharge and referral because the wilderness in this bill would be created out of public lands in the Cherokee National Forest, a national forest created from lands acquired under the Weeks Act. The Agriculture Committee has primary jurisdiction for acquired lands forests. However, I am not conceding the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee jurisdiction over national forests created from the public domain or its jurisdiction over our Nation's wilderness system.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, due to a family commitment, I was unable to cast a vote on Monday evening regarding the nomination of James Comey to be the next director of the Federal Bureau of Investigations, FBI. I would have voted yes because all Presidents are entitled to nominate whomever they want to key positions, and I believe Mr. Comey is well qualified to lead this important agency and the brave men and women who dedicate their lives to protecting our people and enforcing our laws domestically. In this new position, Mr. Comey should expect Congress to maintain its strong oversight role in ensuring that the FBI effectively executes its mission to keep Americans safe, while protecting the rule of law and our constitutional rights.

FRYEBURG, MAINE

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to commemorate the 250th anniversary of the Town of Fryeburg, ME, the first town established in the beautiful White Mountains of Maine and New Hampshire. The same spirit of determination and resiliency that carved a community out of the wilderness two and a half centuries ago still guides Fryeburg today.

In 1763, the Seven Years' War between France and Great Britain for control of North America ended with a resounding British victory. In recognition of his courageous service, GEN Joseph Frye, an American-born militia commander, was rewarded with a homestead grant in the White Mountains region. He chose the place where the great Saco River tumbles from the mountains on its journey to the sea, a place of vast forests and fertile farmland. That first settlement of seven lots soon grew into a thriving town, incorporated in 1777 and named in General Frye's honor.

That first settlement was built on the foundation laid a half century before by another early American hero, CPT John Lovewell. His valiant deeds to secure the colonies' northern frontier—including the legendary Battle of the Pond in 1725—were celebrated by such authors as Longfellow, Hawthorne, and Thoreau. From those long ago days to the present, the Veterans Honor Roll in Bradley Park memorializes the more than 1,200 patriots from Fryeburg who have served our Nation in times of peril.

As the town of Fryeburg became a bustling center of industry with lumber and grain mills, the townspeople invested their prosperity in education and in 1792 established Fryeburg Academy, one of America's oldest preparatory schools. Among the academy's first teachers was Daniel Webster, before he began his remarkable career as a statesman in the U.S. Senate and as America's Secretary of State. Fryeburg's connection to the

world of ideas was strengthened in 1997 when the International Musical Arts Institute was established, bringing world-class musicians and conservatory students together every summer for concerts that enrich the community.

The coming of the railroads in the mid-19th century made Fryeburg, with its spectacular scenery, mountain breezes, and pristine waters, a favorite destination for city dwellers escaping the summer heat. Among those who found their way to Fryeburg during that era was the legendary Arctic explorer Robert Peary, who sharpened his navigation skills while surveying the town as a young civil engineer. Today, visitors and residents alike enjoy Fryeburg's many quiet parks, beautifully maintained historic buildings, and exciting outdoor recreation opportunities. The annual Fryeburg Fair, Maine's largest agricultural exhibition, keeps the town's origins and traditions alive.

The celebration of Fryeburg's 250th anniversary is not merely about the passing of time. It is about human accomplishment. We celebrate the people who, for longer than America has been a nation, have pulled together, cared for one another, and built a great community. Thanks to those who came before, Fryeburg, ME, has a wonderful history. Thanks to those there today, it has a bright future.

RECOGNIZING DICK LOPER

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I wish to speak on behalf of Dick Loper, who will be inducted into the Wyoming Agriculture Hall of Fame at the 101st Wyoming State Fair in August. Since 1992, Wyoming has recognized individuals each year who have made substantial contributions to agriculture in our State. This year I have the honor of presenting this award to Dick with my colleague, Senator BARRASSO.

Dick Loper is known across Wyoming for his rangeland consulting, Federal agency cooperation, and community involvement. As a rangeland consultant, Dick has served Wyoming's farmers, ranchers, and agricultural organizations throughout his entire career. He has also worked as a range consultant to the Wyoming State Grazing Board and has been involved in the organization since its creation. Rawlins Rancher and 2011 Wyoming Agriculture Hall of Fame inductee Niels Hansen commented,

Since his time in the Reagan Administration, Dick has made his home in Wyoming working as a range consultant and helping and teaching many ranchers about the benefits of range monitoring and good range stewardship.

Dick is best known for his commitment to the health of Wyoming's rangelands. For over 30 years, he has worked with Bureau of Land Management, BLM, permittees and other parties to advance livestock management and oversee the implementation of

range improvements. As a member of the Committee on Rangeland Classification, his efforts were crucial in gaining national attention for rangeland health, which led to the establishment of standards of healthy rangelands. These standards now give public land users and managers clear goals for grazing.

Dick Loper is also active in a variety of community organizations important to Wyoming agriculture. He served on the Society for Range Management Select Task Force on Unity in Concepts and the Sustainable Rangelands Roundtable. For his service, Dick has been honored with the Guardian of the Grasslands Award.

On a personal note, it seems I can't go very long without visiting with Dick Loper in Washington. In addition to seeing him in Wyoming, Dick is regularly in DC for meetings with Federal agencies and other partners. It is always helpful receiving the latest on public lands during his visits. I am proud to have the opportunity to recognize Dick Loper's achievements with Senator BARRASSO as a 2013 inductee into the Wyoming Agriculture Hall of Fame. Wyoming and its public lands are well served by his lasting and continuing contributions to our State.

RECOGNIZING JW AND THEA NUCKOLLS

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I will soon be attending the 101st Wyoming State Fair. During the Ag Hall of Fame Picnic, Senator ENZI and I will have the honor of recognizing Jw and Thea Nuckolls as they are inducted into the Wyoming Agriculture Hall of Fame for 2013. I cannot think of two people more deserving of this recognition.

The Nuckolls family came to Wyoming from Virginia in the early 1900s. Jw's parents sold 100 horses in order to purchase the original ranch in 1917. In 1943, the family entered the sheep business by purchasing 500 head of sheep to stock the ranch. Jw was only 12 years old when he began trailing ewes from Moorcroft, where the sheep were bought, to the family ranch 26 miles away.

Jw returned to the ranch after graduating from the University of Wyoming. He was in the market for more sheep, when he met his future wife, Thea. He purchased part of her family's Corriedale flock. The future couple subsequently ran into each other again at the Wyoming State Fair in 1958 and were married the following year. How fitting it is for them to be honored together in the same place where their lives with one another began 55 years ago.

Over the past five decades, Jw and Thea have built a strong, diversified ranching operation. Thea brought registered Angus cows into the family and together she and Jw have built herds of high quality cattle and sheep. Their contributions to agriculture go far beyond their own operation, however. Jw

and Thea helped to start the Mountain States Lamb Cooperative and Center of the Nation Wool Cooperative which serves 1,700 participants and markets approximately 5 million pounds of wool each year, resulting in gross sales of nearly \$10 million. Jw continues to serve as a board member to this day. In addition to the cooperative, Jw has also been active in Wyoming Stock Growers Association, Wyoming Farm Bureau, and the Wyoming Wool Growers Association. Thea has served many years as a 4-H club leader, serves on the Wyoming Cattle Women's Association, Wyoming Wool Growers Auxiliary, and Crook County Farm Bureau.

Jw and Thea have been stalwart representatives of the agriculture industry in every way. Wyoming Stock Growers Association executive vice president Jim Magagna has said that the sheep industry is stronger because of Jw and Thea's involvement. This couple embodies what Wyoming is all about. Honesty, integrity, and hard work are second nature to them. Their willingness to share their knowledge and experience with others ensures that the sheep industry and agriculture in general will continue to be strong in both Wyoming and America for years to come. I would like to extend my congratulations to Jw and Thea and thank them for their dedication to the Wyoming way of life.

TRIBUTE TO BRIAN SCOTT GAMROTH

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, today I come to the floor to tell you about one of Wyoming's own, Brian Scott Gamroth. On the radio, television, or at any number of events, folks all over Wyoming are familiar with his deep, resonating voice. Brian is more than a radio personality; he is an enthusiastic advocate for Wyoming and her people.

Brian spent his youth first at a ranch near Medicine Bow and then at a ranch near Saratoga. His family finally settled in Casper in the mid-1970s. In the early 1980s, Brian had a chance to take on Chicago. He worked for CBS Records, PolyGram, and Geffen Records before the call of Wyoming brought him home to Casper. Brian took over the K2 Radio morning show almost 20 years ago. It remains one of the top rated morning shows anywhere.

Brian is always first to lend his voice to efforts raising awareness for veterans, children, and the needs of the community. No cause is too big or too small for him to show his support. Whether it is the Wyoming Wild Sheep Foundation, the Wyoming Down Syndrome Association, Special Olympics, or many other organizations, Brian generously supports causes that make Wyoming a better place to call home.

Given his impressive resume of generous service, Brian has been selected by the Boys & Girls Clubs of Central Wyoming as the recipient of the Distinguished Service Award. Through his

talents as an entertainer, master of ceremonies, and a community leader, Brian has raised millions of dollars for local and State charities. Last year alone, he was the master of ceremonies at 38 events in four States. Brian has the reputation of being the first to donate his talents, time and treasure for causes that enhance the lives of folks in Wyoming and the region. He joins a distinguished group of alumni who have been recognized with this award, including former U.S. Senator Alan Simpson, Vice President Dick Cheney and his wife Lynne, former U.S. Ambassador to Guatemala Tom Stroock, and Governor Mike Sullivan.

This year marks the 15th annual Boys & Girls Clubs Recognition Breakfast event. For the last 12 years, Brian served as the master of ceremonies. It is fitting that Brian has been chosen to receive the prestigious award this year. On behalf of the children he has helped, the families he has embraced, and friends he has made, I offer my heartfelt congratulations. I am honored to know him and call him my friend. Casper and Wyoming is a better place to live and work because of Brian Scott Gamroth.

TRIBUTE TO CHARLES E. HARMAN, JR.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I rise today to honor a man who has been an invaluable member of my team for 6 unforgettable years, my friend and chief of staff, Charlie Harman.

Charlie first came to Washington in 1970. He took an internship with Senator Richard B. Russell of Georgia, to be near his then-girlfriend Carol, now his wife of 40 years.

This internship sparked a passion for public policy, politics, and the United States Senate Charlie could never extinguish.

After his internship with Senator Russell, the Atlanta, GA native graduated from my alma mater UGA, and took a job as a savings and loan officer with Fulton Federal Savings.

However by 1980, Charlie longed to return to politics and began working for Senator Sam Nunn in Georgia. He finally fulfilled his dream of returning to Washington, D.C. when he was asked to serve as Senator Nunn's chief of staff in 1987. He did so until 1992.

He then returned to the private sector as president of the Georgia Chamber of Commerce. In 1996, he left the Chamber and was named vice president of public affairs for Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Georgia.

Seven years later, after Senator Paul Coverdell died tragically and unexpectedly, Zell Miller was appointed to fill the unexpired seat. Charlie stepped in to be his chief of staff—organizing his office and hiring his staff.

Miller ran for the seat in November 2000 and was elected to serve the final 4 years of Coverdell's term. Charlie returned to Georgia and his job at Blue Cross/Blue Shield.

As you can see, Charlie has been an integral part of Georgia's U.S. Senate history, and his was a name that came up often when I found myself in need of a chief of staff in 2007.

When I interviewed Charlie, I remember asking him what his hobbies were. He replied, 'I don't have a hobby, I just like to work.' That turned out to be true.

I remember telling him my personal policy is to hire good people and then leave them alone to do their job.

In this respect, there are never days when I worry my chief of staff would not be in the office, or a task will not be done. He is passionate and dedicated, and I am better able to focus on my tasks knowing he is there.

Ralph Waldo Emerson once said that "Big jobs usually go to the men who prove their ability to outgrow small ones."

I do not see that in Charlie. He places emphasis on all aspects of the job—big and small.

He walks away from a room full of CEOs to answer the front office phones, so the staff assistants can have a break.

He makes constituent mail a number one priority, ensuring all Georgians receive a quality response by week's end.

And he is never too busy to talk to folks visiting from Georgia, or staffers who are having personal troubles.

Anyone would be amazed to see how he manages such a high-pressure environment with efficiency, focus, and vision. Charlie inspires confidence in the staff and he inspires loyalty.

In my 19 years in Congress, I have had the good fortune of having many talented staffers. You never forget the work they have done for you.

On August 5, Charlie will be leaving my office to join Emory University as its Vice President for Government Relations. I congratulate Charlie and wish him well in his new position.

Charlie has made a difference in thousands of lives around the Hill, around this town, and around Georgia. I will never forget all he has accomplished, and he will be sorely missed.

TRIBUTE TO GERALDINE "JERRIE" MOCK

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Newark, OH native Jerrie Mock, the first woman to fly solo around the world. On September 14, 2013, a bronze statue will be dedicated in honor of her accomplishments at The Works: Ohio Center for History, Art & Technology, a science and history museum for children in Newark, OH.

On March 19, 1964, at the age of 38, the Ohio native and self-described "flying housewife" set off from Columbus, OH on her solo flight around the world in a 1953 Cessna 180 single-engine monoplane named the "Spirit of Columbus." She made the flight in 29 days, including 21 stopovers, covering 22,860 miles.

Jerrie has received numerous awards, including the FAA Gold Medal for Exceptional Service. She made her mark in the aviation world as the first woman to fly solo around the world and also completed other feats worthy of recognition. Her contributions have helped to shape the future of American aviation for our children and grandchildren.

Today, I would like to commend Jerrie Mock for her accomplishments and thank all those who contributed to enshrining her legacy for all Ohioans.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

HAMPTON, NEW HAMPSHIRE

• Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, today I wish to honor Hampton, NH—an historic Granite State community that is also one of the most popular vacation destinations in New England.

A crown jewel of New Hampshire's seacoast, Hampton was one of four original New Hampshire towns and was located in an area originally known as Winnacunnet. According to a town history, it was settled in the autumn of 1638. Incorporated as Hampton in 1639, the current day high school is named Winnacunnet High School—home of the Warriors.

With the arrival of the railroad in the mid 1800s, Hampton became a summertime favorite of travelers from near and far—starting the town's long tradition of providing welcoming hospitality. On a hot summer day, Hampton Beach can expect to see around 100,000 visitors on its beautiful beaches and boardwalk. Generations of New Hampshire families have spent their summer vacation on the shores of Hampton Beach—eating fresh seafood in its restaurants, splashing in the surf, enjoying beachside concerts, and playing in the arcades.

Hampton has been the home of many historical and famous figures. First Lady of the United States, Jane Pierce, called Hampton home, as did former Governor Stephen E. Merrill and former Congressman Tristram Shaw.

Whether it is scenic Hampton Beach, the Tuck Museum or the historic James House historic site—which is described as what may be the earliest surviving example of the two-room deep, center chimney colonial in New Hampshire—the proud people of Hampton have contributed conspicuously to the spirit and heritage of New Hampshire during the town's first 375 years.

Hampton holds a special place in the hearts of citizens across New Hampshire. On this day, I am pleased to recognize the 375th anniversary of Hampton—saluting its citizens and recognizing their accomplishments, their love of country, their warm hospitality, and their spirit of independence.●

LISBON, NEW HAMPSHIRE

• Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, today I wish to honor Lisbon, NH—a town in

Grafton County that is celebrating the 250th anniversary of its founding. I am proud to join citizens across the Granite State in recognizing this historic event.

Famous for its annual Lilac Festival, Lisbon is located along the Ammonoosuc and Gale rivers in the shadow of Babbit Hill.

The land that would become Lisbon was granted in a charter as Concord by Gov. Benning Wentworth in 1763. Renamed Chiswick, the name was subsequently changed to Gunthwaite. At a town meeting in 1824, it was renamed Lisbon in honor of Lisbon, Portugal.

The population has grown to include over 1,500 residents. The patriotism and commitment of the people of Lisbon is reflected in part by their record of service in defense of our Nation.

Among those patriots were Revolutionary War veterans Samuel Young and MAJ Benjamin Whitcomb. Young and members of his family fought in the Battle of Bunker Hill, while Whitcomb, also known as the "Dreaded Scout," was the leader of Whitcomb's Independent Corps of Rangers.

New England Wire Technologies first opened in 1899, and it has grown to become a leader in the design and manufacture of multiconductor cables, custom braids, and strands. Today the company has over 330 employees and is one of the larger employers in the area.

According to a town history, "Three of the five peg mills in the United States were located in Lisbon. Parker Young Company was at one time the largest manufacturer of piano sounding boards in the world. There were two railroad stations, a library, a gold rush, a small airport and the first rope ski tow in New Hampshire."

Lisbon is a place that has contributed much to the life and spirit of the State of New Hampshire. I am pleased to extend my warm regards to the people of Lisbon as they celebrate the town's 250th anniversary.●

RECOGNIZING HALLIE BELL

• Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Hallie Bell for her hard work as an intern in my Cheyenne office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Hallie is a native of Cody, WY, and is a graduate of Cody High School. She currently attends the University of Wyoming, where she is an art and English major. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Hallie for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

RECOGNIZING OMAR ETMAN

• Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Omar Etman for his hard work as an intern in my Rock Springs office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Omar is from Rock Springs, WY, and a graduate of Rock Springs High School. He plans to attend New York University beginning this fall as a journalism major. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Omar for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his next journey.●

RECOGNIZING KIP FAIRCLOTH

• Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Kip Faircloth for his hard work as an intern in my Washington, DC, office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Kip is a native of Buffalo, WY, and a graduate of Buffalo High School. He currently attends the University of Montana, where he is a political science major. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Kip for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his next journey.●

RECOGNIZING SHELBY JORGENSEN

• Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Shelby Jorgensen for her hard work as an intern in my Casper office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Shelby is a native of Casper, WY, and is a graduate of Natrona County High School. She currently attends the University of Wyoming where she is an elementary education major. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Shelby for the dedication she has shown while working for

me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

RECOGNIZING TESS KERSENBROCK

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Tess Kersensbrock for her hard work as an intern in my Casper office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Tess is a native of Casper, WY, and is a graduate of Kelly Walsh High School. She currently attends Colorado State University, where she is a political science major. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Tess for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

RECOGNIZING KIRBY LAWRENCE

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Kirby Lawrence for her hard work as an intern in my Republican policy committee office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Kirby is from Wheatland, WY, and a graduate of Wheatland High School. She currently attends the University of Wyoming, where she is an economics major. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Kirby for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

RECOGNIZING MADELEINE LEWIS

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Madeleine Lewis for her hard work as an intern in my Cheyenne office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Madeleine is a native of Cheyenne, WY, and is a graduate of Cheyenne Central High School. She currently attends the Carleton College, where she is a political science major. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset

to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Madeleine for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

RECOGNIZING HAL LIBBY

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Hal Libby for his continued hard work as an intern in my Republican policy committee office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Hal is a native of McLean, VA, and a graduate of Thomas Jefferson High School. He currently attends Yale University, where he is a history major. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Hal for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his next journey.●

RECOGNIZING JOSH MESSER

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Josh Messer for his hard work as an intern in my U.S. Senate Committee on Indian Affairs office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Josh is a native of Cheyenne, WY, and a graduate of Cheyenne East High School. He currently attends the University of Wyoming, where he is a molecular biology and chemistry major. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Josh for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his next journey.●

RECOGNIZING BRANDON ROSTY

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Brandon Rosty for his hard work as an intern in my Washington, DC, office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Brandon is a native of Casper, WY, and graduated from Natrona County

High School. He currently attends Georgetown University, where he is a government and history major. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Brandon for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his next journey.●

RECOGNIZING MIKE STOPP

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Mike Stopp for his hard work as an intern in my U.S. Senate Committee on Indian Affairs office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Mike is from Tahlequah, OK. He currently attends Northeastern State University, where he is a business administration/finance major. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Mike for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his next journey.●

RECOGNIZING ASHLEY TRUE

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Ashley True for her hard work as an intern in my Washington, DC, office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Ashley is a native of Casper, WY, and is a graduate of Natrona County High School. She currently attends Black Hills State University, where she is a corporate communication major. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Ashley for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

RECOGNIZING SONYA JOHNSON

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I wish to recognize Sonya Johnson of Fallon, NV, and congratulate her on receiving this year's Ag Advocate Award from

the National Agriculture in the Classroom Organization. This award recognizes efforts to promote agriculture literacy in the classroom, and I am immensely proud that Sonya has been selected from a nationwide group of nominees to receive this prestigious award.

As a mother of five daughters and past president of the Churchill County Farm Bureau, Sonya has demonstrated an exceptional commitment to education, volunteerism, and community service. For more than 30 years, she has given of her time by volunteering to educate Nevada's students about the importance of agriculture, as well as agriculture-related higher education and career opportunities that are available to them. Whether in a classroom, at a farm festival in Las Vegas, or at a community workshop, Sonya has helped countless Nevadans understand the critical role agriculture plays in our State and national heritage. Not only has she used creative methods in her educational efforts, but she also often reaches out to students in remote locations, including Indian reservations, and she has volunteered with children of mine workers as well. Her efforts were recognized in 2010 by the Nevada Agriculture Foundation, which named Sonya the Outstanding Nevada Ag in the Classroom Volunteer.

Sonya's commitment to educating Nevadans about agriculture is truly admirable. She has made an invaluable investment in the lives and futures of Nevada's students. I ask my colleagues to join me in commending Sonya on this well-deserved recognition, and I thank her for her many efforts as a volunteer and educator.●

2013 AROOSTOOK ENTREPRENEUR OF THE YEAR

● Mr. KING. Mr. President, I wish to commend David A. Harbison, Jr., and his company, Bison Pumps, for being named the 2013 Aroostook Entrepreneur of the Year. Bison Pumps, located in Houlton, ME, both designs and manufactures hand-powered water pumps. These impressive and elegant devices provide reliable access to well water without the need for any electricity.

The first Bison pump was born out of necessity during Maine's Great Ice Storm of 1998, which crippled parts of Maine for several weeks. Over half of our State lost power, some areas for more than 2 weeks. Like many Mainers faced with adversity, Mr. Harbison and his team of plumbers responded to disaster with resilience and innovation. They designed and built what would be the first Bison hand pump, which allowed people whose electric pumps were inoperable in the aftermath of the storm to access the water in their wells. Since 1998, this timely and resourceful design has gained international appeal and application.

Now a strong and growing business with 12 employees, Bison Pumps sells

its polished stainless steel products around the country and all over the world. From the woods of northern Maine to the hustle and bustle of Singapore, these pumps are making a difference by allowing people to access well water without electricity. Just recently, a ministry organization bought one of the pumps, which is now helping them provide much needed clean water to people in Haiti.

We have many great small businesses in Maine, and the 2013 Aroostook Entrepreneur of the Year Award winner, Mr. Harbison and Bison Pumps, is certainly one of them. Bison Pumps represents the bold, free-thinking spirit that defines the State of Maine. I am proud to join in recognizing their ingenuity, and I expect they will continue to impress us—both in Maine and around the world with their superb products.●

REMEMBERING VERNON AND MARIE NELSON

● Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, there are many things I admire about folks from my home State of Kansas but especially how Kansans carry on the traditions of previous generations. No tradition runs deeper in Kansas than the tradition of working on a family farm.

Across our Nation, 98 percent of our country's 2 million farms are family owned. For many Kansas children, growing up on a farm is a way of life. By working alongside their parents, grandparents, and neighbors, young people learn important life skills and values like hard work, personal responsibility, and perseverance.

Gary Nelson of Falun, KS learned many of these life skills on the farm by working alongside his parents, Vernon and Marie Nelson. The Nelson family farm has been in his family for 144 years. It was originally homesteaded by Gary's great-grandfather Lars Frederick Nelson, in 1869. Nineteen years ago, Gary's father Vernon passed away, leaving the management of the farm in his hands. In the years that followed, Gary took over the farm operations with the help of his mother. But just a few weeks ago, Marie passed away. The community of Falun lost two special people when Vernon and Marie passed away.

Both of Gary's parents came from a strong Swedish heritage and were well known in the small rural community of Falun in Saline County. They were married in 1952 and spent the next 42 years together, raising their son, managing the farm, and investing in the local community. A strong work ethic and an abiding care for others were defining attributes of both Vernon and Marie. They were also both skilled craftsmen—Vernon once made a walnut box that contained a bronze sculpture for President Ronald Reagan, and Marie had a love for quilting and once worked on a special quilt that was given to Nancy Reagan.

Vernon and Marie were also very proud of their son and came to visit

Gary while he was working as an intern for former Senator Bob Dole in the summer of 1983. One of their special memories was enjoying lunch together in the Senate dining room at the invitation of Senator Dole.

In small rural towns across Kansas, people work hard, take pride in their communities and care for one another. Vernon and Marie were two such people. Gary recently said this about his parents: "They are part of the fabric that is our community now and that of the future." Individuals like Vernon and Marie also make up the fabric of our country, and their contributions have made our Nation what it is today. Vernon and Marie lived each day to its fullest, and their devotion to those around them stands as an inspiration to us all.

I extend my heartfelt sympathies to Gary and the Nelson family and friends. I ask my colleagues and all Kansans to remember the Nelson family in your thoughts and prayers in the days ahead.●

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions.

(The message received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:37 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2397. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 8:06 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 1092. An act to designate the air route traffic control center located in Nashua, New Hampshire, as the "Patricia Clark Boston Air Route Traffic Control Center".

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2397. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 2218. An act to amend subtitle D of the Solid Waste Disposal Act to encourage recovery and beneficial use of coal combustion residuals and establish requirements for the proper management and disposal of coal combustion residuals that are protective of human health and the environment.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 1392. A bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-2465. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Navigation and Navigable Waters; Technical, Organizational, and Conforming Amendments; Correction" (RIN1625-AC06) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2466. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Ohio River, Mile 469.4-470.0; Bellevue, KY" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0558)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2467. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Pamlico River and Tar River; Washington, NC" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0517)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2468. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Skagit River Bridge, Skagit River, Mount Vernon, WA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2012-0449)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2469. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Fifth Coast Guard District Fireworks Display Cape Fear River; Wilmington, NC" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0115)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2470. A communication from the Deputy Administrator, Research and Innovative Technology Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Transportation Statistics Annual Report 2012"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2471. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to the Export Administration Regulations: Military Vehicles; Vessels of War; Submersible Vessels; Oceanographic Equipment; Related Items; and Auxiliary and Miscellaneous Items that the President Determines No Longer Warrant Control under the United States Munitions List" (RIN0694-AF39) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2472. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendments to the Export Administration Regulations: Implementation of Limited Syria Waiver for Reconstruction Assistance" (RIN0694-AF94) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2473. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Amendment 37; Correction" (RIN0648-BC66) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2474. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; 2013 Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Quota Specifications" (RIN0648-XC513) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2475. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Enhanced Document Requirements To Support Use of the Dolphin Safe Label on Tuna Products" (RIN0648-BC78) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2476. A communication from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Hazardous Materials Safety, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Hazardous Materials: Revision of Requirements for Fireworks Approval (RRR)" (RIN2137-AE70) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2477. A communication from the Program Analyst, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard; Final Listing of 2014 Light Duty Truck Lines Subject to the Requirements of This Standard and Exempted Vehicle Lines for Model Year 2014" (RIN2127-AL42) received during

adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2478. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Michael C. Gould, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2479. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Walter E. Gaskin, Sr., United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2480. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Robert S. Harward, Jr., United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2481. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 13441 with respect to Lebanon; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2482. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Annual Report to Congress on the Presidential 1 Dollar Coin Program"; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2483. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Bureau of the Fiscal Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Sale and Issue of Marketable Book-Entry Treasury Bills, Notes, and Bonds" (31 CFR Part 356) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2484. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report to the President and Congress Medicaid Home and Community-Based Alternatives to Psychiatric Residential Treatment Facilities Demonstration"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2485. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Annual Report to Congress on the Medicare and Medicaid Integrity Programs Report for Fiscal Year 2011; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2486. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Change in Terminology: 'Mental Retardation' to 'Intellectual Disability'" (RIN0960-AH52) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2487. A communication from the Program Manager, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; Exchange Functions: Standards for Navigators and Non-Navigator Assistance Personnel; Consumer Assistance Tools and Programs of an Exchange and Certified Application Counselors" (RIN0938-AR75; 0938-AR04) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July

15, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2488. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Department of Justice Report to Congress Concerning the International Marriage Broker Regulation Act"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2489. A communication from the Senior Attorney Advisor, Office of Violence Against Women, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removing Unnecessary Office on Violence Against Women Regulations" (RIN1105-AB40) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LEVIN for the Committee on Armed Services.

Jon T. Rymer, of Tennessee, to be Inspector General, Department of Defense.

*Stephen Woolman Preston, of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

*Susan J. Rabern, of Kansas, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

*Dennis V. McGinn, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

*Army nomination of Gen. Martin E. Dempsey, to be General.

*Navy nomination of Adm. James A. Winnefeld, Jr., to be Admiral.

*Navy nomination of Adm. Cecil E.D. Haney, to be Admiral.

*Army nomination of Lt. Gen. Curtis M. Scaparrotti, to be General.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Stephen W. Wilson, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. Robin Rand, to be General.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Russell J. Handy, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Col. Roger L. Nye, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. David L. Mann, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Raymond A. Thomas III, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Col. Marion Garcia, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. John W. Lathrop, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Edward C. Cardon, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Thomas E. Ayres, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Flora D. Darpino, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Michael S. Tucker, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Col. Charles N. Pede, to be Brigadier General, Judge Advocate General's Corps.

Army nominations beginning with Colonel Carl A. Alex and ending with Colonel Eric J. Wesley, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 27, 2013. (minus 2 nominees: Colonel David W. Riggins; Colonel Robert J. Ulse)

Army nomination of Lt. Gen. Kenneth E. Tovo, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Robert B. Abrams, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Kevin L. McNeely, to be Major General.

Marine Corps nomination of Lt. Gen. Thomas D. Waldhauser, to be Lieutenant General.

Navy nomination of Capt. Deborah P. Haven, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Vice Adm. Frank C. Pandolfe, to be Vice Admiral.

Navy nomination of Vice Adm. Harry B. Harris, Jr., to be Admiral.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. William F. Moran, to be Vice Admiral.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. James F. Caldwell, Jr., to be Vice Admiral.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) David F. Baucom and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) Vincent L. Griffith, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 27, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) Colin G. Chinn and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) Elaine C. Wagner, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 27, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) Paul B. Becker and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) Jan E. Tighe, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 27, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) David H. Lewis and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) James D. Syring, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 27, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) John C. Aquilino and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) Michael S. White, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 27, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Capt. Russell E. Allen and ending with Capt. Thomas W. Marotta, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 27, 2013.

Navy nomination of Vice Adm. Kurt W. Tidd, to be Vice Admiral.

Navy nomination of Capt. Kenneth J. Iverson, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

Air Force nominations beginning with Wendy J. Beal and ending with Jared K. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 9, 2013.

Air Force nomination of Peter C. Rhee, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of Joseph M. Markusfeld, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with Deondra P. Asike and ending with Gregory C. Trolley, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 24, 2013.

Army nomination of Ronald E. Beresky, to be Major.

Army nomination of James B. Collins, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Jonathan H. Cody and ending with Justin M. Marchesi, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 20, 2013.

Army nominations beginning with Joseph L. Biehler and ending with Bienvenido

Serranocastro, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 24, 2013.

Army nomination of Dean C. Anderson, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Christopher D. Perrin, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Sheena L. Allen and ending with Miao X. Zhou, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 9, 2013.

Army nominations beginning with Courtney L. Abraham and ending with D011476, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 9, 2013.

Army nominations beginning with Christopher L. Aaron and ending with Nathan P. Zwintscher, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 9, 2013.

Army nominations beginning with Richard R. Abelkis and ending with G001407, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 9, 2013.

Army nominations beginning with Joseph H. Albrecht and ending with D011309, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 9, 2013.

Army nomination of Karl F. Meyer, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Stephanie M. Price, to be Major.

Army nomination of Gregory C. Pedro, to be Major.

Army nomination of John H. Seok, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Frederick C. Lough, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Admirado A. Luzuriaga and ending with Jon Kiev, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 24, 2013.

Army nominations beginning with William G. Huber and ending with Mark L. Leitschuh, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 24, 2013.

Army nomination of Curtis J. Alitz, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Guy R. Beaudoin and ending with Rebecca A. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 24, 2013.

Navy nomination of Jackie S. Fantes, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Doran T. Kelvington, to be Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Orenthal G. Adderson and ending with John F. Warner III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 27, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Philip B. Bagrow and ending with David M. Todd, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 9, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Tanya Cruz and ending with Jeanine B. Womble, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 9, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Rene J. Alovera and ending with Joyce Y. Turner, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 9, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with James Alger and ending with Jason N. Wood, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 9, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Christopher W. Abbott and ending with Lorenzo Tarpley, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 9, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Mary R. Anker and ending with Georgina L. Zuniga, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 9, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Lillian A. Abuan and ending with Christopher R. Zegley, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 9, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Erin G. Adams and ending with Luke A. Zabrocki, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 9, 2013.

Navy nomination of Timothy C. Moore, Jr., to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Pierre A. Pelletier, to be Captain.

By Mr. Rockefeller for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

*Jannette Lake Dates, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2016.

*Bruce M. Ramer, of California, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2018.

*Brent Franklin Nelsen, of South Carolina, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2016.

*Howard Abel Husock, of New York, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2018.

*Loretta Cheryl Sutliff, of Nevada, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2018.

*Thomas Edgar Wheeler, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 2013.

*Thomas Edgar Wheeler, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of five years from July 1, 2013.

*Mark E. Schaefer, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere.

*Thomas C. Carper, of Illinois, to be a Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors for a term of five years.

*Coast Guard nominations beginning with Bruce D. Baffer and ending with Joseph A. Servidio, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 15, 2013.

*Coast Guard nomination of Kurt B. Hinrichs, to be Rear Admiral.

*Coast Guard nomination of Richard T. Gromlich, to be Rear Admiral.

By Mrs. BOXER for the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

*Avi Garbow, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

*James J. Jones, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Administrator for Toxic Substances of the Environmental Protection Agency.

*Kenneth J. Kopocis, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

By Mr. MENENDEZ for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

*Morrell John Berry, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Australia.

Nominee: Morrell John Berry.

Post: AMB to Australia.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, donee:

1. Self: \$1,000, 6/2/09, Hoyer for Congress; Hoyer for Congress: \$1,000, 10/8/10, Hoyer for Congress; \$1,000, 4/24/12, Hoyer for Congress; \$1,000, 6/15/13, Hoyer for Congress; \$250, 10/28/10, Tammy Baldwin for Senate; \$500, 6/30/11, Tammy Baldwin for Senate; \$1,000, 10/4/12, Ben Cardin for Senate; \$250, 3/30/12, Krysten Sinema for Congress; \$2,500, 8/13/12, Obama Victory Fund; \$2,500, 10/23/12, Obama for America.

2. Spouse: N/A.

3. Children and Spouses: N/A.

4. Parents: deceased.

5. Grandparents: deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: none.

7. Sisters and Spouses: none.

*Patricia Marie Haslach, of Oregon, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia.

Nominee: Patricia Marie Haslach.

Post: Ethiopia.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, donee:

1. Self: none.

2. Spouse: divorced.

3. Children and Spouses: Shereen Herbert: none; Kiran Herbert: none.

4. Parents: Patricia M. Haslach: none.

5. Grandparents: deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Timothy Haslach: none.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Mary Powers: none; Matt Powers: none; Margaret Haslach: none; Maureen Rankin: none; Mark Rankin: none.

*Reuben Earl Brigety, II, of Florida, to be Representative of the United States of America to the African Union, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

Nominee: Reuben Earl Brigety, II.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to the AU.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, donee:

1. Self: \$1200, 8/27/08, Obama for America; \$1100, 8/27/08, Obama for America; \$2300, 8/16/08, Obama Victory Fund; \$500, 2/08/08, Obama for America; \$250, 11/27/07, Obama for America.

2. Spouse: \$200, 10/20/08, Obama for America; \$800, 10/16/08, Obama for America; \$800, 10/12/08, Obama Victory Fund; \$200, 10/25/08, Obama for America; \$200, 10/25/08, Obama for America.

3. Children and Spouses: none.

4. Parents: none.

5. Grandparents: none.

6. Brothers and Spouses: none.

7. Sisters and Spouses: none.

*Daniel A. Clune, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Ex-

traordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Lao People's Democratic Republic.

Nominee: Daniel A. Clune.

Post: Lao People's Democratic Republic.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, Amount, Date, Donee:

1. Self: None.

2. Spouse: None.

3. Children and Spouses: Margaret Clune Giblin: \$55, Sep 2013, Barack Obama. Bryan Giblin: None. Sarah Clune Hartman: None. Robert Hartman: None. Kathryn Clune: \$35, Nov 2012, Barack Obama.

4. Parents: William H. Clune, Jr.: Deceased. Helen Clune: Deceased.

5. Grandparents: James Hadley: Deceased. Ethel Hadley: Deceased. William H. Clune: Deceased. Gatel Clune: Deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: William H. Clune III: \$250, May 2012, Tammy Baldwin; Less than \$250, 2012, Barack Obama. Constance Clune: None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Sheila Fariel: Deceased. Susan Lorenz Aiken: Deceased. Sarah Clune: \$20, 2012, Barack Obama. Michael Long, None.

*Patrick Hubert Gaspard, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of South Africa.

Nominee: Patrick Hubert Gaspard.

Post: South Africa.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, Amount, Date, Donee:

1. Self: None.

2. Spouse: \$100, 2012, Obama for America.

3. Children and Spouses: N/A.

4. Parents: Father—Deceased. Mother—None.

5. Grandparents: N/A—Deceased

6. Brothers and Spouses: None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: None.

*Stephanie Sanders Sullivan, of New York, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Congo.

Nominee: Stephanie S. Sullivan.

Post: Brazzaville, Republic of Congo.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, Amount, Date, Donee:

1. Self: None.

2. John H. Sullivan (spouse): None.

3. Daniel W. Sullivan (son): None.

4. Scott W. Sullivan (son): None.

5. John E. Sanders and Barbara W. Sanders (parents, deceased): None.

6. Roger and Gladys Wood (grandparents, deceased): None.

7. Alice H. Sanders (grandmother, deceased): None.

8. William L. Sanders (grandfather, deceased): None.

9. Thomas H. Sanders (brother) and Janice Sanders (sister-in-law): None.

10. Philip E. Sanders (brother): None.

*Joseph Y. Yun, of Oregon, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Malaysia.

Nominee: Joseph Y. Yun.

Post: Ambassador to Malaysia.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, Amount, Date, Donee:

1. Self: \$100, 2013, Korean Americans for Obama.

2. Spouse: \$100, 2012, Emily's List, \$250, 2012, Obama for America.

3. Children and Spouses: Matthew and Amy Yun: None.

4. Parents: Chunja Kim: None. Sukwoon Yun: Deceased.

5. Grandparents: Hyung-Joong Yun: Deceased. Yuk-sung Ryu: Deceased. Chan-Ho Kim: Deceased. Bong-Ja Kim: Deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Yuojin Yun: None. Sookwon Kim: None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Haechin Priestly: None. Richard Priestly: None. Haesun Yun: None. Chulho Lieu: None.

*Linda Thomas-Greenfield, of Louisiana, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (African Affairs).

*James F. Entwistle, of Virginia, a career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Republic of Nigeria.

Nominee: James F. Entwistle.

Post: Abuja.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: none.

2. Spouse: Pamela G. Schmoll: none.

3. Children and Spouses: Jennifer B.S. Entwistle (Daughter, not married): none; Jeffrey W.S. Entwistle (Son, not married): none.

4. Parents: Oliver H. Entwistle, Jr. (Father—deceased); Barbara G. Entwistle (Mother): \$100, 11/9/11, Obama for America; \$50, 11/15/11, Obama for America; \$100, 1/12/12, Obama for America; \$100, 3/4/12, Obama for America; \$100, 7/13/12, Obama for America; \$200, 8/20/12, Obama for America; \$50.75, 3/4/12, Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee (DSCC); \$50, 7/13/12, Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee (DSCC).

5. Grandparents: Geraldine Gaskill—deceased; Loren B. Gaskill—deceased; Emily G. Entwistle—deceased; Oliver H. Entwistle—deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Steven D. Entwistle (only sibling): none; Sharon B. Entwistle (his wife): none.

7. Sisters and Spouses: N/A.

*David D. Pearce, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Greece.

Nominee: David D. Pearce.

Post: Greece.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge the infor-

mation contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: none.

2. Spouse: None.

3. Children and Spouses: Jennifer Eva Pearce: none; Joseph Alan Pearce: none.

4. Parents: D. Duane Pearce: none; Mary Jean Pearce: none.

5. Grandparents: Howard A. Pearce—deceased; Muriel Pearce—deceased; Joseph Little—deceased; Urania Little—deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Michael Pearce: none; Kathleen Pearce: none; Jonathan Pearce—deceased; Robyn Pearce: none; Christopher Pearce—deceased.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Elizabeth Hunt: none. (NB: My sister was divorced this past year from David Hunt, who was reported as her spouse on the 2008 Federal Campaign Contribution Report that I filed in connection with my nomination as Ambassador to Algeria).

*John B. Emerson, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Republic of Germany.

Nominee: John Bonnell Emerson.

Post: Ambassador to Germany.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amounts, date, and donee:

1. Self: \$1,500, 02/05/2013, Capital Group Inc. PAC; \$2,500, 02/2013, Shaheen, Jeanne; \$1,000, 03/2013, Markey, Ed; \$1,000, 03/2013, Hagen, Kay; \$1,000, 04/2013, Frankin, AL; \$1,000, 04/2013, Begich, Mark; \$-5,000, 12/21/2012, OfftheSidelinesPAC; \$1,000, 11/06/2012, Waxman, Henry; \$500, 10/07/2012, Nevada Senate Victory Fund; \$2,500, 10/02/2012, Feinstein, Dianne, \$5,000, 09/28/2012, OfftheSidelinesPAC; \$1,000, 09/15/2012, Garamendi, John; \$1,000, 09/14/2012, Carmona, Richard; \$1,000, 08/27/2012, Brown, Sherrod; \$2,500; 08/09/2012, Carper, Tom; \$-100, 07/20/2012, DSCCmte/California; \$200, 07/08/2012, DSCCmte/California; \$250, 06/28/2012, Bysiewicz, Susan; \$30,800, 05/31/2012; DNC; \$1,000, 2012, Kloubachar, Amy; \$1,000, 05/15/2012, Donnelly, Joe; \$1,000, 04/11/2012, McCaskill, Claire; \$2,500, 03/28/2012, Kennedy III, Joe; \$2,000, 03/13/2012, Nelson, Bill; \$500, 03/13/2012, Nelson, Bill; \$1,000, 03/06/2012, Hahn, Janice; \$1,000, 02/22/2012, Ruiz, Raul; \$1,000, 02/15/2012, Cherny, Andrei; \$1,000, 01/10/2012, Wasserman Schultz, Debbie; \$2,500, 10/28/2011, Warren, Elizabeth, \$500, 10/07/2011, Bass, Karen; \$250, 09/30/2011, Bass, Karen; \$1,000, 09/30/2011, Berman, Howard; \$1,000, 09/23/2011, Gillibrand, Kirsten; \$500, 09/21/2010, DCCC; \$500, 09/14/2010, Coons, Chris; \$1,000, 06/23/2010, Hodes, Paul; \$500, 06/07/2010, Blumenauer, Earl; \$1,000, 05/29/2010, Gillibrand, Kirsten; \$500, 08/17/2011, Nelson, Bill; \$1,000, 07/13/2011, Khazei, Alan; \$500, 06/15/2011, Brown, Sherrod; \$5,000, 06/09/2011, Obama Victory Fund; \$5,000, 06/09/2011, DNC; \$2,500, 05/23/2011, Kaine, Tim; \$500, 03/30/2011, Sherman, Brad; \$2,500, 03/07/011, Feinstein, Dianne; \$1,000, 03/03/2011; McCaskill, Claire; \$1,000, 10/27/2010, Dingell, John; \$500, 10/06/2010, Harman, Jane; \$500, 09/21/2010, Gillibrand, Kirsten; \$500, 09/21/2010, DCCC; \$500, 09/14/2010, Coons, Chris; \$1,000, 06/23/2010, Hodes, Paul; \$500, 06/07/2010, Blumenauer, Earl; \$1,000, 05/29/2010, Gillibrand, Kirsten; \$250, 05/13/2010, Critz, Mark; \$250, 05/10/2010, Bass, Karen; \$600, 02/05/2010, Boxer, Barbara; \$400, 02/05/2010, Boxer, Barbara; \$1,000, 01/11/2010, Fisher, Lee; \$500, 12/17/2009, Meek, Kendrick; \$1,000, 11/02/2009, Khazei, Alan; \$1,000, 09/29/2009, Bennet, Michael; \$1,000, 09/23/2009, Berman, Howard; \$500, 06/30/2009, Dorgan, Byron; \$500, 06/26/2009, Obey, David; \$1,000, 06/18/2009, Garamendi, John; \$-500, 05/13/2009, Chu, Judy; \$500, 05/05/2009, Chu, Judy.

2. Spouse: Kimberly Marteau: \$5,000, 09/17/2012, Off The Sidelines PAC; \$2,500, 09/19/2011, DNC; \$1,000, 02/10/2010, Carnahan, Robin; \$5,000, 06/21/2011, Obama Victory Fund; \$500, 09/30/2011, Brown, Sherrod.

3. Children and spouses: none.

4. Parents: James Emerson (Father): \$250, 10/10/2012, Obama Victory Fund, subsequently disbursed in full to Obama for America; \$200, 09/21/2012, DCCC; \$312, 07/18/2012, DCCC; \$50, 2012, DCCC; \$125, 2012, DCCC; \$150, 2012, DCCC; \$200, 2011, DCCC; \$100, 2011, DCCC; \$200, 11/13/2009, DSCC; \$85, 2012, DLCC.

5. Grandparents: none.

6. Brother: James Emerson: \$250, 10/10/2012, Obama Victory Fund.

*John Rufus Gifford, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Denmark.

Nominee: John Rufus Gifford.

Post: Ambassador to Denmark.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: \$500, 8/19/10, Friends of Barb. Boxer; \$500, 9/14/11, Kaine for VA; \$5000, 11/22/11, Obama Victory Fund; \$500, 11/29/11, Tammy Baldwin for Senate; \$1000, 6/25/12, Cicilline Committee.

2. Children and Spouses: N/A.

3. Parents: Charles Gifford: \$2500, 7/27/09, DNC; \$2400, 1/16/10, Coakley for Senate; \$15200, 3/15/10, DNC; \$2400 6/30/10 Bennett for CO; \$2400, 10/21/10, Bennett for CO; \$2460, 2/14/11, McCaskill for MO; \$1500, 6/30/11, Khazei for MA; \$17,500, 9/28/11, Obama Victory Fund; \$2000, 10/29/11, Bill Keating Committee; \$2000, 11/15/11, Barney Frank for Congress; \$7500, 12/09/11, Obama Victory Fund; \$2500, 12/31/11, Obama Victory Fund; \$2500, 3/14/12, Joe Kennedy for Congress; \$2500, 7/19/12, Kaine for VA; \$40000 8/1/12, Obama Victory Fund; \$1000, 8/23/12, Joe Kennedy for Congress; \$1500, 8/26/12, Andrei for AZ; \$1500, 8/27/12, Win VA 2012; \$2000, 9/26/12, Angus King for Senate. Anne Gifford: \$30000, 6/12/09, DNC; \$2000, 10/27/09, Citizens for Alan Khazei; \$2400, 1/16/10, Coakley for Senate; \$15200, 3/15/12, DNC; \$2400, 5/17/10, Barney Frank for Congress; \$1000, 12/1/10, Friends of Sherrod Brown; \$1000, 6/26/11, Khazei for MA; \$1000, 6/30/11, Obama for America; \$17500, 9/28/11, Obama Victory Fund; \$1500, 9/30/11, Khazei for MA; \$15000, 12/18/11, Obama Victory Fund; \$20000, 4/18/12, Obama Victory Fund; \$2500, 7/19/12, Kaine for VA; \$1000, 8/23/12, Joe Kennedy for Congress; \$1000, 8/27/12, Win VA 2012; \$2000, 9/13/12, Tisei Congressional Cmte.

4. Grandparents: N/A.

5. Brothers and Spouses: Charles Gifford, Jr.: \$3500, 9/20/11, Khazei for MA. Betsey Gifford: None.

6. Sisters and Spouses: Ramsay Trussell: None. Geoffrey Trussell: None. Jessica Nigrelli (most made under Jessica Gifford): \$1000, 10/20/09, Coakley for Senate; \$500, 11/05/09, Capuano Committee; \$15200, 3/16/10, DNC; \$2000, 6/11/12, Obama Victory Fund; \$400, 6/30/11, Obama for America; \$500, 7/26/11, Obama Victory Fund; \$1500, 10/31/11, Obama Victory Fund. Andrew Nigrelli: None.

*Denise Campbell Bauer, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Belgium.

Nominee: Denise Campbell Bauer.

Post: Belgium.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I

have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: \$7600, 01/12/2011, DNC; \$500, 06/12/2009, DNC; \$250, 04/16/2011, OVF; \$300, 06/21/2012, OVF; \$300, 06/12/2012, OVF; \$1000, 03/27/2012, OVF; \$1000, 12/13/2011, OVF; \$250, 05/31/2012, OVF; \$250, 09/17/2012, OVF; \$500, 09/25/2012, OVF; \$1000, 09/30/2012, OVF; \$600, 08/23/2012, OVF; \$250, 04/16/2011, OFA; \$1000, 03/27/2012, OFA; \$1000, 12/13/2011, OFA; \$205, 05/31/2012, OFA; \$300, 06/21/2012, OFA; \$300, 06/21/2012 OFA; \$645, 09/30/2012, DNC; \$250, 09/17/2012, OFA; \$500, 09/25/2012, OFA; \$355, 09/30/2012, OFA; \$250, 09/09/2011, Kaine for Virginia; \$500, 01/31/2012, Kaine for Virginia; \$200, 10/17/2010, Friends of Barbara Boxer.

2. Spouse: Steven Bauer: \$355, 10/10/2012, OFA.

3. Children and Spouses: Katherine Bauer: None. Natalie Bauer: None.

4. Parents: Charlotte Campbell: \$200, 10/04/2012, OVF; \$100, 09/14/2012, OVF; \$25, 08/31/2012, OVF; \$100, 05/31/2012, OVF.

Dennis R. Elston: None. Gaylo Elston: None.

5. Grandparents: Elizabeth Tharp: None. Vernon Tharp: None. Evelyn Elston: None. Charles Elston: None.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Dennis A. Elston: None. Erin Elston: None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Jessica Campbell: None. Michael Reget: None. Mary Elston: None. Elizabeth Williams: None.

*James Costos, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Spain.

Nominee: James Costos.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to Spain, U.S. Ambassador to Andorra.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: 09.16.2009, DNC Services Corporation/Democratic National Committee, \$500; 09.30.2012, Collins For Senate, \$2,500; 04.14.2012, Obama Victory Fund 2012, \$5,000; 06.04.2012, Obama Victory Fund 2012, \$1,250; 07.02.2012, Obama Victory Fund 2012, \$15,000; 08.07.2012, Obama Victory Fund 2012, \$5,000; 10.22.2012, Obama Victory Fund 2012, \$5,000; 12.16.2011, Obama Victory Fund 2012, \$35,800; 04.30.2012, DNC Services Corporation/Democratic National Committee, \$5,000; 06.21.2012, DNC Services Corporation/Democratic National Committee, \$1,250; 07.31.2012, DNC Services Corporation/Democratic National Committee, \$15,000; 09.04.2012, DNC Services Corporation/Democratic National Committee, \$5,000; 10.22.2012, DNC Services Corporation/Democratic National Committee, \$4,550; 12.31.2011, DNC Services Corporation/Democratic National Committee, \$30,800; 12.16.2011, Obama for America, \$2,495; 12.16.2011, Obama for America, \$2,500; 9.27.2012, Lon Johnson, \$500; 1.1.2013 (est.), Christine Quinn for Mayor, \$2,950; 1.15.2013, Corey Booker for Senate (Primary), \$2,600; 1.15.2013, Corey Booker for Senate (General), \$2,400; 3.19.2013, Kay Hagan for Senate, \$2,600; TOTAL, \$142,695.

2. Spouse: N/A.

3. Children and Spouses: N/A.

4. Parents: Katherine Costos & Charles Costos—no donations.

5. Grandparents: Achilleas Kostopoulos & Kyriakitsa Kostopoulos—no donations.

James Dardas & Theopoula Dardas—no donations.

6. Brothers and Spouses: N/A.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Maria Shahum & Peter Shahum—no donations. Elaine Scott & Jack Scott—no donations.

*James Costos, of California, to serve currently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Andorra.

Nominee: James Costos.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to Spain, U.S. Ambassador to Andorra

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: 9.16.2009, DNC Services Corporation/Democratic National Committee, \$500; 9.30.2012, Collins For Senate, \$2,500; 04.14.2012, Obama Victory Fund 2012, \$5,000; 06.04.2012, Obama Victory Fund 2012, \$1,250; 07.02.2012, Obama Victory Fund 2012, \$15,000; 08.07.2012, Obama Victory Fund 2012, \$5,000; 10.22.2012, Obama Victory Fund 2012, \$5,000; 12.16.2011, Obama Victory Fund 2012, \$35,800; 04.30.2012, DNC Services Corporation/Democratic National Committee, \$5,000; 06.21.2012, DNC Services Corporation/Democratic National Committee, \$1,250; 07.31.2012, DNC Services Corporation/Democratic National Committee, \$15,000; 09.04.2012, DNC Services Corporation/Democratic National Committee, \$5,000; 10.22.2012, DNC Services Corporation/Democratic National Committee, \$4,550; 12.31.2011, DNC Services Corporation/Democratic National Committee, \$30,800; 12.16.2011, Obama for America, \$2,495; 12.16.2011, Obama for America, \$2,500; 9.27.2012, Lon Johnson, \$500; 1.1.2013, (est.) Christine Quinn for Mayor, \$2,950; 1.15.2013, Corey Booker for Senate (Primary), \$2,600; 1.15.2013, Corey Booker for Senate (General), \$2,400; 3.19.2013, Kay Hagan for Senate, \$2,600; TOTAL, \$142,695.

2. Spouse: N/A.

3. Children and Spouses: N/A.

4. Parents: Katherine Costos & Charles Costos—no donations.

5. Grandparents: Achilleas Kostopoulos & Kyriakitsa Kostopoulos—no donations. James Dardas & Theopoula Dardas—no donations.

6. Brothers and Spouses: N/A.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Maria Shahum & Peter Shahum—no donations. Elaine Scott & Jack Scott—no donations.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 1385. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional Federal circuit and dis-

trict judges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. CORKER):

S. 1386. A bill to provide for enhanced embassy security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. JOHANNIS):

S. 1387. A bill to establish a pilot program to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants to non-profit organizations to rehabilitate and modify homes of disabled and low-income veterans; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1388. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Secretary of Energy, to conduct a study on the public health and environmental impacts of the production, transportation, storage, and use of petroleum coke, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 1389. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating the Prison Ship Martyrs' Monument in Fort Greene Park, in the New York City borough of Brooklyn, as a unit of the National Park System; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 1390. A bill to establish an independent advisory committee to review certain regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 1391. A bill to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 and other laws to clarify appropriate standards for Federal employment discrimination and retaliation claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 1392. A bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. NELSON, Mr. REID, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1393. A bill to ensure that the courts of the United States may provide an impartial forum for claims brought by United States citizens and others against any railroad organized as a separate legal entity, arising from the deportation of United States citizens and others to Nazi concentration camps on trains owned or operated by such railroad, and by the heirs and survivors of such persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TESTER:

S. 1394. A bill to provide for the settlement of the water rights claims of the Fort Belknap Indian Community, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. MORAN):

S. 1395. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and

expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 1396. A bill to authorize the Federal Emergency Management Agency to award mitigation financial assistance in certain areas affected by wildfire; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 1397. A bill to improve the efficiency, management, and interagency coordination of the Federal permitting process through reforms overseen by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. COBURN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. TESTER, and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 1398. A bill to require the Federal Government to expedite the sale of underutilized Federal real property; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 1399. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to extend the interest rate limitation on debt entered into during military service to debt incurred during military service to consolidate or refinance student loans incurred before military service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1400. A bill to increase access to adult education to provide for economic growth; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. LEVIN):

S. Res. 202. A resolution designating July 30, 2013, as "National Whistleblower Appreciation Day"; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. Res. 203. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding efforts by the United States to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through a negotiated two-state solution; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KING (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. Res. 204. A resolution designating August 7, 2013, as "National Lighthouse and Lighthouse Preservation Day"; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. HAGAN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MORAN, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. VITTER, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. Res. 205. A resolution expressing support for the designation of September 2013 as National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. WICKER, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. SHELBY, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs.

FEINSTEIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. MORAN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. KING):

S. Res. 206. A resolution designating September 2013 as "National Prostate Cancer Awareness Month"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 154

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 154, a bill to amend title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to ensure that the coverage offered under multi-State qualified health plans offered in Exchanges is consistent with the Federal abortion funding ban.

S. 204

At the request of Mr. ENZI, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 204, a bill to preserve and protect the free choice of individual employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, or to refrain from such activities.

S. 240

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 240, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to modify the per-fiscal year calculation of days of certain active duty or active service used to reduce the minimum age at which a member of a reserve component of the uniformed services may retire for non-regular service.

S. 314

At the request of Mr. REED, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 314, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the health of children and help better understand and enhance awareness about unexpected sudden death in early life.

S. 381

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors of S. 381, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the "Doolittle Tokyo Raiders", for outstanding heroism, valor, skill, and service to the United States in conducting the bombings of Tokyo.

S. 409

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 409, a bill to add Vietnam Veterans Day as a patriotic and national observance.

S. 554

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 554, a bill to provide for a biennial budget process and a biennial appropriations process and to enhance oversight and the performance of the Federal Government.

S. 629

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr.

SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 629, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to recognize the service in the reserve components of the Armed Forces of certain persons by honoring them with status as veterans under law, and for other purposes.

S. 675

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 675, a bill to prohibit contracting with the enemy.

S. 727

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 727, a bill to improve the examination of depository institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 790

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 790, a bill to require the United States International Trade Commission to recommend temporary duty suspensions and reductions to Congress, and for other purposes.

S. 907

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 907, a bill to provide grants to better understand and reduce gestational diabetes, and for other purposes.

S. 1033

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1033, a bill to authorize a grant program to promote physical education, activity, and fitness and nutrition, and to ensure healthy students, and for other purposes.

S. 1053

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1053, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to strengthen and protect Medicare hospice programs.

S. 1140

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1140, a bill to extend the authorization of the Highlands Conservation Act through fiscal year 2024.

S. 1174

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1174, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 65th Infantry Regiment, known as the Borinqueneers.

S. 1195

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1195, a bill to repeal the renewable fuel standard.

S. 1204

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1204, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to protect rights of conscience with regard to requirements for coverage of specific items and services, to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit certain abortion-related discrimination in governmental activities, and for other purposes.

S. 1208

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1208, a bill to require meaningful disclosures of the terms of rental-purchase agreements, including disclosures of all costs to consumers under such agreements, to provide certain substantive rights to consumers under such agreements, and for other purposes.

S. 1215

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1215, a bill to strengthen privacy protections, accountability, and oversight related to domestic surveillance conducted pursuant to the USA PATRIOT Act and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978.

S. 1218

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1218, a bill to establish a State Energy Race to the Top Initiative to assist energy policy innovation in the States to promote the goal of doubling electric and thermal energy productivity by January 1, 2030.

S. 1228

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1228, a bill to establish a program to provide incentive payments to participating Medicare beneficiaries who voluntarily establish and maintain better health.

S. 1254

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1254, a bill to amend the Harmful Algal Blooms and Hypoxia Research and Control Act of 1998, and for other purposes.

S. 1271

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1271, a bill to direct the President to establish guidelines for the United States foreign assistance programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1279

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1279, a bill to prohibit the revocation or withholding of Federal funds to pro-

grams whose participants carry out voluntary religious activities.

S. 1335

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1335, a bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

S. 1342

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1342, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit expensing of certain depreciable business assets for small businesses.

S. 1349

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1349, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 1360

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1360, a bill to amend the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012, including making changes to the Do Not Pay initiative, for improved detection, prevention, and recovery of improper payments to deceased individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 1378

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1378, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for investigative leave requirements with respect to Senior Executive Service employees, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 69

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 69, a resolution calling for the protections of religious minority rights and freedoms in the Arab world.

S. RES. 164

At the request of Mr. UDALL of Colorado, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 164, a resolution designating October 30, 2013, as a national day of remembrance for nuclear weapons program workers.

S. RES. 165

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 165, a resolution calling for the release from prison of former Prime Minister of Ukraine Yulia Tymoshenko in light of the recent European Court of Human Rights ruling.

S. RES. 199

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Delaware

(Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 199, a resolution celebrating the 200th August Quarterly Festival taking place from August 18, 2013, through August 25, 2013, in Wilmington, Delaware.

AMENDMENT NO. 1814

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1814 intended to be proposed to S. 1243, an original bill making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. JOHANNIS):

S. 1387. A bill to establish a pilot program to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants to nonprofit organizations to rehabilitate and modify homes of disabled and low-income veterans; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am proud to be once again reintroducing the Housing Assistance for Veterans Act, HAVEN Act, with my colleague, Senator JOHANNIS.

Last year, we joined forces to successfully pass this legislation as an amendment during the Senate's consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act, NDAA. Unfortunately, due to concerns by some on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, it was not included in the final version of the NDAA. Those concerns have been addressed in this version of the HAVEN Act, and I would like to thank the Veterans' Affairs Committee for working cooperatively with us to strengthen the legislation.

Our veterans have made many personal sacrifices in service to our Nation, and we must honor our commitment to provide them with the care they have earned and deserve. One such way is to ensure that they have access to adequate housing.

According to Rebuilding Together, 5.5 million of our veterans are disabled, and one and a half million are at risk of homelessness. In my home State of Rhode Island, according to the U.S. Census Bureau, there are more than 19,000 veterans with disabilities, each of whom face their own unique challenges in terms of their housing needs.

The Department of Veterans Affairs, VA, has programs that assist veterans in adapting and improving their homes, but unfortunately, these programs do not extend assistance to all veterans with disabilities. It is clear we must do more, and with this legislation, we are seeking to serve all veterans with disabilities, regardless of the severity of the disability and whether the disability is service-connected.

The HAVEN Act will give veterans the opportunity to renovate and modify their existing homes by installing wheelchair ramps, widening doors, re-equipping rooms, and making necessary additions and adjustments to existing structures—all so that these homes are safer and more suitable for our veterans.

Our legislation encourages key stakeholders, such as the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the VA, housing non-profits, and veterans service organizations, to work together to serve our veterans. In order to extend the reach of this Federal funding, grant recipients would be expected to either match Federal funding or make in-kind contributions, through encouraging volunteers to help make repairs or engaging businesses to donate needed supplies.

This bill is supported by the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Vietnam Veterans of America, Paralyzed Veterans of America, VetsFirst, a program of United Spinal Association, Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, Habitat for Humanity, and Rebuilding Together. I thank Senator JOHANNIS for working with me on this important bill, and I look forward to working with him and the rest of our colleagues to pass this legislation.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1388. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Secretary of Energy, to conduct a study on the public health and environmental impacts of the production, transportation, storage, and use of petroleum coke, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am introducing today, with my colleagues Senators Durbin, Stabenow, and Brown, the Petroleum Coke Transparency and Public Health Study Act, which would require the Department of Health and Human Services to conduct a study on the health and environmental impacts of petroleum coke. This bill, which is a companion to a bill introduced by Representative PETERS on June 6, 2013, was motivated by a situation in Detroit.

In March 2013, large piles of uncontained petroleum coke stored along the banks of the Detroit River became publicly visible, raising questions about the potential environmental and public health impacts. Sitting just feet from the Detroit River, the piles have grown to nearly three stories high over the past several months. I want to make sure that this low-grade fuel does not pose a threat to the people of Detroit or impair our waterways. The Detroit River is a valued resource that must be preserved and protected.

Petroleum coke is a byproduct of refining crude oil into liquid fuels such

as gasoline and diesel. It is a commodity that can be cofired with coal to produce low-cost energy. In recent years, a number of U.S. refineries have undergone expansions in order to accommodate increases in processing crude oil, including the Marathon refinery in Detroit, MI; the Cenovus refinery in Wood River, IL; and the BP refinery in Whiting, IN.

With increases in crude oil processing in the United States and Canada, petroleum coke production is expected to rise. However, the impacts of petroleum coke on public health and the environment have not been fully assessed. Further, each State has different regulations for managing, storing, and transporting it. It is important that we understand the market projections for petroleum coke, how to properly manage it, and its potential impacts on public health and the environment.

This bill would address these key knowledge gaps by requiring a comprehensive study on petroleum coke. The study would include an analysis of the public health and environmental impacts of the production, transportation, storage, and use of petroleum coke; an assessment of best practices for storing, transporting, and managing petroleum coke; and a quantitative analysis of current and projected domestic petroleum coke production and utilization locations.

We should ensure that energy production occurs in a diligent and responsible manner and does not harm public health or our environment. With a changing energy market and limited dollars, we must have a comprehensive understanding of how to effectively and efficiently manage our future energy supply. This bill would give us the tools to properly manage petroleum coke production with good environmental and public stewardship.

By Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 1390. A bill to establish an independent advisory committee to review certain regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I would like to offer a few words on a bill that I am introducing today with my colleague and friend, Senator ROY BLUNT of Missouri. Upon my arrival to the Senate, Senator BLUNT and I shared a conversation in which we discovered our interest in proposing pragmatic legislation that would go about easing the ever-growing regulatory burden borne by businesses across the country. Since then, we have worked together to craft a bill that takes a reasonable approach toward thinning out older regulations that have outlived their utility, all while retaining essential congressional oversight. Today we introduce the Regulatory Improvement Act of 2013, which I believe will achieve this goal.

The Regulatory Improvement Act will create an independent Regulatory

Improvement Commission that will be tasked with reviewing outdated regulations with the goals of modifying, consolidating, or repealing regulations in order to reduce compliance costs, encourage growth and innovation, and improve competitiveness. The composition of the commission will be determined by congressional leadership and the President, and the commission will be tasked with identifying a single sector or area of regulations for consideration. After extensive review involving broad public and stakeholder input, the commission will submit to Congress a report containing regulations in need of streamlining, consolidation, or repeal. This report will enjoy expedited legislative procedures and will be subject to an up-or-down vote in both houses of Congress without amendment.

Let me be clear: the intent of this bill is not to engage in a wholesale dismantling of the existing regulatory regime. In particular, I share some of my colleagues concerns that “regulatory reform” can be employed as a euphemism to disguise an undercurrent of efforts to completely undo significant legislation—from the Clean Air Act to the Affordable Care Act. I do not support such efforts. That said, I believe there is broad bipartisan consensus that regulations have a cumulative effect and that Congress has neither the expertise nor formal mechanisms through which it can effectively and expeditiously conduct retrospective analyses. A Regulatory Improvement Commission would provide a vehicle for the review of older regulations and provided much-needed relief to businesses struggling to comply with layers of competing or even duplicative regulations.

In a larger sense, this bill seeks to reclaim some of the ground that Congress has ceded to executive agencies in recent years. From my vantage point, the current regulatory structure has become akin to a fourth, unchecked branch of government. As an institution, we must find ways to reverse this disturbing trend and reestablish an appropriate role of congressional oversight. Therefore, I am glad to introduce this bipartisan bill that offers a reasonable way to revisit older regulations, and I thank Senator BLUNT for his interest and support of the proposal.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 1391. A bill to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 and other laws to clarify appropriate standards for Federal employment discrimination and retaliation claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, today I join with my senior colleague from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY, and with the distinguished chair of the Judiciary

Committee, Senator LEAHY, in reintroducing the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act.

The need for this legislation was vividly demonstrated by the experience of an Iowan—Jack Gross. Mr. Gross gave the prime of his life, a quarter century of loyal service, to one company. Despite Mr. Gross's stellar work record, FBL Financial demoted him and other employees over the age of 50 and gave his job to a younger employee.

Expressly to prevent this kind of discrimination, in 1967 Congress passed the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, ADEA. Modeled from and using the same language as Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964—which prohibits employment discrimination on the basis of race, sex, national origin and religion—the ADEA makes it unlawful to discriminate on the basis of age.

When Mr. Gross sought to enforce his rights under this law, a jury of Iowans heard the facts and found that his employer discriminated against him because of his age. That jury awarded him almost \$47,000 in lost compensation.

The case was ultimately appealed to the Supreme Court. In June 2009, in *Gross v. FBL Financial, Inc.*, the Court ruled against Mr. Gross, and in doing so made it harder for those with legitimate age discrimination claims to prevail under the ADEA. In fact, on remand, despite the fact Mr. Gross had established that age discrimination was a factor in his demotion, he lost his retrial.

For decades, the law was clear. In 1989, in *Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins*, the Court ruled that if a plaintiff seeking relief under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act demonstrated that discrimination was a “motivating” or “substantial” factor behind the employer's action, the burden shifted to the employer to show it would have taken the same action regardless of the plaintiff's membership in a protected class. As part of the Civil Rights Act of 1991, Congress codified the “motivating factor” standard with respect to Title VII discrimination claims.

Since the ADEA uses the same language as Title VII, was modeled from it, and had been interpreted consistent with the Civil Rights Act, courts rightly and consistently held that, like a plaintiff claiming discrimination on the basis of race, sex, religion and national origin, a victim bringing suit under the ADEA need only show that membership in a protected class was a “motivating factor” in an employer's action. If an employee showed that age was one factor in an employment decision, the burden was on the employer to show it had acted for a legitimate reason other than age.

In *Gross*, the Court, addressing a question on which it did not grant certiorari, tore up this decades' old standard. In its place, the Court imposed a standard that makes it prohibitively difficult for a victim to prove age dis-

crimination. According to the Court, a plaintiff bears the full burden of proving that age was not only a “motivating” factor but the “but for” factor, or decisive factor. And, unfortunately, just last month the Supreme Court, in *University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center v. Nassar*, extended *Gross* to retaliation cases under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act. Moreover, lower courts have extended *Gross* to other civil rights claims, including cases arising under the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Rehabilitation Act.

The extremely high burden *Gross* imposes radically undermines workers' ability to hold employers accountable. As Professor Helen Norton testified to the HELP Committee, “*Gross* entirely insulates from liability even an employer who confesses discrimination so long as that employer had another reason for its decision. By permitting employers to escape liability altogether even for a workplace admittedly infected by discrimination, with no incentive to refrain from similar discrimination in the future, the *Gross* rule thus undermines Congress's efforts to stop and deter workplace discrimination.”

Bear in mind, unlawful discrimination is often difficult to detect. Obviously, those who discriminate do not often admit they are acting for discriminatory reasons. Employers rarely post signs saying, for example, “older workers need not apply.” To the contrary, they go out of their way to conceal their true intent. The employer is in the best position to offer an explanation of why a decision that involves discrimination or retaliation was actually motivated by legitimate reasons. As Professor Norton testified, “[s]uch burden shifting appropriately recognizes and responds to employers' greater access to information that is key to proving or disproving an element of a particular claim . . .” By putting the entire burden on the worker to demonstrate the absence or insignificance of other factors, the court in effect has freed employers to discriminate or retaliate.

Unfortunately, as Mr. *Gross* and his colleagues know all too well, age discrimination does indeed occur. Countless thousands of American workers who are not yet ready to voluntarily retire find themselves jobless or passed over for promotions because of age discrimination. Older workers often face stereotypes: That they are not as productive as younger workers; that they cannot learn new skills; that they somehow have a lesser need for income to provide for their families.

Indeed, according to an AARP study, 60% of older workers have reported that they or someone they know has faced age discrimination in the workplace. According to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, in Fiscal Year 2012, over 2,800 age discrimination complaints were filed, a more than 20 percent increase from just five years

ago. Given the stereotypes that older workers face, it is no surprise that on average they remain unemployed for more than twice as long as all unemployed workers.

The Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act reiterates the principle that Congress established when it passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, the Rehabilitation Act and the Americans with Disabilities Act—when making employment decisions it is illegal for race, sex, national origin, religion, age or disability to be a factor.

The bill repudiates the Supreme Court's *Gross v. FBL Financial* decision and will restore the law to what it was for decades. It makes clear that when an employee shows discrimination was a “motivating factor” behind a decision, the burden is properly on the employer to show the same decision would have been made regardless of discrimination or retaliation. And, like the Civil Rights Act of 1991 with respect to discrimination cases under Title VII, if the employer meets that burden, the employer remains liable, but remedies are limited.

This is a common sense, bipartisan bill. In fact, the Civil Rights Act of 1991, key provisions of which served as a model for this legislation, passed the Senate on a bipartisan basis 93–5. Further, we are introducing this bill only after countless hours of consultation with civil rights stakeholders and representatives of the business community. Moreover, this bill addresses the concerns that were raised about an earlier version of the bill at a hearing held before the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee in March 2010.

In fact, I want to comment on two changes from that earlier version of this bill introduced in the last Congress. Since October 2009, when Senator LEAHY and I first introduced the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act, we have had the benefit of nearly three and a half years of lower court application of the *Gross* decision.

The 2009 bill would have expressly amended the ADEA to make clear that the analytical framework set out in *McDonnell Douglas v. Green* applied to that statute. Even though, before *Gross*, every Court of Appeals had held that *McDonnell Douglas* had applied to age claims, this clarification was meant to address a footnote in *Gross* in which the Court arguably questioned the applicability of *McDonnell Douglas* to the ADEA. Since the bill was first introduced, however, every lower court that has examined the issue has continued to apply *McDonnell Douglas* to the ADEA. As a result, because *McDonnell Douglas* applies to the ADEA already, we deem it unnecessary to amend the statute.

Second, the initial bill expressly amended only the ADEA. Since *Gross*, however, lower courts have applied the Court's reasoning in that decision to

other statutes. Because the most notable application has been to the ADA, Rehabilitation Act and Title VII retaliation claims, those statutes are expressly amended here too.

Finally, in *Gross*, the Court defended the Court's departure from well-established law by noting that it "cannot ignore Congress' decision to amend Title VII's relevant provisions but not make similar changes to the ADEA." In other words, the Court found that because Congress, in the Civil Rights Act of 1991, codified the "motivating factor" framework for discrimination claims under Title VII, but not for the ADEA, Congress somehow must have intended *Price Waterhouse* not to apply to any statute but Title VII.

Because of the Court's reasoning, I want to emphasize that this bill in no way questions the motivating factor framework for other anti-discrimination and anti-retaliation statutes that are not expressly covered by the legislation. As the bill's findings make clear, not only does this bill repudiate the *Gross* decision itself, but it expressly repudiates the reasoning underlying the decision, including the argument that Congress's failure to amend any statute other than Title VII means that Congress intended to disallow mixed motive claims under other statutes. It would be an error for a court to apply similar reasoning following passage of this bill to other statutes. The fact that other statutes are not expressly amended in this bill does not mean that Congress endorses *Gross*'s application to any other statute.

In conclusion, this bill is very straightforward. It reiterates what Congress said in 1967 when it passed the ADEA—when making employment decisions it is illegal for age to be a factor. A person should not be judged arbitrarily because he or she was born in a certain year or earlier when he or she still has the ability to contribute as much, or more, as the next person. This bill will help ensure that all our citizens will have an equal opportunity, commensurate with their abilities, for productive employment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1391

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) In enacting section 107 of the Civil Rights Act of 1991 (adding section 703(m) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964), Congress reaffirmed its understanding that unlawful discrimination is often difficult to detect and prove because discriminators do not usually admit their discrimination and often try to conceal their true motives. Section 703(m) of

the Civil Rights Act of 1964 expressly approved so-called "mixed motive" claims, providing that an unlawful employment practice is established when a protected characteristic was a motivating factor for any employment practice, even though other factors also motivated the practice.

(2) Congress enacted amendments to other civil rights statutes, including the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (referred to in this section as the "ADEA"), the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, but Congress did not expressly amend those statutes to address mixed motive discrimination.

(3) In the case of *Gross v. FBL Financial Services, Inc.*, 557 U.S. 167 (2009), the Supreme Court held that, because Congress did not expressly amend the ADEA to address mixed motive claims, such claims were unavailable under the ADEA, and instead the complainant bears the burden of proving that a protected characteristic or protected activity was the "but for" cause of an unlawful employment practice. This decision has significantly narrowed the scope of protections afforded by the statutes that were not expressly amended in 1991 to address mixed motive claims.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to clarify congressional intent that mixed motive claims shall be available, and that a complaining party need not prove that a protected characteristic or protected activity was the "but for" cause of an unlawful employment practice, under the ADEA and similar civil rights provisions;

(2) to reject the Supreme Court's reasoning in the *Gross* decision that Congress' failure to amend any statute other than title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (with respect to discrimination claims), in enacting section 107 of the Civil Rights Act of 1991, suggests that Congress intended to disallow mixed motive claims under other statutes; and

(3) to clarify that complaining parties—

(A) may rely on any type or form of admissible evidence to establish their claims of an unlawful employment practice;

(B) are not required to demonstrate that the protected characteristic or activity was the sole cause of the employment practice; and

(C) may demonstrate an unlawful employment practice through any available method of proof or analytical framework.

SEC. 3. STANDARDS OF PROOF.

(a) AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1967.—

(1) CLARIFYING PROHIBITION AGAINST IMPERMISSIBLE CONSIDERATION OF AGE IN EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES.—Section 4 of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (29 U.S.C. 623) is amended by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

"(g)(1) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, an unlawful practice is established under this Act when the complaining party demonstrates that age or an activity protected by subsection (d) was a motivating factor for any practice, even though other factors also motivated the practice.

"(2) In establishing an unlawful practice under this Act, including under paragraph (1) or by any other method of proof, a complaining party—

"(A) may rely on any type or form of admissible evidence and need only produce evidence sufficient for a reasonable trier of fact to find that an unlawful practice occurred under this Act; and

"(B) shall not be required to demonstrate that age or an activity protected by subsection (d) was the sole cause of a practice."

(2) REMEDIES.—Section 7 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 626) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) in the first sentence, by striking "The" and inserting "(1) The";

(ii) in the third sentence, by striking "Amounts" and inserting the following:

"(2) Amounts";

(iii) in the fifth sentence, by striking "Before" and inserting the following:

"(4) Before"; and

(iv) by inserting before paragraph (4), as designated by clause (iii) of this subparagraph, the following:

"(3) On a claim in which an individual demonstrates that age was a motivating factor for any employment practice, under section 4(g)(1), and a respondent demonstrates that the respondent would have taken the same action in the absence of the impermissible motivating factor, the court—

"(A) may grant declaratory relief, injunctive relief (except as provided in subparagraph (B)), and attorney's fees and costs demonstrated to be directly attributable only to the pursuit of a claim under section 4(g)(1); and

"(B) shall not award damages or issue an order requiring any admission, reinstatement, hiring, promotion, or payment."; and

(B) in subsection (c)(1), by striking "Any" and inserting "Subject to subsection (b)(3), any".

(3) DEFINITIONS.—Section 11 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 630) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(m) The term 'demonstrates' means meets the burdens of production and persuasion."

(4) FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—Section 15 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 633a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(h) Sections 4(g) and 7(b)(3) shall apply to mixed motive claims (involving practices described in section 4(g)(1)) under this section."

(b) TITLE VII OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964.—

(1) CLARIFYING PROHIBITION AGAINST IMPERMISSIBLE CONSIDERATION OF RACE, COLOR, RELIGION, SEX, OR NATIONAL ORIGIN IN EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES.—Section 703 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-2) is amended by striking subsection (m) and inserting the following:

"(m) Except as otherwise provided in this title, an unlawful employment practice is established under this title when the complaining party demonstrates that race, color, religion, sex, or national origin or an activity protected by section 704(a) was a motivating factor for any employment practice, even though other factors also motivated the practice."

(2) FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—Section 717 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2000e-16) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(g) Sections 703(m) and 706(g)(2)(B) shall apply to mixed motive cases (involving practices described in section 703(m)) under this section."

(c) AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—Section 101 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12111) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(11) DEMONSTRATES.—The term 'demonstrates' means meets the burdens of production and persuasion."

(2) CLARIFYING PROHIBITION AGAINST IMPERMISSIBLE CONSIDERATION OF DISABILITY IN EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES.—Section 102 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 12112) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(e) PROOF.—

"(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Except as otherwise provided in this Act, a discriminatory practice is established under this Act when the

complaining party demonstrates that disability or an activity protected by subsection (a) or (b) of section 503 was a motivating factor for any employment practice, even though other factors also motivated the practice.

“(2) DEMONSTRATION.—In establishing a discriminatory practice under paragraph (1) or by any other method of proof, a complaining party—

“(A) may rely on any type or form of admissible evidence and need only produce evidence sufficient for a reasonable trier of fact to find that a discriminatory practice occurred under this Act; and

“(B) shall not be required to demonstrate that disability or an activity protected by subsection (a) or (b) of section 503 was the sole cause of an employment practice.”.

(3) CERTAIN ANTIRETALIATION CLAIMS.—Section 503(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 12203(c)) is amended—

(A) by striking “The remedies” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the remedies”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) CERTAIN ANTIRETALIATION CLAIMS.—Section 107(c) shall apply to claims under section 102(e)(1) with respect to title I.”.

(4) REMEDIES.—Section 107 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 12117) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) DISCRIMINATORY MOTIVATING FACTOR.—On a claim in which an individual demonstrates that disability was a motivating factor for any employment practice, under section 102(e)(1), and a respondent demonstrates that the respondent would have taken the same action in the absence of the impermissible motivating factor, the court—

“(1) may grant declaratory relief, injunctive relief (except as provided in paragraph (2)), and attorney’s fees and costs demonstrated to be directly attributable only to the pursuit of a claim under section 102(e)(1); and

“(2) shall not award damages or issue an order requiring any admission, reinstatement, hiring, promotion, or payment.”.

(d) REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Sections 501(g), 503(d), and 504(d) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 791(g), 793(d), and 794(d)), are each amended by adding after the words “title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12111 et seq.)” the following: “, including the standards of causation or methods of proof applied under section 102(e) of that Act (42 U.S.C. 12112(e)).”.

(2) FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) to section 501(g) shall be construed to apply to all employees covered by section 501.

SEC. 4. APPLICATION.

This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall apply to all claims pending on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. MORAN):

S. 1395. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am pleased today to introduce the Good Samaritan Hunger Relief Tax Incentive Act along with Senators COCHRAN, CASEY, and MORAN. This bill is an effort I have worked on with former Senator Richard Lugar for many years and I am happy to continue the effort on

behalf of hungry families nationwide this Congress.

In the wake of our Nation’s economic recession, the demand on food banks, church food pantries, and soup kitchens has increased significantly. According to a study by the United States Department of Agriculture, over 50 million Americans lived in food insecure households in 2011. The same study found that households with children reported food insecurity at a much higher rate than households without children. In fact, in Vermont alone, over 12,000 children rely on food from food shelves each month.

Despite the increased demand for donated food, it is estimated that between 25 and 40 percent of the food that is produced, grown, and transported in the United States will never be consumed. This contributes to the 70 billion pounds of fit and wholesome food that are sent to landfills in the United States each year.

This bill would address this troubling trend by giving greater incentives to all businesses to donate food to non-profit organizations that feed the hungry. The current tax code allows corporations to receive a special deduction for donations to food banks, but it excludes many other small businesses such as farmers, ranchers, and restaurant owners from the same tax incentive. Unfortunately, these businesses often find it more cost effective to throw away food than to donate it to those in need.

I am pleased beginning in 2006, Congress temporarily extended this tax incentive to most businesses, and most recently extended the provision through the end of 2013. After the provision was enacted, in the restaurant industry alone we saw a 137 percent increase in the pounds of food donated. The Good Samaritan Hunger Relief Tax Incentive Act would make this provision permanent, and would extend the deduction to farmers who often have large amounts of fresh food to donate.

This bipartisan legislation is supported by numerous organizations including Feeding America, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the Food Marketing Institute, Grocery Manufacturers Association, the National Restaurant Association, the Vermont Food Bank, and Hunger Free Vermont. I hope as this Congress considers comprehensive tax legislation in the future this measure is included. We must do more to ensure that no one in America goes hungry, and increasing the amount of food available to food banks is a critical step toward meeting that goal.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 1399. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to extend the interest rate limitation on debt entered into during military service to debt incurred during military service to consolidate or refinance student loans incurred before military service; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1399

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

SECTION 1. INTEREST RATE LIMITATION ON DEBT ENTERED INTO DURING MILITARY SERVICE TO CONSOLIDATE OR REFINANCE STUDENT LOANS INCURRED BEFORE MILITARY SERVICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 207 of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 527) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting “ON DEBT INCURRED BEFORE SERVICE” after “LIMITATION TO 6 PERCENT”;;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively;

(3) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph (2):

“(2) LIMITATION TO 6 PERCENT ON DEBT INCURRED DURING SERVICE TO CONSOLIDATE OR REFINANCE STUDENT LOANS INCURRED BEFORE SERVICE.—An obligation or liability bearing interest at a rate in excess of 6 percent per year that is incurred by a servicemember, or the servicemember and the servicemember’s spouse jointly, during military service to consolidate or refinance one or more student loans incurred by the servicemember before such military service shall not bear an interest at a rate in excess of 6 percent during the period of military service.”;

(4) in paragraph (3), as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection, by inserting “or (2)” after “paragraph (1)”; and

(5) in paragraph (4), as so redesignated, by striking “paragraph (2)” and inserting “paragraph (3)”.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION OF LIMITATION.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “the interest rate limitation in subsection (a)” and inserting “an interest rate limitation in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a)”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “AS OF DATE OF ORDER TO ACTIVE DUTY”; and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “in the case of an obligation or liability covered by subsection (a)(1), or as of the date the servicemember (or servicemember and spouse jointly) incurs the obligation or liability concerned under subsection (a)(2)”.

(c) STUDENT LOAN DEFINED.—Subsection (d) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) STUDENT LOAN.—The term ‘student loan’ means the following:

“(A) A Federal student loan made, insured, or guaranteed under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.).

“(B) A private student loan as that term is defined section 140(a) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650(a)).”.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1400. A bill to increase access to adult education to provide for economic growth; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, our economy will not work for individuals or for our nation unless we create and support avenues for adults to continue their education and build their skills. These are longstanding issues that I

have worked on for many years, including the last attempt to reauthorize the Workforce Investment Act. I was pleased to work with Senator Webb in the 112th Congress on the Adult Education and Economic Growth Act, and I am proud to reintroduce it today with Senator BROWN. I thank Congressman RUBÉN HINOJOSA for introducing the companion legislation in the House of Representatives.

The Adult Education and Economic Growth Act increases the investment in adult education programs; ensures better coordination among adult education programs, workforce development programs, and higher education; strengthens professional development for adult education providers; expands the use of technology in adult education programs; and provides incentives for employers to support their workers who need adult education services.

In Rhode Island, roughly 41 percent of working age adults have a college degree. By 2018, it is estimated that 61 percent of Rhode Island jobs will require some postsecondary education. We have an estimated 91,000 individuals without a high school diploma—the basic ticket to accessing postsecondary education and training.

Nationally, the numbers make a similar case for the need to invest in adult education. According to the National Commission on Adult Literacy, 80 to 90 million U.S. adults today, about half of the adult workforce, do not have the basic education and communication skills required to obtain jobs that pay a family-sustaining wage. These individuals continue to struggle in the recovering economy, with unemployment rates above 10 percent for individuals who do not have a high school diploma, compared to 7.6 percent for high school graduates and less than 4 percent for workers with bachelor's degrees.

Simply put, we will not be able to close the skills gap without a robust investment in adult education. Unfortunately, we have not been making this kind of investment. Funding has been anemic, and as a result, services reach fewer than 3 million adults annually—a fraction of the need.

The Adult Education and Economic Growth will help turn around this dire situation by increasing the authorization for adult education programs authorized under Title II of the Workforce Investment Act to \$850 million and establishing a new state technology grant for adult education to upgrade the delivery system and assist adults in attaining critical digital literacy skills. This legislation requires state and local workforce investment boards to address adult education in their plans for using funds authorized under Title I of the Workforce Investment Act, including incorporating adult education into career pathways programs and offering integrated education and training programs. It also strengthens programs and services for

English learners, including authorizing the Integrated English Literacy and Civics Program, and for adults with disabilities. The legislation will also build the knowledge base on what works for adult learners through a National Center for Adult Education, Literacy, and Workplace Skills. Finally, the Adult Education and Economic Growth Act will provide employers with tax incentives to invest in developing the basic skills of their employees.

In sum, the Adult Education and Economic Growth Act offers a comprehensive approach to reaching the millions of adults who need basic skills, English literacy instruction, or a secondary school diploma so that they can embark on a career pathway that leads to economic stability and success. I am pleased to have worked with the National Commission on Adult Literacy in developing this legislation. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this bill and work with me to include its provisions in the pending reauthorization of the Workforce Investment Act.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 202—DESIGNATING JULY 30, 2013, AS “NATIONAL WHISTLEBLOWER APPRECIATION DAY”

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. LEVIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to.:

S. RES. 202

Whereas, in 1777, before the passage of the Bill of Rights, 10 sailors and marines blew the whistle on fraud and misconduct harmful to the United States;

Whereas the Founding Fathers unanimously supported the whistleblowers in words and deeds, including releasing government records and providing monetary assistance for reasonable legal expenses necessary to prevent retaliation;

Whereas, on July 30, 1778, in demonstration of their full support for whistleblowers, the members of the Continental Congress unanimously enacted the first whistleblower legislation in the United States that read: “Resolved, That it is the duty of all persons in the service of the United States, as well as all other the inhabitants thereof, to give the earliest information to Congress or other proper authority of any misconduct, frauds or misdemeanors committed by any officers or persons in the service of these states, which may come to their knowledge” (legislation of July 30, 1778, reprinted in *Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774–1789*, ed. Government Printing Office (Washington, DC, 1908), 11:732);

Whereas whistleblowers risk their careers, jobs, and reputations by reporting waste, fraud, and abuse to the proper authorities;

Whereas, when providing proper authorities with lawful disclosures, whistleblowers save taxpayers in the United States billions of dollars each year and serve the public interest by ensuring that the United States remains an ethical and safe place; and

Whereas it is the public policy of the United States to encourage, in accordance with Federal law (including the Constitu-

tion, rules, and regulations) and consistent with the protection of classified information (including sources and methods of detection), honest and good faith reporting of misconduct, fraud, misdemeanors, and other crimes to the appropriate authority at the earliest time possible: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates July 30, 2013, as “National Whistleblower Appreciation Day”; and

(2) ensures that the Federal Government implements the intent of the Founding Fathers, as reflected in the legislation enacted on July 30, 1778, by encouraging each executive agency to recognize National Whistleblower Appreciation Day by—

(A) informing employees, contractors working on behalf of United States taxpayers, and members of the public about the legal rights of citizens of the United States to blow the whistle; and

(B) acknowledging the contributions of whistleblowers to combating waste, fraud, abuse, and violations of laws and regulations in the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 203—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING EFFORTS BY THE UNITED STATES TO RESOLVE THE ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT THROUGH A NEGOTIATED TWO-STATE SOLUTION

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.:

S. RES. 203

Whereas the special relationship between the United States and Israel is rooted in shared interests and shared values of democracy, human rights, and the rule of law;

Whereas the United States has worked for decades to strengthen Israel's security through assistance and cooperation on defense and intelligence matters in order to enhance the safety of Americans and Israelis;

Whereas the United States remains unwavering in its commitment to help Israel address the myriad challenges our ally faces, including threats from anti-Israel terrorist organizations, regional instability, horrifying violence in neighboring states, and the prospect of a nuclear-armed Iran;

Whereas, the United States continues to seek a permanent, two-state solution to resolve the conflict between Israel and Palestine as a fundamental component of our Nation's commitment to the security of Israel;

Whereas, for 20 years, Presidents of the United States from both political parties and Israeli Prime Ministers have supported a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict;

Whereas ending the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is vital to the interests of all parties and to peace and stability in the Middle East;

Whereas a peace agreement that establishes a Palestinian state, coexisting side-by-side with Israel in peace and security, is necessary to ensure that Israel remains a Jewish, democratic state;

Whereas, recognizing the urgency of the situation, Secretary John Kerry made 6 trips to the Middle East in his first 6 months as Secretary of State in an effort to resume negotiations toward a two-state solution;

Whereas, on July 29, 2013 representatives of Israel and Palestine engaged in face-to-face talks in order to move toward a resumption

of formal negotiations on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict's final status issues:

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) a two-state solution is the only outcome to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict which can—

(A) ensure the State of Israel's survival as a secure, democratic homeland for the Jewish people; and

(B) fulfill the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian people for a state of their own;

(2) achievement of a two-state solution that would enhance stability and security in the Middle East is a fundamental United States security interest;

(3) while only Israel and Palestine can make the difficult choices necessary to end their conflict, the United States remains indispensable to any viable effort to achieve that goal;

(4) Secretary of State John Kerry is to be commended for his tireless efforts to urgently advance a negotiated two-state solution; and

(5) the Senate pledges its support for a sustained United States diplomatic initiative to help Israel and Palestine conclude an agreement to end their conflict.

SENATE RESOLUTION 204—DESIGNATING AUGUST 7, 2013, AS “NATIONAL LIGHTHOUSE AND LIGHTHOUSE PRESERVATION DAY”

Mr. KING (for himself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 204

Whereas August 7, 2013, marks the 224th anniversary of the signing by President George Washington of the Act entitled “An Act for the establishment and support of lighthouses, beacons, buoys, and public piers”, approved August 7, 1789 (commonly known as the “Lighthouse Act of 1789”) (1 Stat. 53, chapter 9);

Whereas that Act, the ninth act of the 1st Congress, established a Federal role in the support, maintenance, and repair of all lighthouses, beacon buoys, and public piers necessary for safe navigation, commissioned the first Federal lighthouse, and represents the first public works act in the young United States;

Whereas the establishment of the United States system of navigational aids set the United States on a path to the forefront of international maritime prominence and established lighthouses that played an integral role in the rich maritime history of the United States, as that history spread from the Atlantic coast, through the Great Lakes and the Gulf coast, to the Pacific States;

Whereas those iconic structures, standing at land's end through 2 centuries, have symbolized safety, security, heroism, duty, and faithfulness;

Whereas architects, designers, engineers, builders, and keepers devoted, and in some cases jeopardized, their lives for the safety of others during centuries of light tending by the United States Lighthouse Service and the United States Coast Guard;

Whereas the automation of the light system exposed the historic lighthouse towers to the ravages of time and vandalism and yet, at the same time, opened an opportunity for citizen involvement in efforts to save and restore those beacons that mark the evolving maritime history of the United States and its coastal communities;

Whereas the national lighthouse preservation movement has gained momentum over the past half century and is making major contributions to the preservation of maritime history and heritage and, through the development and enhancement of cultural tourism, to the economies of coastal communities in the United States;

Whereas the National Historic Lighthouse Preservation Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-355; 114 Stat. 1385), enacted on October 24, 2000, and with the aid of the lighthouse preservation community, provides an effective process administered by the General Services Administration and the National Park Service for transferring lighthouses to the best possible stewardship groups;

Whereas, for the past several decades, regional and national groups have formed within the lighthouse preservation community to promote lighthouse heritage through research, education, tourism, and publications;

Whereas the earliest and largest regional preservation group, the Great Lakes Lighthouse Keepers Association, headquartered in Michigan, marks its 30th anniversary in 2013, and the largest and oldest national group, the United States Lighthouse Society, which relocated from San Francisco, California, to the State of Washington in 2008, marks its 30th anniversary in 2014;

Whereas other groups have also been formed to promote lighthouse preservation and history, many with regional chapters, including—

(1) a national leadership council and forum named the American Lighthouse Council (formerly the American Lighthouse Coordinating Committee), currently headquartered in Illinois;

(2) the American Lighthouse Foundation in Maine;

(3) the Michigan Lighthouse Alliance and Michigan Lighthouse Conservancy;

(4) the Maine Lights Program;

(5) the Outer Banks Lighthouse Society in North Carolina;

(6) the New Jersey Lighthouse Society;

(7) the Florida Lighthouse Association; and

(8) the Lighthouse Preservation Society in Massachusetts;

Whereas major lighthouse publications, including the United States Lighthouse Society's Keeper's Log and the Lighthouse Digest, contribute greatly to the promotion of lighthouse heritage and preservation;

Whereas single-lighthouse preservation efforts by individuals or organizations, including historical societies and governments, have even longer histories, including preservation efforts in—

(1) Grosse Point, Illinois, established in 1935;

(2) Buffalo, New York, established in 1962;

(3) Navesink Twin Lights, New Jersey, established in 1962;

(4) Point Fermin, California, established in 1970;

(5) Charlotte-Genesee near Rochester, New York, established in 1965;

(6) Key West, Florida, established in 1969;

(7) Split Rock Lighthouse, Minnesota, established in 1971;

(8) Ponce de Leon Inlet, Florida, established in 1972;

(9) St. Augustine, Florida, established in 1981; and

(10) Fire Island, New York, established in 1982;

Whereas, despite progress, many lighthouses in the United States remain threatened by erosion, neglect, vandalism, and deterioration by the elements;

Whereas Congress passed, and President Ronald Reagan signed, a Joint Resolution entitled “Joint Resolution designating the day of August 7, 1989, as ‘National Light-

house Day’”, approved November 5, 1988 (Public Law 100-622; 102 Stat. 3201), in honor of the bicentennial of the United States Lighthouse Service; and

Whereas the many completed, ongoing, or planned private and public efforts to preserve lighthouses demonstrate the public support for those historic structures: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates August 7, 2013, as “National Lighthouse and Lighthouse Preservation Day”;

(2) encourages lighthouse grounds to be made open to the general public to the extent feasible; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe National Lighthouse and Lighthouse Preservation Day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 205—EX-PRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF SEPTEMBER 2013 AS NATIONAL OVARIAN CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. HAGAN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MORAN, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. VITTER, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 205

Whereas ovarian cancer is the deadliest of all gynecologic cancers;

Whereas ovarian cancer is the fifth leading cause of cancer deaths among women in the United States;

Whereas, in 2013, approximately 22,000 new cases of ovarian cancer will be diagnosed, and 14,400 women will die of ovarian cancer in the United States;

Whereas the mortality rate for ovarian cancer has not significantly decreased since the “War on Cancer” was declared more than 40 years ago;

Whereas all women are at risk for ovarian cancer, and 90 percent of women diagnosed with ovarian cancer do not have a family history that puts them at a higher risk;

Whereas some women, such as those with a family history of breast or ovarian cancer, are at higher risk for developing the disease;

Whereas the Pap test is sensitive and specific to the early detection of cervical cancer, but not ovarian cancer;

Whereas there is currently no reliable early detection test for ovarian cancer;

Whereas many people are unaware that the symptoms of ovarian cancer often include bloating, pelvic or abdominal pain, difficulty eating or feeling full quickly, urinary symptoms, and several other symptoms that are easily confused with other diseases;

Whereas, in June 2007, the first national consensus statement on ovarian cancer symptoms was developed to provide consistency in describing symptoms to make it easier for women to learn and remember the symptoms;

Whereas there are known methods to reduce the risk of ovarian cancer, including prophylactic surgery, oral contraceptives, and breastfeeding;

Whereas due to the lack of a reliable early detection test, 75 percent of cases of ovarian cancer are detected at an advanced stage, making the overall 5-year survival rate only 46 percent;

Whereas there are factors that are known to reduce the risk for ovarian cancer and

that play an important role in the prevention of the disease;

Whereas awareness of the symptoms of ovarian cancer by women and health care providers can lead to a quicker diagnosis;

Whereas, each year during the month of September, the Ovarian Cancer National Alliance and its partner members hold a number of events to increase public awareness of ovarian cancer; and

Whereas September 2013 should be designated as "National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month" to increase public awareness of ovarian cancer: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate supports the goals and ideals of National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month.

SENATE RESOLUTION 206—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 2013 AS "NATIONAL PROSTATE CANCER AWARENESS MONTH"

MR. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. WICKER, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. SHELBY, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. MORAN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. KING) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 206

Whereas 2,500,000 families in the United States live with prostate cancer;

Whereas 1 in 6 males in the United States will be diagnosed with prostate cancer in their lifetimes;

Whereas prostate cancer is the most commonly diagnosed non-skin cancer and the second most common cause of cancer-related deaths among males in the United States;

Whereas the National Cancer Institute estimates that, in 2013, nearly 240,000 men will be diagnosed with, and more than 29,000 men will die of, prostate cancer;

Whereas 40 percent of newly diagnosed prostate cancer cases occur in males under the age of 65;

Whereas approximately every 14 seconds, a male in the United States turns 50 years old and increases his odds of developing cancer, including prostate cancer;

Whereas African-American males suffer from a prostate cancer incidence rate that is up to 65 percent higher than that for white males and have double the prostate cancer mortality rate than that of white males;

Whereas obesity is a significant predictor of the severity of prostate cancer;

Whereas the probability that obesity will lead to death and high cholesterol levels is strongly associated with advanced prostate cancer;

Whereas males in the United States with 1 family member diagnosed with prostate cancer have a 33 percent chance of being diagnosed with the disease, males with 2 close family members diagnosed have an 83 percent chance, and males with 3 family members diagnosed have a 97 percent chance;

Whereas only 33 percent of males survive more than 5 years if diagnosed with prostate cancer after the cancer has metastasized;

Whereas there are no noticeable symptoms of prostate cancer while in the early stages, making screening critical;

Whereas screening by a digital rectal examination and a prostate-specific antigen blood test can detect the disease in the early stages, increasing the chances of survival for more than 5 years to nearly 100 percent;

Whereas ongoing research promises further improvements in prostate cancer prevention, early detection, and treatment; and

Whereas educating people in the United States, including health care providers, about prostate cancer and early detection strategies is crucial to saving the lives of males and preserving and protecting families: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates September 2013 as "National Prostate Cancer Awareness Month";

(2) declares that steps should be taken—

(A) to raise awareness about the importance of screening methods for, and treatment of, prostate cancer;

(B) to increase research funding to a level that is commensurate with the burden of prostate cancer, so that—

(i) screening and treatment for prostate cancer may be improved;

(ii) the causes of prostate cancer may be discovered; and

(iii) a cure for prostate cancer may be developed; and

(C) to continue to consider ways for improving access to, and the quality of, health care services for detecting and treating prostate cancer; and

(3) calls on the people of the United States, interest groups, and affected persons—

(A) to promote awareness of prostate cancer;

(B) to take an active role in the fight to end the devastating effects of prostate cancer on individuals, families, and the economy; and

(C) to observe National Prostate Cancer Awareness Month with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1823. Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1824. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1825. Ms. AYOTTE (for herself and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1826. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 959, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to compounding drugs; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1827. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 959, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1828. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 959, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1829. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 959, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1830. Mr. ENZI (for himself and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1831. Mr. ENZI (for himself and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S.

1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1823. Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 15, line 16, strike the period and insert the following: "Provided further, That the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall expend amounts appropriated under this heading to pay for the costs of all air traffic and safety support services required when general aviation traffic increases and the need for such services is significant and anticipated."—

SA 1824. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 25, line 14, after "2014", insert "of which \$100,000 shall be made available to the Secretary of Transportation to encourage States to prioritize vehicles defined in section 30D(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and vehicles that operate solely on compressed natural gas for purposes of section 166(b)(5)(B) of title 23, United States Code".

SA 1825. Ms. AYOTTE (for herself and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . . HOURS OF SERVICE STUDY

In carrying out the requirements of Section 32301 of PL 112-141 (MAP-21), the Secretary shall evaluate impacts on small business operators, and consider a low-cost option to address any adverse impacts and report back to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate no later than December 31, 2013.

SA 1826. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 959, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to compounding drugs; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 37, strike lines 6 through 10.

SA 1827. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 959, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act

with respect to compounding drugs; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 37, strike lines 11 through 18.

SA 1828. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 959, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to compounding drugs; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 38, strike lines 4 through 9.

SA 1829. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 959, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to compounding drugs; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 39, strike line 24 and all that follows through line 7 on page 42 and insert the following:

“(2) NON-APPLICABILITY TO NON-STERILE DRUGS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the requirements of this section shall not apply to a non-sterile drug (a drug that does not meet the definition of a sterile drug under subsection (b)(9)), or to a traditional compounder or compounding manufacturer with respect to such a drug.”.

SA 1830. Mr. ENZI (for himself and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the royalties collected pursuant to the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) that are required to be paid, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, to the State from which the minerals were located, may be deposited into the Highway Trust Fund.

SA 1831. Mr. ENZI (for himself and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 188, after line 24, insert the following:

SEC. 4 ____ . (a) Section 411(h) of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1240a(h)) is amended by striking paragraph (5).

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) takes effect on July 6, 2012.

NOTICE OF HEARING

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 executive session on Wednesday, July 31, 2013, at 10 a.m. in

room 608 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to mark-up S. 1356, Workforce Investment Act of 2013, the nominations of Robert F. Cohen, Jr., of West Virginia, to be a member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, William I. Althen, of Virginia, to be a member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health review Commission, Catherine E. Lhamon, of California, to be Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, Department of Education as well as any additional nominations cleared for action.

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact the Committee at (202) 224-5375.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

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

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

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. HARKIN. 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 30, 2013, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Mitigating Systemic Risk in Financial Markets Through Wall Street Reforms.”

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

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 30, 2013, at 2:30 p.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. HARKIN. 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 30, 2013, at 2:30 p.m., in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 30, 2013.

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

mittee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 30, 2013, at 2:15 p.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 30, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

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

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ANTITRUST, COMPETITION POLICY, AND CONSUMER RIGHTS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy, and Consumer Rights, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on July 30, 2013, at 10 a.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Standard Essential Patent Disputes and Antitrust Law.”

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS, FORESTS, AND MINING

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 30, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office building.

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a legal fellow in Senator BLUMENTHAL's office, Afton Cissell, be granted floor privileges for the duration of July 30, 2013.

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the privilege of the floor be granted to the following member of my staff: Chris Jacob.

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

DOUGLAS A. MUNRO COAST GUARD HEADQUARTERS BUILDING

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 2611, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2611) to designate the headquarters building of the Coast Guard on the campus located at 2701 Martin Luther King, Jr., Avenue Southeast in the District of Columbia as the "Douglas A. Munro Coast Guard Headquarters Building," and for other purposes.

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

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I further ask that the bill be read three times and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The bill (H.R. 2611) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

IMPROVING THE HOME EQUITY CONVERSION MORTGAGE INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I ask unanimous consent the Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2167, and the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2167) to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to establish additional requirements to improve the fiscal safety and soundness of the home equity conversion mortgage insurance program.

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

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I ask unanimous consent the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The bill (H.R. 2167) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZING USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. Con. Res. 44, which was received from the House and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 44) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds

for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 44) was agreed to.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration en bloc of the following resolutions, which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 202, S. Res. 204, S. Res. 205, and S. Res. 206.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 1392

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I understand that S. 1392, introduced earlier today by Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN, is at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1392) to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I now ask for its second reading and object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will receive its second reading on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 31, 2013

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the

Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, July 31, 2013, and that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of S. 1243, the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill, under the previous order; further, that upon disposition of the Paul amendment, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 201, the nomination of Byron Todd Jones to be Director of the ATF, and that the Senate proceed to the cloture vote on the Jones nomination.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. There will be two rollcall votes at approximately 10:45 a.m. tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:13 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, July 31, 2013 at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nomination received by the Senate:

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

NICHOLAS CHRISTOPHER GEALE, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2016. (REAPPOINTMENT)

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 30, 2013:

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

HARRY I. JOHNSON III, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING AUGUST 27, 2015.

PHILIP ANDREW MISCIMARRA, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING DECEMBER 16, 2017.

MARK GASTON PEARCE, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING AUGUST 27, 2018.

KENT YOSHIHO HIROZAWA, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING AUGUST 27, 2016.

NANCY JEAN SCHIFFER, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING DECEMBER 16, 2014.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRATULATING THE TOWN OF SPRUCE PINE FOR REACHING THEIR 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MARK MEADOWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the town of Spruce Pine for reaching their 100th anniversary. Nestled between the majestic peaks of Mt. Mitchell and Roan Mountain, the flourishing Appalachian town of Spruce Pine boasts all the natural beauty of the North Carolina Blue Ridge Mountains.

Spruce Pine's story began at the turn of the century when a single house was erected near the Carolina, Clinchfield, and Ohio Railroad Depot. Situated between river and mountain-side, the town grew quickly, became chartered in 1913, quadrupled in population, and soon became the commercial center of the Toe River Valley.

Growth continued as mining emerged in the economic anchor of the Spruce Pine community. Best known for its incredibly rich mineral deposits, Spruce Pine boasts the most concentrated feldspar deposits on earth. This geological wonder is responsible for 60 percent of the total United States feldspar, which is used in ceramics, paints, electrical wiring devices, tile, fiberglass insulation, and glass containers.

In a way, most everyone east of the Mississippi has been impacted by goods originated from Spruce Pine. In addition, Spruce Pine is home to the entire world supply of the pure quartz used in manufacturing fused quartz apparatuses. This fused quartz is used to manufacture the semiconductors found in every computer. To own a computer is to have a connection to Spruce Pine.

Spruce Pine is also home to a proud farming population and one of the world's largest art communities. The Toe River Arts Council, which has worked in Spruce Pine for the last 37 years, ensures a legacy of handmade mountain artwork that will continue for many future generations.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great satisfaction that I recognize the town of Spruce Pine and congratulate a truly exceptional 100 years. Its contributions to our culture and industry have been remarkable. I couldn't be more proud to represent such an exemplary town, such warm people, and such a beautiful part of North Carolina.

HONORING ABILITYONE CENTERS OF SOUTH CENTRAL INDIANA

HON. TODD C. YOUNG

OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the great work of the

AbilityOne Program. As the largest single provider of employment for people who are blind or have significant disabilities, the AbilityOne Program puts more than 47,000 Americans to work by providing products and services to federal and commercial customers. In my home State of Indiana, I am pleased to have two AbilityOne centers, Bosma Enterprises and the First Chance Center, who help bring Hoosiers with disabilities into the workforce.

Since 1915, Bosma Enterprises has been providing Hoosiers who are blind or visually impaired with job training, employment services, rehabilitation, and outreach programs, empowering Hoosiers to reach their own personal goals while giving them to tools to live independently. In the past year, Bosma has been able to change the lives of many blind and disabled Hoosiers as they navigated the complexities of finding meaningful employment. One of those individuals is Ray Montgomery who, at the age of 17, lost his sight as a victim of a violent crime. After rehabilitation, Mr. Montgomery graduated college and began searching for a job without much success. He then came to Bosma Enterprises where they looked beyond his disability and focused on his skills and potential. Ray now works in Bosma's production facility and is learning new skills to develop personally and professionally.

The First Chance Center in Paoli, Indiana, has helped to provide sustainable gainful employment for Hoosiers with disabilities for the past 13 years. They promote the abilities of Hoosiers with disabilities and provide opportunities for these individuals to fully participate in their community. It is through these meaningful job opportunities that these Hoosiers have been able to gain marketable skills and confidence. The First Chance Center also provides a multitude of other support services, including day services for persons with intellectual or developmental disabilities and Tot-to-Tot playgroup for children with special needs.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the efforts of Bosma Enterprises, the First Chance Center, and other AbilityOne organizations and am grateful for the work they do each day to open the doors of opportunity for Americans who are blind or have significant disabilities.

RECOGNIZING DR. JANICE IZLAR, CRNA, DNAP

HON. JACK KINGSTON

OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my constituent Janice Izlar, CRNA, DNAP, of Savannah, Georgia. Dr. Izlar will soon complete her year as national president of the American Association of Nurse Anesthetists (AANA). I am proud that Dr. Izlar was elected as the 2012–2013 president of this prestigious national organization.

Certified Registered Nurse Anesthetists (CRNAs) are advanced practice registered

nurses who treat approximately 34 million patients each year. They work in every setting in which anesthesia is delivered including hospital surgical suites, obstetrical delivery rooms, ambulatory surgical centers, and the offices of dentists, podiatrists, and specialty surgeons. They also provide acute and chronic pain management services to patients in need of such care. CRNAs provide anesthesia for all types of surgical cases and are the sole anesthesia providers in many rural hospitals.

As a CRNA, Dr. Izlar has contributed greatly to the healthcare community in southeast Georgia, serving as a self-employed CRNA and as Chief Nurse Anesthetist and Administrator for Anesthesia Services at the Georgia Institute for Plastic Surgery since 1996. Dr. Izlar was awarded her Doctorate in Nurse Anesthesia Practice by Virginia Commonwealth University, her Master of Science in Nursing by Columbia University, her Bachelor's in Nursing, cum laude, by the University of Tulsa, and her Diploma in Nurse Anesthesia by the North Carolina Baptist Hospital School of Nurse Anesthesia. In addition to her service as AANA President, Dr. Izlar has held various leadership positions in the AANA, including President-elect, Vice President, and Region 2 Director, and has served on numerous committees. She is a former president of the Georgia Association of Nurse Anesthetists and is a distinguished speaker on anesthesia topics, lecturing nationwide on the safety, value and cost-effectiveness of CRNA care.

During her AANA Presidency, Dr. Izlar has been a prominent advocate for the patients and practice of nurse anesthesia before federal agencies and members of Congress. She has worked tirelessly to promote anesthesia patient safety and the value of CRNAs to our healthcare system. I am proud to have worked with Janice for years as well as during her time as President and am happy to call her a friend and a loyal advocate for CRNA priorities in Washington and beyond. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Janice on a successful term.

HONORING IRMA LOPEZ

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to recognize Irma J. Lopez, a community leader and activist, who is a tireless champion of women's and social justice issues in Ventura County. Irma is a remarkable role model, and a woman who never stops striving to improve and strengthen her community.

Irma was born and raised in Ventura County. As a graduate of Camarillo High School and the University of California, Santa Barbara, Irma has been a longstanding citizen of the area. Her career in public service began in the State of California Employment Development Department, where she worked for more

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

than 20 years. Additionally, Irma also worked for California State Senator Gary Hart.

Irma's leadership is a testament to her invigorating commitment to Ventura County. She is the founder, former chair and a current board member of Ventura County's Rebozo Festival. Every year, this festival promotes the cultural richness and diversity of the Latino community and philanthropy in Ventura County.

Irma is also a founding member of the Women's Legacy Fund and the Destino Hispanic Legacy Fund. She is a former City of Oxnard Woman of the Year and has been recognized for her humanitarian achievements on both the local and national level.

Irma's passion for public service and dedication to the community is one that I commend. Throughout her life, Irma's tireless efforts have always focused on helping those who are underrepresented and unheard. She is an exemplary model of the great achievements a devoted citizen can make.

I have personally known Irma for many years and am most pleased to join the Ventura County Women's Political Council in honoring Irma Lopez for her contributions, dedication and engagement in Ventura County.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE
OF FORMER GUAM SENATOR
JAMES H. UNDERWOOD

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of James Holland Underwood, who served five consecutive terms as a member of the Guam Legislature from 1975 to 1984. He passed away on July 24, 2013, at the age of 67.

Jim was born on May 4, 1946, to former Senator Raymond Ferdinand Underwood and Ana Eclavea Torres Underwood, owners of Mariana Sales and Tendan Nene in Hagåtña.

As a senator, Jim authored legislation that led to the development of the Guam Environmental Protection Agency and the Port Authority of Guam. He also worked on the capital financing project with Duty Free Shoppers for the construction and expansion of the Guam International Airport Authority. In 1977, Jim also served as a delegate to Guam's Constitutional Convention.

Additionally, Jim held many leadership positions in several Government of Guam agencies. He served as the Executive Director of the Commission on Decolonization; General Manager of the Guam Mass Transit Authority; Director of the Guam Departments of Labor, Public Works, Public Health and Social Services, and Integrated Services for Individuals with Disabilities. He also was a Director for the Guam Telephone Authority.

Beyond his clear passion for public service, Jim made significant contributions to the local community, where he spearheaded numerous projects such as the Guam-Karuizawa Student Exchange and construction of crosses atop Mt. Jumulong Manglo. He also was an active member of the Young Men's League of Guam and Past-President of the Rotary Club of Guam.

Together with his family, Jim was a devout Catholic and an active parishioner of the

Dulce Nombre de Maria Cathedral-Basilica in Hagåtña, where he served as a lector and commentator for the December 8 procession in honor of Santa Marian Kamalen. For many years, Jim and his family were also responsible for erecting the "Lanchon Kotpus" on the Feast of Corpus Christi.

My thoughts and prayers are with his wife Alma, his son James III, his stepdaughters Lisa and Theresa, grandchildren, friends and loved ones. I join the people of Guam in remembering Jim's leadership and contributions to our community. He will be dearly missed.

IN TRIBUTE TO THE FIRST RESPONDERS OF THE PROPHETSTOWN FIRE

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the brave first responders who rushed to help put out the recent devastating fire that demolished much of downtown Prophetstown, Illinois.

The massive fire destroyed eight buildings and damaged two others in a blaze that took hours to put out. An estimated two dozen firefighters and EMTs responded quickly in the early morning hours to battle the flames that were destroying the town.

As Prophetstown begins the healing process, I salute all the first responders from across my region of Illinois for their courageous and selfless service. Because of their valiant efforts, the blaze did not spread to more buildings and no major injuries occurred.

I am proud to once again recognize the heroic efforts of our firefighters and EMTs, and thank them again for their service.

COMMUNITY PHARMACIES

HON. DAVID LOESACK

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. LOESACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the important role that community pharmacies play in Iowa's Second Congressional District and throughout the country. They are the front-line health care providers and counselors for many patients who consistently depend on their training and expertise to stay informed, healthy, and out of the hospital. They also play an incredibly important role in strengthening the economies of the areas they serve, particularly in rural counties like many of those I represent.

Like most small business owners, community pharmacists face many challenges and compete and negotiate on a day-to-day basis with large entities in their business transactions. However, small pharmacy owners face an even larger disadvantage than most because of their clear lack of leverage they have when negotiating the amount they will be reimbursed for filling prescriptions when dealing with pharmacy benefit managers (PBMs). PBMs serve as the middleman between the health plans and pharmacies, but they also own large mail-order pharmacies themselves.

As a result, they are in direct competition with the small pharmacies with whom they also are called upon to negotiate contracts. Also as a note, the largest PBM in the country had nearly \$94 billion in revenue in 2012.

PBMs also are charged with auditing pharmacies to detect fraud and abuse. This is an important role to ensure that Medicare beneficiaries are not taken advantage of, but problems arise when audits are conducted over clerical, administrative errors rather than targeted toward bad actors who willfully game the system. I have heard from several upstanding small business owners in my district who have been subject to these unnecessary audits and I think the process needs to be reformed so that these audits are as fair and transparent as possible.

As the federal government is business partners with PBMs in Medicare Part D, FEHBP, TRICARE and Medicaid Managed Care, I believe it is our duty to take a close look at these practices to ensure our small pharmacies have a fair working relationship with these large PBMs and that the needs of seniors and all those that depend on community pharmacists are met.

I look forward to continuing to work with the community pharmacies throughout Iowa's Second Congressional District to ensure they can continue to provide individual, high quality services to Iowans.

RECOGNIZING THE 38TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DIVISION OF THE ISLAND OF CYPRUS

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 38th anniversary of the division of the island of Cyprus, and to encourage all parties in this longstanding dispute to reason together and work to achieve a final settlement that will bring about a united Cyprus.

Over 50 years ago, the Republic of Cyprus was established by Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots who were to have hands in the administration of the government and participation in national life. As a result of steps counter to that spirit through the 1960s and early 1970s, the two communities are now isolated from each other. The Greek Cypriot community, as the Republic of Cyprus, enjoys full membership in the European Union while Turkish Cypriots remain largely isolated from the global community. Nevertheless, Turkish Cypriots have demonstrated, time and again, their support for a solution where a bi-zonal, bi-communal federation is secured.

A continuation of the status quo serves no purpose, and prevents all Cypriots from living to their full potential. I ask my colleagues to join me in encouraging both parties to set a timeline of tangible steps to achieve a final agreement, and for the Obama Administration to work with both parties and European partners in securing these steps. Any solution must respect the human rights and freedoms of all Cypriots, and this must be enshrined in the work of the parties.

Let us redouble our efforts so that we do not have to observe the beginning of yet another decade in the life of the division of this

island, in the hope that all Cypriots will be able to live and work together in peace.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN GREEK
CYPRIOTS AND TURKISH CYP-
RIOTS

HON. TREY RADEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. RADEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address some of the statements conveyed in this House concerning the continuing division of the island of Cyprus, a division that has now, unfortunately, approaching four decades.

I believe that the time is long overdue for a final agreement between the Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots—one which is arrived at together by both parties, with the support of the international community, which respects the human rights of all Cypriots. I call upon the Administration to reenergize its engagement on this issue, one that has largely been tolerated through Administrations and Congresses of both parties, and unfortunately by many Cypriots themselves.

While I do not wish to revisit the history that has led to this division, I would ask my colleagues to note that Turkish Cypriots voted overwhelmingly in favor of the “UN Plan for a Comprehensive Settlement of the Cyprus Problem” in the simultaneous referenda held on both sides of the island, conveying to their Greek Cypriot neighbors, and the wider world, its desire to solve the Cyprus problem, and become integrated into the life of Europe and the international community. Additionally, Turkey has been stating that it would welcome a resolution of the Cyprus issue, as long as the rights of the Turkish Cypriot community are guaranteed. I do not believe this is an unreasonable request. Indeed, it should apply to all Cypriots.

The Greek Cypriot community, as the Republic of Cyprus, enjoys all of the rights and privileges of European Union membership, and participates freely in the international community. Turkish Cypriots continue to endure international isolation and embargoes—a status quo that can never be considered a long-term, permanent solution. The time has come for both parties to work together to secure a political settlement, and to put this long, sorry chapter behind them. I ask my colleagues to recommit themselves to supporting a just and comprehensive solution to the division of Cyprus.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CAROLYN MCCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent during the week of July 8, 2013. If I were present, I would have voted on the following.

Monday, July 8, 2013: rollcall No. 305: Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 1341, “yea”; rollcall No. 306: Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 1564, “yea”; rollcall No. 307: Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 1171, “yea”.

Tuesday, July 9, 2013: rollcall No. 308: Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule for H.R. 2609, “nay”; rollcall No. 309: Motion on Agreeing to the Resolution on the Rule H.R. 2609, “nay”; rollcall No. 310: Motion on Approving the Journal, “nay”; rollcall No. 311: Moran of Virginia Amendment No. 1, “aye”; rollcall No. 312: Moran of Virginia Amendment No. 2, “aye”; rollcall No. 313: Takano of California Amendment No. 2, “aye”; rollcall No. 314: Perry of Pennsylvania Amendment, “aye”; rollcall No. 315: Broun of Georgia Amendment, “no”; rollcall No. 316: Cohen of Tennessee Amendment, “aye”; rollcall No. 317: Broun of Georgia Amendment, “no”; rollcall No. 318: Swalwell of California Amendment, “aye”; rollcall No. 319: McClintock of California Amendment, “no”; rollcall No. 320: Peters of California Amendment, “aye”; rollcall No. 321: Perlmutter of Colorado Amendment, “aye”; rollcall No. 322: Connolly of Virginia Amendment, “aye”; rollcall No. 323: First Takano of California Amendment, “aye”; rollcall No. 324: Second Takano of California Amendment, “aye”; rollcall No. 325: Heck of Nevada Amendment, “aye”; rollcall No. 326: Butterfield of North Carolina Amendment, “aye”; rollcall No. 327: Foster of Illinois Amendment, “aye”.

Wednesday, July 10, 2013: rollcall No. 328: Hastings of Florida Amendment, “aye”; rollcall No. 329: Garamendi of California Amendment, “aye”; rollcall No. 330: Broun of Georgia Amendment, “no”; rollcall No. 331: Jackson Lee of Texas Amendment, “aye”; rollcall No. 332: Quigley of Illinois Amendment, “no”; rollcall No. 333: Heck of Nevada Amendment, “no”; rollcall No. 334: Polis of Colorado Amendment, “aye”; rollcall No. 335: First Burgess of Texas Amendment, “no”; rollcall No. 336: Second Burgess of Texas Amendment, “no”; rollcall No. 337: Titus of Nevada Amendment, “no”; rollcall No. 338: Lynch of Massachusetts Amendment, “aye”; rollcall No. 339: Whitfield of Kentucky Amendment, “no”; rollcall No. 340: Fleming of Louisiana Amendment, “no”; rollcall No. 341: Garamendi of California Amendment No. 28, “aye”; rollcall No. 342: Speier of California Amendment, “aye”; rollcall No. 343: Chabot of Ohio Amendment, “no”; rollcall No. 344: Motion to Recommit with Instructions for H.R. 2609, “aye”; rollcall No. 345: Final Passage of H.R. 2609—Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2014, “nay”.

Thursday, July 11, 2013: rollcall No. 346: Motion to Adjourn, “yea”; rollcall No. 347: Table Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair for H. Res. 295, “no”; rollcall No. 348: Motion to Adjourn, “yea”; rollcall No. 349: Motion on Agreeing to the Resolution for H. Res. 295, “no”; rollcall No. 350: Table Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair for H.R. 2642, “nay”; rollcall No. 351: Table Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair for H.R. 2642, “no”; rollcall No. 352: Motion to Recommit with Instructions for H.R. 2642, “aye”; rollcall No. 353: Final Passage of H.R. 2642—Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act, “nay”.

RECOGNIZING THE 39TH ANNIVERSARY OF TURKEY'S INVASION AND OCCUPATION OF CYPRUS

HON. JOHN P. SARBANES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, June 20, 2013 marks the 39th anniversary of Turkey's invasion and occupation of the small island Republic of Cyprus. Over time, Turkey's forced division of Cyprus has become its signature failing—a senseless act of defiance against the family of nations.

For more than 60-years, the United States and our European allies have given unyielding and steadfast economic, military and moral support to Turkey. Today, Turkey reaps great benefit from its relationship with the West. Its economy has grown tremendously. Its homeland is secure against enemies who know that NATO stands sentinel over Turkey.

Turkey's rulers have long promised the people of Turkey that theirs is a nation on a journey to full democratic liberties, a powerful nation confident and secure in its place on the world stage, a country that pursues “zero problems with its neighbors.” As it seeks to join the European Union, Turkey has given repeated assurances to its allies that its principal ambition is to embrace democracy and the rule of law.

How then to explain the continued stationing of 45,000 Turkish troops on Cyprus? How to explain a myriad of other conduct that so glaringly belies Turkey's stated aspirations. The truth is that an authoritarian impulse still pervades the Turkish ruling establishment and keeps it from democracy's full embrace. This was most recently illustrated in Turkey's treatment of the burgeoning relationship between Cyprus and Israel. Rather than join those two nations in a peaceful and democratic dialogue for the future development of the Eastern Mediterranean, Prime Minister Erdogan has set Turkish warships to sail in Cypriot waters and threatens the use of force against both Israel and Cyprus.

The United States and our European allies must no longer tolerate Turkey's provocative and antidemocratic conduct. To that end, it is eminently fair to view Cyprus as the yard stick by which Turkey is to be judged. As long as Turkey maintains its occupation of the island, it cannot pretend to have rid itself of the utterly destructive colonial and authoritarian ideologies of a bygone era. To demonstrate a readiness to take up its responsibilities as a NATO ally and candidate country of the European Union, Cyprus is the test that Turkey must pass.

RECOGNIZING SRC ELECTRICAL

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor SRC Electrical on their induction into the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) Voluntary Protection Program (VPP).

Founded in 1991 under the Springfield Remanufacturing Company umbrella, SRC Electrical has been a market leader in providing

new and remanufactured rotating electrical components that include starters, alternators, and generators. For over twenty years, SRC Electrical has remained an employee-owned company based on the desire to redefine the art of remanufacturing and operates under Founder, President, and CEO Jack Stack's world-renowned open-book management business philosophy.

Through hard work and dedication, SRC Electrical was awarded its Voluntary Protection Program approval in April 2013. SRC Electrical should be extremely proud of this achievement as worksites under the VPP boast some very impressive statistics. Working cooperatively between management, labor, and OSHA, companies under VPP work to prevent and reduce the chances of worksite fatalities, injuries, and illnesses through a rigorous onsite evaluation by a team of safety and health professionals. In fact, companies included in the program have an average Days Away, Restricted, or Transferred (DART) case rate 52 percent below the industry average. As of July 1, 2013, SRC Electrical reached 1.2 million safe hours without a lost time incident.

Our nation needs strong and robust manufacturing companies like SRC Electrical. The hard working men and women who make up SRC Electrical are the backbone of our nation's manufacturing sector. I am honored to recognize SRC Electrical on its outstanding achievement and look forward to following its continued success.

CONGRATULATING PRIME MINISTER NAJIB OF MALAYSIA ON HIS RE-ELECTION

HON. ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Prime Minister Mohd Najib Bin Tun Haji Abdul Razak of Malaysia on his re-election in May 2013.

Dato' Sri Najib is the eldest son of the second Prime Minister, Tun Abdul Razak Hussein. He received his primary and secondary education at St. John's Institution. For secondary education, he attended the Malvern Boys' College in Worcestershire, England. In 1974, he graduated from the University of Nottingham with a degree in Industrial Economics.

At the very young age of 23, Dato' Sri Najib was elected a Member of Parliament following the sudden passing of his father in 1976. Dato' Sri Najib later served as Deputy Minister of Energy, Telecommunication and Post, Deputy Minister of Education, Deputy Minister of Finance, Minister of Culture, Minister of Defense, Minister of Education, and Minister of Finance.

In service to his country, Prime Minister Najib has built a world-class education system in Malaysia and modernized the armed forces, making it a leaner fighting force capable of handling any conventional threats. He has also improved the quality of public services, introduced a new cabinet position in charge of unity and performance management, and implemented a New Economic Model with reforms to create a business environment conducive to economic growth, development and investment.

Due to his extraordinary leadership, Prime Minister Najib is driving the nation forward. I commend Prime Minister Najib for rolling back race-based policies and obligating \$2.6 billion in spending programs benefitting poor families. I also commend him for bringing about peace, prosperity and stability in a country that others seek to undermine for their own political purposes and gain.

Because Malaysia is a significant regional and global partner of the United States, I pay special tribute to Prime Minister Najib for winning the people's mandate. Malaysians turned out in record numbers to vote and the will of the Malaysian people is reflected in the results. Consequently, U.S.-Malaysia relations will remain strong. In fact, to reaffirm the strong bonds of friendship between the United States and Malaysia, President Obama made a surprise phone call to Prime Minister Najib to congratulate him on his victory. President Obama is also expected to participate in the two-day Global Entrepreneurship Summit to be held in Kuala Lumpur in October of this year.

I acknowledge Malaysian Parliament Member and Special Envoy to the United States, Dr. Jamaluddin Jarjis, for the exemplary service he continues to render in bolstering the U.S.-Malaysia partnership for and on behalf of Prime Minister Najib and the people of Malaysia. Prime Minister Najib has earned the respect of many at home and abroad, and I am pleased that he has the full and unwavering support of the United States as he enters his second term as Prime Minister.

SOLVING THE CYPRUS PROBLEM

HON. VIRGINIA FOXX

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the ongoing Cyprus problem.

Another year has passed, and yet again Members of Congress are speaking out in support of resolving this problem. As co-chair of the Congressional Caucus on US-Turkish Relations and Turkish-Americans, I wish to join my colleagues in these efforts. A positive resolution of this matter would enhance the stability, security, and economic integration in the Eastern Mediterranean region and ensure the equitable and effective sharing of natural resources.

Many of my colleagues have grown frustrated over the years by the lack of progress toward a negotiated political settlement. Perhaps the greatest frustration was caused by the failure of the UN peace initiative in 2004, when—despite the strong approval of the Turkish Cypriots—Greek Cypriots overwhelmingly rejected the Peace Plan and defeated the initiative.

If it had been approved by the both sides, the UN Peace Plan of 2004, which was strongly supported by the United States and the international community, would have established a bi-zonal and bi-communal state, demilitarized the island and settled the very issues that many of my colleagues have raised in recent weeks in conjunction with Cyprus.

In a report issued in May 2004, the UN Secretary General stated: "In the aftermath of the

vote, the situation of the Turkish Cypriots calls for the attention of the international community as a whole, including the Security Council." The report also noted that "[t]he Turkish Cypriot vote has undone any rationale for pressuring and isolating them."

Meanwhile, on April 26, the General Affairs Council of the European Union declared that: "The Turkish Cypriot community has expressed their clear desire for a future within the European Union. The Council is determined to put an end to the isolation of the Turkish Cypriot community and to facilitate the reunification of Cyprus by encouraging the economic development of the Turkish Cypriot community."

Yet we cannot let frustration deter us from moving forward.

I applaud The Turkish Cypriots for their willingness to move forward and their continued commitment to a negotiated political settlement. I am also encouraged by the newly elected Greek Cypriot President's previous support of the 2004 Peace Plan. Mr. Anastasiades now has a genuine opportunity to not only support a comprehensive settlement, but to achieve it.

The economic difficulties that have gripped Southern Cyprus this year should not be an obstacle to peace. On the contrary, as many experts say, they offer a good reason to take the path of cooperation. A united Cyprus would increase economic growth and provide stability in an important region—for the United States and our allies.

And while it will be up to the Greek and Turkish Cypriots to decide on their common or separate futures, the United States' interests in the region require an active involvement and engagement in the process. The U.S. should use its best influence to encourage all relevant parties in Cyprus to launch comprehensive peace talks without any further delay.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this time next year we will be able to applaud the ultimate resolution of the 40-year-old Cyprus problem.

HONORING THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KOREAN WAR ARMISTICE

HON. BETO O'ROURKE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 60th Anniversary of the armistice that ended the Korean War on July 27, 1953 and honor the Korean War Veterans and their families, who have taught us about strength, duty, service, and resolve. I am proud to represent hundreds of Korean War Veterans. Their service has been selfless and their accomplishments have been extraordinary.

The 60th Anniversary of the end of the Korean War calls us to reflect on the immeasurable burdens of war that have been borne by our veterans and their families. We pay tribute to our wounded, our missing, our fallen, and their families. They know the true costs of conflict and deserve our deepest respect.

On June 25, 1950, the Korean War began when approximately 75,000 soldiers from the North Korean People's Army poured across the 38th parallel, the boundary between the

Soviet-backed Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the north and the pro-Western Republic of Korea to the south. This invasion was the first military action of the Cold War. By July, American troops had entered the war on South Korea's behalf.

Nearly 5 million people died as a result of the Korean War. More than half of these—about 10 percent of Korea's prewar population—were civilians, a rate higher than either World War II or Vietnam. Nearly 40,000 Americans died in action in Korea, and more than 100,000 were wounded.

289,000 Texans served in the Korean War. 1,916 were killed in action and 440 are still missing in action. 169 El Pasoans gave their lives in Korean War and 23 are missing in action. The President of the United States awarded the highest of military honors to 11 Texans, including one El Pasoan Modesto Cartagena, for their acts of valor during the war.

Today we remember our commitments to those who served in Korea. As we do so, let us reaffirm our promise that when our troops finish their tours of duty, they come home to an America that gives them the benefits they have earned, the care they deserve, and the fullest opportunity to keep their families strong and our country moving forward.

FELLOWSHIP GENERAL BAPTIST CHURCH CELEBRATES ITS FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JASON T. SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Fellowship General Baptist Church is commemorating the milestone occasion of its Fortieth Anniversary in 2013, having served the community of Poplar Bluff for four decades since its official organization on July 15, 1973. The church traces its beginnings to April 5, 1973, when a group of faithful Baptists met for the first time at the Town and Country Restaurant in Poplar Bluff. On May 2, 1973, Fellowship General Baptist Church was organized into a mission with a charter membership of eighty-one individuals under the pastoral leadership of Kenneth Kennedy, Leland Duncan, Ernie Rogers, John Clanton, and Riley Mathias. The congregation broke ground for a permanent house of worship on July 21, 1974, and celebrated their first meeting in the complete church building on January 5, 1975 and over the years, the congregation at Fellowship General Baptist has been blessed with the leadership of three pastors: Dr. Onis Chapman (1976–79), Dr. Kenneth Kennedy (1978–87), and the Reverend Byron Beck (1987–present).

Members of the Fellowship General Baptist Church have consistently been the top financial supporter of the General Baptist Denomination, while successfully participating in outreach programs including Fellowship of Acceptance, Divorce Care, Salt and Light Sundays, Salvation Army, Living Water International and Grief Share. The congregation of Fellowship General Baptist Church, now 781 members strong, prepares to minister to the community for a fifth decade.

CELEBRATING THE FORT ROSS FESTIVAL AND DIALOGUE

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to recognize the 201st anniversary of Fort Ross, a California State Park and the site of an early Russian colony established on the North Coast of California in 1812. The annual Fort Ross Festival and Dialogue will take place on July 27–29, 2013 to celebrate the history and cultural significance of the site, and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending best wishes for the event.

Fort Ross is located in the home region of the Kashaya Pomo people of Northern California. In the early 1800s, the Russian-American Company founded Fort Ross as an early agricultural and fur-trading outpost to support their operations from San Francisco to Alaska. Russian colonists developed farms, ranches, and hunting operations in concert with local Kashaya and Alaska Native employees, playing an early role in establishing the agricultural character of the North Coast.

Today, Fort Ross is a national historic landmark, and an important piece of the shared history of the Russian and American people. Through cultural events, archeological study, and efforts to preserve the historical structures at the site, Fort Ross has become a hub for the Russian-American community and a destination for visitors from all over the world. The Fort Ross Festival will offer historical re-enactments and celebrations of Russian influence in the region while the Dialogue will enable Russian and American leaders to discuss Russian-American relations and trade in the modern era.

As we reflect on this unique landmark of California's history, I thank both the Fort Ross Conservancy and California State Parks for their commitment to restoring and preserving the park's historic buildings and features. This beautiful 3,400 acre park is a jewel of Sonoma County's coastline and offers visitors both outdoor recreation and historical significance.

I ask my colleagues to join me in marking this historic occasion and sending them our best wishes for a successful festival.

A TRIBUTE TO THE TYREE AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in tribute today of the Tyree A.M.E. Church to celebrate its Centennial Anniversary. Over the past 100 years, the Tyree A.M.E. Church has endured as the spiritual home for countless numbers of Philadelphia's citizens.

This past century, eighteen pastors have led the church successfully, relying on the steadfast faith and fellowship of its members to improve the church and surrounding community. The church's resolute determination to con-

tinue their noble work has set a great example for congregations across the country.

I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues help me in honoring the Centennial Anniversary of the founding of the Tyree A.M.E. Church. May it continue to grow and prosper for another 100 years and beyond.

HONORING THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KOREAN WAR ARMISTICE

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of our brave veterans of the Korean War on the eve of the 60th Anniversary of the end of combat operations in that region. These heroes fought so valiantly to protect our country and they rightfully deserve our recognition and admiration.

I am proud to represent a district that is home to such a large number of veterans, and I feel tremendous gratitude to the heroes of World War II, Korea, Vietnam and to the new generation of veterans from the Gulf War, Iraq and Afghanistan. My father, Bernard Deutch, volunteered to fight in World War II as a teenager where he earned a Purple Heart at the Battle of the Bulge. It was his example of service to our nation that motivated me to serve in Congress.

The veterans of the Korean War endured unique hardships in order to ensure the ideals of freedom and democracy lived on, both at home and abroad. Their selfless dedication to these values is a testament to true character of the men and women who fought in this conflict. With the bar set, I am confident their patriotic spirit lives on in those in the armed forces who serve our nation today.

In this era of partisan vitriol and gridlock in Washington, our leaders can always look to veterans as an example of how individuals from all walks of life can put their differences aside in order to accomplish great things. So long as I am in Congress, I promise to do everything in my power to ensure the well-being of our Nation's veterans. I join today with my family in wishing the veterans of the Korean War many more years of good health and urge all citizens of this great country to live by their example.

HONORING JAMES "JAY" EARL ALEXANDER FOR HIS SERVICE AS A EULESS POLICE OFFICER

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize Corporal James "Jay" Earl Alexander for his 36 years of public service as a police officer, 30 of which for the City of Euless, Texas.

Corporal Alexander began his career in law enforcement with several police departments in Texas, starting in 1970 at the age of 19 as a dispatcher for the Commerce Police Department. Two years later, he was a jailer and

deputy for Hunt County. In 1976, Alexander took the step of becoming an officer for the Lakeworth Police Department then, in 1977, he went to work for the Bedford Police Department and went on to receive his Basic Police Certification as a police officer a few months later. In 1982, he worked for the Grapevine and then Azle police departments.

In January 1983, Alexander joined the Euless Police Department as a police officer. In October of 1985 he earned his Intermediate Certification and, with Office Haywood, became the department's first Field Training Officer. That same year he received his Intoxilyzer Certification and, the following year, his Instructor's Certification. In 1987, Alexander was assigned to the Tactical Team as a sniper. He received his Advanced Certification in 1989 and, in 1991, his years of hard work were rewarded with a promotion to the rank of corporal.

Upon request, Corporal Alexander was assigned to be a School Resource Officer at Euless Junior High School in 1995, where he remained for the rest of his career. In 1997 he earned the Master Police Officer Certification. Over his outstanding and honorable career, Corporal Alexander has received eleven commendations, one of which was for his capturing of a Fort Worth murder suspect. He earned two years of credit from Tarrant County College and Texas Christian University, and accumulated 1,800 hours of continuing education as an officer.

Alexander was raised in Weatherford, Texas, and worked for a veterinarian and then moved to the Dallas—Fort Worth metroplex where he worked for a delivery service before getting involved with law enforcement. He is an avid student of local history and knows much of the pioneering families who settled the area. He is married and he and his wife Teresa have four children—Michael, Cody, Ashley, and Chris.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 24th Congressional District of Texas, I ask all my distinguished colleagues to join me in thanking Corporal James Alexander for his many years of public service as an officer of the Euless Police Department.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF
PAMELA KALLSEN

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Pamela Kallsen as she retires as Executive Director from the Marjaree Mason Center. Pam has dedicated her life to empowering domestic violence victims and advocating for their well-being. Her efforts have been paramount in ensuring the safety of hundreds of families in Fresno County.

Pam grew up in Fresno, California. After completing high school, she moved to Tennessee and attended the University of Memphis. Pam obtained her degree in Vocational Education and returned back to Fresno to receive an additional degree in Home Economics from California State University, Fresno.

Prior to her position as Executive Director at the Marjaree Mason Center, Pam worked extensively in the health care arena. While pur-

suage her career in the medical field she served as Vice President of executive services at Fresno Community Medical Centers. In addition, she held various positions at the California Eye Institute, St. Agnes Medical Center, and the Fresno Hospital Council.

Pam is a true advocate for those in need. She is past chair of the Fresno Continuum of Care, which is an initiative that is devoted to housing and supporting the local homeless population. Pam serves as a critical component to the Fresno County Ten-Year plan to abolish homelessness. She is also a dynamic participant in the Fresno County Domestic Violence Roundtable and the California Domestic Violence Advisory Council.

Under Pam's leadership, the Marjaree Mason Center has gone above and beyond, providing victims with resources to help them thrive in a safe environment. In addition to providing victims with shelter, the center offers legal assistance, counseling, and education for victims as well as for individuals throughout the entire community. During Pam's tenure, the center has expanded, so the Marjaree Mason Center reaches out to more women and children than ever before.

Pam has proven to be a successful change agent because she fights for what she believes is right. In 2001, Pam was recognized as one of the Top Ten Professional Women of Fresno, and in 2006, she was selected as Woman of the Year by the California State Assembly. Pam's efforts to make the Central Valley a better place are observed throughout the entire state and nation.

In addition to being a victims' advocate, Pam is also a wife and mother. It is my hope that Pam enjoys her retirement with her husband, Gene, and daughters, Laura and Leslie.

As co-chair of the Victims' Rights Caucus and a passionate supporter of the Violence Against Women Act, it is truly an honor to recognize Pam. Her years of tireless work on the behalf of some of the nation's most vulnerable is exceptionally admirable.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the service of Pamela Kallsen. Pam will undoubtedly be missed as she retires from the Marjaree Mason Center, but we can expect that she will continue to be a strong voice and advocate for victims and their families.

INTRODUCTION OF END RACIAL
PROFILING ACT OF 2013

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce the End Racial Profiling Act of 2013, along with additional cosponsors. This legislation represents a comprehensive federal commitment to healing the rift caused by racial profiling and restoring public confidence in the criminal justice system at-large. This legislation is designed to enforce the constitutional right to equal protection of the laws by changing the policies and procedures underlying the practice of profiling.

This legislation can be traced back to the data collection efforts of the late 1990's that were designed to determine whether racial profiling was a fact versus an urban legend.

Based upon the work around that legislation, by September 11, 2001, there was significant empirical evidence and wide agreement among Americans, including President Bush and Attorney General Ashcroft, that racial profiling was a tragic fact of life in the minority community and that the Federal government should take action to end the practice.

Moreover, many in the law enforcement community have acknowledged that singling out people for heightened scrutiny based on their race, ethnicity, religion, or national origin had eroded the trust in law enforcement necessary to appropriately serve and protect our communities.

During our 112th Congress Judiciary Committee hearing on racial profiling, we approached the issue from the perspective of "smart policing" and what makes sense in a time of austerity for protecting public safety. I believe that it became clear during the hearing that enough agreement exists to allow us to re-open the bipartisan dialogue on racial profiling commenced by President Bush and Attorney General Ashcroft.

Despite the fact that the majority of law enforcement officers perform their duties professionally and without bias—and we value their service highly—the specter of racial profiling has contaminated the relationship between the police and minority communities to such a degree that federal action is justified to begin addressing the issue.

While the Department of Justice promulgated a series of guidelines in 2003 which were designed to end the practice of racial profiling by federal law enforcement agencies, these measures do not reach the vast majority of racial profiling complaints arising from the routine activities of state and local law enforcement agencies. Further, the guidelines provide no enforcement mechanism or methods for identifying law enforcement agencies not in compliance and, therefore, fail to resolve the racial profiling problem nationwide. In this instance, there is no substitute for comprehensive federal anti-profiling legislation.

The End Racial Profiling Act is designed to eliminate the well documented problem of racial, ethnic, religious, and national origin profiling. First, the bill provides a prohibition on racial profiling, enforceable by declaratory or injunctive relief. Second, the bill mandates that training on racial profiling issues as part of Federal law enforcement training, the collection of data on all routine or spontaneous investigatory activities that is to be submitted through a standardized form to the Department of Justice.

Third, the Justice Department is authorized to provide grants for the development and implementation of best policing practices, such as early warning systems, technology integration, and other management protocols that discourage profiling. Finally, the Attorney General is required to provide periodic reports to assess the nature of any ongoing discriminatory profiling practices.

Recent events demonstrate that racial profiling remains a divisive issue that strikes at the very foundation of our democracy. Though the death of Trayvon Martin was not the result of a law enforcement encounter, the issues of race and reasonable suspicion of criminal conduct are so closely linked in the minds of the public that his death cannot be separated from the law enforcement profiling debate.

Ultimately, he is one of too many individuals across the country who have been victimized

by a perception of criminality simply because of their race, ethnicity, religion or national origin. These individuals are denied the basic respect and equal treatment that is the right of every American.

Decades ago, in the face of shocking violence, the passage of sweeping civil rights legislation made it clear that race should not affect the treatment of an individual American under the law. I believe that thousands of pedestrian and traffic stops of innocent minorities and the killing of innocent teen calls for a similar federal response. The practice of using race as a criterion in law enforcement undermines the progress we have made toward racial equality. Please join me in supporting this legislation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CAROLYN MCCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent during the week of July 15, 2013. If I were present, I would have voted on the following.

Tuesday, July 16, 2013: rollcall No. 354: On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, "yea;" rollcall No. 355: On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, "yea;" rollcall No. 356: On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, "yea."

Wednesday, July 17, 2013: rollcall No. 357: Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule for H.R. 2667, "nay;" rollcall No. 358: Motion on Agreeing to the Resolution providing the Rule on H.R. 2667 and H.R. 2668, "nay;" rollcall No. 359: Motion to Adjourn, "nay;" rollcall No. 360: On Motion to Recommend with Instructions H.R. 2667, "yea;" rollcall No. 361: On passage of H.R. 2667, "nay;" rollcall No. 362: On Motion to Recommend with Instruction H.R. 2668, "yea;" rollcall No. 363: On Passage of H.R. 2668, "nay."

Thursday, July 18, 2013: rollcall No. 364: Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule for H.R. 5, "nay;" rollcall No. 365: On Agreeing to the Resolution providing the Rule on H.R. 5, "nay;" rollcall No. 366: On passage of the Journal, "yea;" rollcall No. 367: On Agreeing to the Amendment to H.R. 5 offered by YOUNG of Alaska, "yea;" rollcall No. 368: On Agreeing to the Amendment to H.R. 5 offered by LUETKEMEYER of Missouri, "nay;" rollcall No. 369: On Agreeing to the Amendment to H.R. 5 offered by MEEHAN of Pennsylvania, "nay."

Friday, July 19, 2013: rollcall No. 370: On Agreeing to the Amendment to H.R. 5 offered by CULBERSON of Texas, "nay;" rollcall No. 371: On Agreeing to the Amendment to H.R. 5 offered by JACKSON LEE of Texas, "yea;" rollcall No. 372: On Agreeing to the Amendment to H.R. 5 offered by MILLER of California, "yea;" rollcall No. 373: On the Motion to Recommend with Instructions H.R. 5, "yea;" rollcall No. 374: On Passage of H.R. 5, "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RON BARBER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, due to airplane mechanical difficulties, I missed two recorded votes on July 30. I would like to indicate how I would have voted had I been present for those votes.

On Rollcall No. 375, H.R. 21542, the WMD Intelligence and Information Sharing Act, I would have voted "yea" to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish weapons of mass destruction intelligence and information sharing functions of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security and to require dissemination of information analyzed by the Department to entities with responsibilities relating to homeland security.

On Rollcall No. 376, H. Con. Res. 44, I would have voted "yea" to authorize the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run.

HONORING MR. DAN CALLOWAY

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Dan Calloway. Mr. Calloway attended Roosevelt Senior High School in West Palm Beach, from which he was graduated in 1956. A veteran of the U.S. Army, he was in charge of special services, rising to the rank of Captain of Special Services. Dan was the first black captain of the Army baseball team in 1963. For his accomplishments in that sport, he was inducted into the German Hall of Fame.

Following his successful time in the military, he embarked on a career in law enforcement. He retired as a Detective Sergeant with the Palm Beach County Sheriff's Office, where he also served as sports coordinator. In 1965, Dan founded the Youth Recreation Association (YRA) of Palm Beach County, which helps young people through scholarships and mentoring in sports and recreational activities. Numerous National Football League (NFL) stars and other professional athletes credit the YRA as an invaluable resource that helped them toward successful careers in sports. All have returned to Palm Beach County to "pay it forward," helping other young people with scholarships, skills camps and various other events.

Continuing his involvement in sports, Dan was honored as a torch bearer in Palm Beach County for the 1996 Olympics. In recognition of his many important contributions to sports, he was inducted into the Palm Beach County Sports Hall of Fame by the Palm Beach County Sports Commission in 1993. The Dan Calloway Recreation Center in Riviera Beach was dedicated in May 2010. In February 2011, Dan was inducted into the Roosevelt Senior High School Sports Hall of Fame for his contributions in baseball and basketball.

He married Delores Oliver in 1981. He calls her "the love of my life, and my eyes if I ever

go blind." He is a member of the Singer Island Civic Association and Palm Beach County Community Relations Board. He is among more than a dozen local professionals who have issued a call to black men to step-up as mentors and role models for young people in the community.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pride to recognize Dan Calloway, for everything that he has done for Palm Beach County, and our nation. He has accomplished so many wonderful things for the community, and I am proud to call him my friend.

RECOGNIZING KAREN KRAUSE,
PROGRESS OHIO'S BARBARA
KLASS SOKOL AWARD WINNER

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a woman of remarkable achievement, Karen Krause, of Toledo Ohio. This weekend I was privileged to join Karen as a 2013 honoree of Progress Ohio, from which she received the Barbara Klass Sokol Award. The award is given to a person who embodies the Columbus, Ohio activist's "high level of energy, humanitarianism, love of the arts, concern for the environment; who cared deeply about good government and spent a great deal of time and effort working to get good people elected at the state and local level, who was a champion for a fair and just society for all." Though this description is of the activist herself, it could just as easily have been written in describing Karen Krause, a woman who has spent her life defining public service.

After graduating from Toledo's Whitmer High School, Karen received her nursing training from the Maumee Valley Hospital School of Nursing. She went on to obtain her undergraduate degree from the University of Toledo and a Masters of Public Health Degree from the University of Michigan. She also attended the University of Toledo Law School.

Karen began her public service on the front lines, as a public health nurse with the Lucas County Health Department. Though her jobs changed, Karen never left the front lines in service to Ohio's vulnerable people. Karen became the Director of Nursing for the Lucas County Health Department in 1967 and remained at the helm until 1993. During part of those years she also served as a consultant to the Ohio Department of Health. Her advice and counsel was sought by many as an expert on matters of health care.

Following her "retirement" from the health department, Karen became the principal consultant at Community Health Consulting. She also served as Executive Director of the Mildred Bayer Clinic for two years. Rounding out her public service, Karen lent herself as Executive Director of Toledo District Nurses Association, Ohio AFL-CIO NWO Retiree Coordinator, Ohio Health Policy Consultant in the 2004 Presidential Campaign, Social Justice Chair of Toledo Area Jobs with Justice, and as President of AFSCME Retirees in Wood & Lucas Counties. All the while she has served 32 different organizations in various ways. She has been wise counsel to myself and many others, sharing her knowledge of health care

and the need for affordable, available coverage. As if that isn't enough, Karen has also given to our community as a one of the most capable and caring elected officials, having served on the Lucas County Educational Service Center since election in 1999 and on which she has served four terms as Board President.

Throughout, Karen has opened her heart and home to others. Those young people are now grown with children of her own, and Karen is now a proud grandma. We share with her family our pride in her accomplishments and in the receipt of the honor most recently bestowed. The Barbara Klass Sokol Award is a special award and this year it has been given to a very special woman.

Karen Krause's legacy in our community runs deep. As was noted when the presentation was made this weekend, Karen is truly "a champion of the people," a mantle she wears most humbly. She has travelled a path of her own and brought up many others along the way. Her servant's heart is her true gift, and one she has shared willingly in more than fifty years of public service. She has truly practiced Christ's Word that "Whatsoever you do to the least among you, that you do unto me." Her efforts have earned her the respect of those of us lucky enough to call her friend. This weekend's recognition was a chance for all of us to say, most heartfelt, "Thank you Karen."

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, CARSON
WILLIAMS

HON. ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to wish Carson Williams a Happy Birthday.

Carson was born on July 30, 1999 in Chattanooga, Tennessee. He is the son of Carlton Williams and Gretchen Richards.

Carson attends Signal Mountain Middle High School—home of the Eagles—located in Signal Mountain, Tennessee. From the time he could swing a bat, Carson played t-ball and Dixie Youth baseball. Today, Carson plays baseball for the Signal Mountain Middle High School varsity team. He is one on the best ball players on Signal Mountain.

As well as baseball, Carson loves to wake board, snow board, and play basketball. He kayaks, fishes and camps with his dad. Sometimes they go to the Nantahala River. They are best friends forever.

Carson and his mom are best friends forever, too. Carson and his mom do school projects together and cook. Carson also spends time on the lake with his mom and stepdad Mike. At 13 years old, Carson earned his boating license. He now drives a pontoon. Carson and Mike also like to hunt together. They hunt in Alabama, and anywhere else with lots of woods.

Carson loves Funyuns, Dr. Pepper, sea food, rare prime rib, and his family. He is proud to be from Tennessee.

Carson's sister is Margot Clark, married happily ever after to Justin.

Carson's grandparents on his paternal side are the late Thomas "Papa" Williams, a graduate of Texas A&M (Class of '60), and Mildred "Mimi" Williams, a retired school teacher who graduated from the University of South Carolina Aiken where she was a Who's Who Among Students in American Colleges and Universities. Carson says no one makes chicken and dumplings better than his Mimi. Carson misses his Papa.

On his maternal side, Carson's grandparents are Albert and Betty Jones, and Mike and Sue Richards. Albert is a graduate of Sewanee: The University of the South. Betty graduated from the University of Tennessee and was a tennis coach at Chattanooga State. She is teaching Carson to play tennis. Mike is a graduate of Auburn University, and Sue graduated from Troy State and earned a Master's degree from the University of Alabama. Grandma Sue is one of the best cooks Carson knows.

Carson's aunts are Lisa Williams, Cindy Jones, and Lynn Civitts.

Carson wants a truck one day soon. For now, he has to make do with happy birthday wishes from his family.

LONG BEACH CENTRAL AREA
ASSOCIATION

HON. ALAN S. LOWENTHAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following.

Whereas, the Long Beach Central Area Association (LBCAA) is a 22 year old non-profit organization; and

Whereas, MusicUNTOLD is the program and event production arm of the LBCAA, dedicated to educational art programs that promote diversity and human dignity; and

Whereas, all of MusicUNTOLD events and programs are free to the public, except annual signature/ticketed concerts; and

Whereas, the signature concert for 2013, is the 50th anniversary of the "Martin Luther King, Jr. Symphony of Brotherhood" Concert, on August 18 at the Zipper Hall-Colburn; and

Whereas, the chamber music concert is celebrating the 50th Anniversary "March on Washington for Freedom and Jobs" and Dr. King's "I Have A Dream" speech, featuring national and local classical and opera artists; and

Whereas, the concert will present MLK Jr.'s little known appreciation of classical and opera music, a correlation between Beethoven and MLK Jr., and the historical footprint of MLK Jr. in Los Angeles; and

Whereas, the world premiere of "Candlelight" for soprano by South Korean educator and composer Dr. Joopoong Kim.

More information can be found <http://www.brownpapertickets.com/event/385424> and www.musicuntold.com.

CELEBRATING 28 YEARS OF SERVICE: PEGGY LYNCH, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, FRIENDS OF THE PARKS AND TRAILS OF SAINT PAUL AND RAMSEY COUNTY

HON. BETTY MCCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the inspiring career of Ms. Peggy Lynch, a leader in preservation of parks and green space, on the occasion of her retirement as Executive Director from Friends of the Parks and Trails of Saint Paul and Ramsey County.

The Friends of the Parks and Trails of Saint Paul and Ramsey County has its origins in a group of citizens who banded together to protect Hidden Falls—Crosby Lake Regional Park in 1984 from developers proposing to build housing within the park. After the housing proposal was defeated, the group continued to meet, and a permanent organization was established in 1985 with a grant from the Saint Paul Foundation. Peggy Lynch co-founded the organization and served as Executive Director for the next 28 years. Today, because of Peggy's extraordinary persistence and advocacy for the outdoors, the organization has led development and preservation of parks across the east metro region and earned her the title the "Conscience of the Parks."

Thanks to Peggy Lynch's vision, the organization achieved foundational work to protect public access to green space. In 1985 the group initiated a study of parks in Saint Paul and Ramsey County during a period of intense developer interest in prime park land. At the time, there were few local park commissions and developers had no obligation to contribute to the park system. Cities such as Saint Paul sold parkland for a dollar per parcel. As a result of a study by the Friends of the Parks and Trails of Saint Paul and Ramsey County, Park Commissions in Saint Paul and Ramsey County were established. The amendment of the City of Saint Paul and Ramsey County charters for "no net loss" of parkland were approved. These actions built a system to preserve and add parkland for public use.

Additionally, Peggy and Friends of the Parks and Trails of Saint Paul and Ramsey County have helped develop and support the environment by promoting appreciation for parks and open space through quality parks, trails, and bikeways. Through educational, community, and corporate outreach programs, they have provided access to recreational opportunities to communities who otherwise may not have the opportunity to experience it.

Peggy's influence brought increased recognition and elevated the importance of preserving the great outdoors for present and future generations to come. Her work along with the Friends of the Parks and Trails of Saint Paul and Ramsey County are legacies that will live on in the organization's work advocating for the environment in the Twin Cities.

HONORING JOHN R. LASSEN, JR.

HON. KYRSTEN SINEMA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and passing of Mr. John R. Lassen, Jr., a lifelong teacher in Tempe, Arizona, and a nationally distinguished innovator in secondary education.

A native fourth generation Arizonan, John served his country in the United States Air Force after graduating from high school in Tempe. Following his distinguished service to his country, John returned home to attend Arizona State University on a basketball scholarship, where he earned both a bachelor and a master's degree in mathematics.

John's heart never left Tempe—his passion was mathematics. He loved teaching in his hometown at Marcos De Niza and Mountain Pointe High Schools for nearly forty years, eventually serving as Mathematics Department Chairman for the Tempe Unified School District.

Under the administration of President George H. W. Bush, Mr. Lassen earned the Presidential Award for Excellence in Science and Mathematics Teaching, for which he was honored at the White House Rose Garden and the U.S. State Department. Mr. Lassen also initiated a dual-credit collaboration between Tempe public schools and Rio Salado College, offered first at Mr. Lassen's own Mountain Pointe High School and later throughout the greater Phoenix area. For this, he was given the President's Award for dedication and commitment to education in Arizona from the President of Rio Salado College.

It was to the great benefit of Tempe, his community, and the state of Arizona that Mr. Lassen served so dutifully and lived so well. I ask that my colleagues join me in posthumously recognizing Mr. Lassen and extending our condolences to his family.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$16,738,094,608,381.03. We've added \$6,111,217,559,467.95 to our debt in 4 and a half years. This is \$6 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

RECOGNIZING JONATHAN "TIG" WILLARD

HON. TOM RICE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize Jonathan "Tig" Willard

from Loris, South Carolina today for his commendable bravery and act of selflessness. While driving to training camp for the Tennessee Titans this past Tuesday, he noticed a car with black smoke billowing out of it. Jonathan signaled for the car to pull over and helped to rescue the driver, her three children, and her dog as the car was engulfed in flames.

A native of the Seventh District of South Carolina, Jonathan is an exemplary football player who led Clemson University's defense in tackles last season and now plays at the professional level. However, it is an act like this—one that puts the safety of others before the safety of self—that demonstrates Jonathan's compassion and character. I commend his efforts, as this is a reminder that we should all keep our eyes open for ways to be a Good Samaritan and help our fellow neighbors.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF
HANDLEY REGIONAL LIBRARY

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th anniversary of Handley Regional Library in Winchester, Virginia.

The original Handley Library building has long been an important architectural and historical site in Winchester. It first opened in 1913 and was designed by architects J. Stewart Barney and Henry Otis Chapman.

The growth and change the library has gone through over the past 100 years has been extraordinary. In 1915, the library's annual attendance was 52,902. Today, more than 357,000 guests visit the facility each year. The collection of books and periodicals has expanded significantly as well. The library's collection totaled 6,000 in 1915; today, the collection contains over 302,000 books, magazines and digital materials, including audio books, e-books, CDs and DVDs.

The library's growth over the years is due in part to the growth in the Shenandoah Valley region. Today, the population served by the library is 120,000, an increase of nearly 100,000 since 1915.

Additionally, Handley Library is unique because it is one of three libraries in the regional system. It became regional when Frederick County joined the system in 1979 and Clarke County joined in 1981. Regional systems ensure the libraries can all provide excellent services without duplicating administrative costs. This has saved taxpayers money, which is crucial during these economically challenging times.

Handley Regional Library is a treasure for the northern Shenandoah Valley community. From computer literacy programs, to youth and adult programs, to the vast collection of regional history and genealogy located in its outstanding archives section, the library provides exceptional facilities and services for area residents.

The success of the library today is due to director Trish Ridgeway and the entire library staff, as well as the generous support of the Friends of Handley Library and its many volunteers.

I would like to particularly recognize the efforts of Trish Ridgeway, who during her 20 years as its director has overseen several of the regional library system's construction projects, including the major renovation of the original library building in Winchester. As she prepares to retire at the end of September, I want to thank Trish for her leadership and wish her all the best for retirement.

There will be a gala celebration in honor of the 100th anniversary at Handley Library on August 24, 2013. Congratulations to the library, its staff and the volunteers as they celebrate this very important milestone.

DIVISION IN CYPRUS

HON. ED WHITFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in mid-May, twenty-three of my colleagues joined me in sending a letter to the Secretary General of the United Nations to encourage the newly elected Greek Cypriot leader and his Turkish Cypriot counterpart to resume talks aimed at expediently resolving the ongoing dispute over a divided Cyprus. A negotiated and mutually acceptable comprehensive settlement, based on a bi-zonal and bi-communal federation is vital to the region. I support international and domestic efforts to achieve such a resolution and urge the House of Representatives to encourage constructive dialogue between the two sides. In 2003, the House unanimously adopted H. Res. 165 in support of the Annan Plan, which would have approved the creation of a reunified Partnership State in Cyprus as a loose federation of two component states—the Greek Cypriot State and the Turkish Cypriot State. Unfortunately, this historic opportunity was rejected by Greek Cypriots through a referendum on the island.

Although a majority of Turkish Cypriots approved the peace plan also by referendum, an opportunity of historic proportions was missed. Many would attribute the Greek Cypriots rejection of the Annan Plan and pro-division choice to becoming European Union (EU) members, which followed this move. At that time, it was believed that EU accession was predicated on solving this division after the fact. Subsequently, there has been no progress in this regard, further indicating a pro-division State. While the Greek Cypriots enjoy recognition as a sovereign state, there has been no imputes for them to solve the problem. Despite promises made to Turkish Cypriots over and over again, they still remain isolated.

Over ten years have gone by without any progress on this issue. This year may once again be a year of opportunity to put an end to the status quo. We should be courageous enough to encourage a solution in Cyprus, and creative enough to promote a more secure, stable and prosperous Eastern Mediterranean where Greece, Turkey, a unified Cyprus, together with their allies and partners in the region, work together to build a better future.

With the firm belief that such an outcome is not only achievable, but will also set an invaluable example of peace and cooperation in the region and beyond, I urge the Administration to encourage the United Nations Secretary

General to enhance his efforts in reaching a comprehensive and just solution in Cyprus.

EDWARD R. MURROW HIGH
SCHOOL'S NATIONAL CHESS
CHAMPIONSHIP TITLE

HON. YVETTE D. CLARKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to congratulate my alma mater Edward R. Murrow High School for winning the 2013 National High School Chess Championship. This is the eighth time that my alma mater has won this prestigious title.

Edward R. Murrow's chess team, along with more than 5000 students from across the country, vied for the national title in Nashville, Tennessee. Murrow trumped the competition and came away with the top prize.

Murrow's championship chess team hails from a diverse background reflective of the multicultural and vibrant communities that call Brooklyn, New York home.

I am tremendously proud of the team's talented young men and women, who worked hard to perfect their skills. I also want to acknowledge their coach, Mr. Eliot Weiss, who helped the students hone their talents, while offering guidance and mentorship throughout the year.

This victory was no easy feat. It was only through hard work, tenacity, and long hours spent perfecting the craft that they were able to claim the title.

Through judicious choice and astute strategy, Murrow's chess team has again proven that they are some of the most proficient and accomplished in the sport.

I feel honored to call myself an alumna of such a distinguished institution, which has a long history of shaping the sharp and analytic minds of New York's most promising youth.

Once again, I say congratulations to Edward R. Murrow's Chess Team for a job well done!

HONORING THE LIFE OF NORTH-
WEST FLORIDA'S BLUFORD
WARD

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of Mr. Bluford Ward, who passed away on July 25, 2013. During his life, Bluford made it his mission to engage with his neighbors, reaching out to hear their concerns and assist them in any way he could. The loss of this great man is felt across the entire Northwest Florida community.

Bluford was born on August 18, 1939 and was raised in the small and historic Coon Hill community of Santa Rosa County, Florida. He attended Allentown High School where he met and married his beloved companion of fifty-four years, Betty Crutchfield.

In his lifetime, Bluford was a trusted and valuable employee for many local companies. In his earlier years, he worked for American

Cyanamid. He also worked as a car salesman for several dealerships in both Florida and Alabama. It was a position that suited him well, providing him an opportunity to talk with his "neighbors" about the concerns of the day, as well as helping them find the best deal possible. An avid hunter, Bluford served as a hunting guide in Colorado and Wyoming. He built a reputation on working and tooling hunting rifles and scopes and worked at a variety of sporting stores, including Mike's Outdoor Sports, Scott's Outdoor Sports, and most recently Owen's Outfitters. Outside of the workplace, Bluford loved tinkering around the house and maintaining a vegetable garden.

Bluford will always be remembered as a good neighbor, outdoorsman, and one of Central High School Jaguars biggest fans. But above all, he was a dedicated family man and a devoted Christian. Bluford is survived by the love of his life, Betty; their three daughters: Sherry (Reed) Compton of Auburn, Alabama; Jennifer (Lee) Langham of Jay, Florida; and Terry (Bart) Bray of Jay, Florida; four granddaughters: Chloe Compton, Arissa Bray, Paige Bray and Kolby Bray; five sisters, and one brother, numerous nieces, nephews, and man's best friend, Hope.

Family, friends, and neighbors mourn the loss of a man with a genuine smile, loving heart, and unwavering compassion.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am privileged to honor the life of Bluford Ward. My wife Vicki and I offer our prayers and sincerest condolences to his wife, Betty, his family, and friends. He will be truly missed.

CONGRATULATING UZBEKISTAN ON ITS INDEPENDENCE

HON. ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Uzbekistan on 22 years of independence. The United States has supported Uzbekistan's sovereignty following its independence from the Soviet Union in 1991.

Uzbekistan is a key partner in supporting international efforts in Afghanistan. Uzbekistan has supported North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) troops in Afghanistan through provision of electricity, development of rail infrastructures and the Northern Distribution Network. Uzbekistan was the United States' main regional partner in the war on terrorism.

But our relationship with Uzbekistan has developed beyond Afghanistan. I commend President Islam Karimov for strengthening U.S.-Uzbekistan relations and for providing stability in one of the world's tougher neighborhoods. Under his leadership, the United States and Uzbekistan are cooperating on security, economic relations, political and civil society issues, agricultural development, transnational crime, and the threat of infectious disease.

As a result of strong bilateral relations between our countries, Uzbekistan is becoming an attractive investment location for United States companies including Coca-Cola, Case New Holland, Lockheed Martin, Boeing, Caterpillar, and others. Just last year, 50 executives from top United States companies took part in the annual Uzbekistan-U.S. Business Forum.

With the largest population in Central Asia and a fast-growing economy, Uzbekistan is also a major producer of energy and minerals. Uranium is one of Uzbekistan's largest exports to the United States.

Uzbekistan's history spans more than 2,500 years. Samarkand is the second largest city in Uzbekistan and is as old as Rome, Athens and Babylon. Samarkand is one of the most important cities in Central Asia. It is the city of legends. Registan Square is considered an architectural gem representing the finest in Islamic art. The Mausoleum of Tamerlane houses a massive slab of green jade under which Tamerlane the conqueror is buried, and is thought to be the largest such stone in the world. Today, Samarkand is included in the UNESCO World Heritage List.

Once an important trading center at the crossroads of the Great Silk Road connecting Asia and Europe, Uzbekistan is, again, emerging as a regional and global leader. And so, it is my honor to congratulate President Karimov and the people of Uzbekistan on their Independence Day and to extend to them my best wishes for a bright and prosperous future.

HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES MUST 'INTERFERE' IN U.S.-CHINA RE- LATIONS

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, this week the U.S. and China will hold its annual human rights dialogue—a dialogue that began after the brutal Tiananmen Square crackdown 24 years ago.

Nearly a quarter of a century later the Chinese government remains frightened by the spirit that animated that protest. A June 23 Washington Post article reported that, "In the 2½ decades since the protests' violent end, China's government has largely scrubbed Tiananmen from history."

Try as they might the Chinese government's "Orwellian" efforts to erase this unpleasant event from its history books are incomplete. There are those still living with the scars of that day—both emotional and physical. In 1991, Congressman CHRIS SMITH and I traveled to China. We visited Beijing Prison Number One, which at the time housed approximately 40 Tiananmen Square protesters. While our request to visit the demonstrators was denied, we left with a pair of socks, made by the prisoners, for export to the West.

The abuses of Tiananmen are not simply the stuff of history. The State Department's most recent human rights report found that, "Repression and coercion, particularly against organizations and individuals involved in rights advocacy and public interest issues, were routine. Individuals and groups seen as politically sensitive by authorities continued to face tight restrictions on their freedom to assemble, practice religion, and travel. Efforts to silence and intimidate political activists and public interest lawyers continued to increase. Authorities resorted to extralegal measures such as enforced disappearance, 'soft detention,' and strict house arrest, including house arrest of family members, to prevent the public voicing of independent opinions."

In the face of these and other abuses, it is striking that the human rights dialogue with the Chinese government rarely produces real results or changes. The content of these discussions is cloaked in secrecy, even with other policy makers, including Congress, and the broader human rights community. We are assured that behind closed doors the administration gave an impassioned defense of basic freedoms and human dignity. We are told that, privately, specific cases were raised. This approach has, time and again, failed to produce meaningful results. The imprisoned Catholic bishop, the detained blogger and the beleaguered human rights lawyer deserve far more than this administration has given them.

Human Rights Watch summed it up this way in a press release issued before last year's human rights dialogue: "Many of the United States' and other governments' past human rights dialogues with China have been largely a rhetorical shell, lacking in accountability, transparency, and clear benchmarks for progress. The Chinese government often points to these dialogues as a human rights 'deliverable,' an end in itself, or insists that human rights issues can only be discussed in the context of a dialogue. None of the governments that pursue these dialogues with the Chinese government have established benchmarks to ensure meaningful progress."

Will the same hold true this week? Will we find simply another rhetorical shell and no discernible progress on the part of one of the world's worst human rights abusers?

If history is to be our guide, I fear the answer is yes.

Early in her tenure as Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton, during a visit to Asia, famously said that U.S. concern with human rights issues in China "can't interfere with the global economic crisis, the global climate change crisis, and the security crisis." Her statement garnered shock and dismay from human rights activists at home, and I would venture, abroad—the very people who historically have looked to America to champion their cause, rather than relegate it to the backburner. Further, it effectively showed this administration's hand to everyone, including Beijing. Any mention of human rights was just that—an obligatory mention. Human rights were an interference to be managed, a pesky deterrent to bilateral collaboration on more pressing issues.

This notion has been born out in reality. Only when events literally force a response from the U.S. government do human rights garner the attention they rightly deserve.

In April 2012, Chinese activist and legal advocate Chen Guangcheng sought refuge in the U.S. embassy. All of a sudden human rights were sure to "interfere" with the Strategic and Economic Dialogue, which was bringing secretaries Clinton and Geithner to Beijing for high level talks the following week.

Several months earlier, in February 2012 I was one of several Members of Congress—including Rep. CHRIS SMITH, who for years championed Chen's case—who wrote a letter to President Obama on the eve of Chinese Vice President Xi Jinping's visit to the U.S. We encouraged President Obama to follow the time-tested model of President Ronald Reagan during the height of the Cold War, when Reagan spoke out on behalf of specific dissidents by name, linking human rights and religious freedom to every other facet of U.S.-

Soviet relations rather than sidelining the very principles that make this country unique. Chen Guangcheng was among the cases we featured and pressed him to raise.

But it was only with Chen's heroic escape from house arrest that he guaranteed that he was a diplomatic priority.

Too often, it seems that this administration's posture vis-a-vis human rights is one of caution to the point of silence.

Silence in the face of China's abysmal human rights record is indefensible.

The government is an equal opportunity oppressor of people of faith—Catholic bishops, Protestant house church leaders, Tibetan monks and nuns, Uyghur Muslims and Falun Gong practitioners to name a few. Harassments, intimidation and imprisonment are the order of the day.

According to the Congressional Executive Commission on China, at least 40 Roman Catholic bishops remain imprisoned or detained, or were forcibly disappeared including the elderly Bishop Su Zhimin, whose current whereabouts are unknown and who had been under strict surveillance since the 1970s.

Protestant house church pastors are routinely intimidated, imprisoned and tortured. Writing in *Christianity Today* on February 27, 2013, ChinaAid's Bob Fu declared, "... the number of incidents of 'persecution' increased in 2012 from the previous years, including a number of arrest, sentencing to labor camps, short term detentions, rape and torture in police custody, destruction and confiscation of property, beatings, fines, the loss of jobs or business licenses, and police intimidation."

Over the last two years, a growing number of peace-loving Tibetan Buddhist monks and nuns have set themselves aflame in desperation at the abuses suffered by their people. Human Rights Watch reports that, "The Chinese government, under the rationale of a campaign to improve rural living standards, has sent more than 20,000 officials and communist party cadres to Tibetan villages to undertake intrusive surveillance of people, carry out widespread political re-education, and establish partisan security units..."

Uyghur Muslims are unable to freely associate and have been subject to forced confessions and persecution. I repeatedly requested, to no avail, that Secretary Clinton meet with Uyghur human rights activist Rebiya Kadeer who has long been at the forefront of this issue having suffered in prison for five years, including two years of solitary confinement, before she was exiled to the U.S. in 2005. In addition to being a leading human rights activist she is a mother. Her own children have been harassed and wrongly imprisoned as a direct result of her advocacy efforts.

The annual report of the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom (USCIRF) found that, "poor religious freedom conditions in China have deteriorated significantly, particularly for Tibetan Buddhists and Uighur Muslims. To stem the growth of independent Catholic and Protestant groups, the government has detained and arrested leaders, forcibly closed churches, and selected Catholic bishops without the approval of the Vatican. The Falun Gong and other groups deemed 'evil cults' face long-term imprisonments, forced renunciations of faith, and torture in detention."

In November 2009 I wrote a series of high-ranking Obama Administration officials, includ-

ing U.S. Trade Representative Ron Kirk, urging that when they have the opportunity to travel to China, that they take time to attend a service at one of China's underground house churches.

I noted that it is not uncommon for U.S. government officials to attend one of the state-sanctioned Three-Self Patriotic Movement churches but that officials rarely if ever visit any of China's house churches which constitute a significant segment of China's faith community and consistently face persecution and repression at the hands of their own government.

I further noted that, perhaps counter-intuitively, many house churches welcome visits by high-profile government officials from the West. Not only do such visits give decision-makers a clearer sense of the repression that the church in China faces but in some cases it actually affords them protection from future harassment and lends credibility to the church themselves. Few administration officials bothered to respond to my letter and, to my knowledge, not a single one has attended a service since the request was made a year and a half ago. In several meetings I personally raised the issue with Mr. Kirk. He seemed to view the request as bothersome—a distraction from more important things.

In its annual report, the bipartisan U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom (USCIRF) pointed to the administration's so-called "Asia Pivot," and observed that the "security and economic pillars of the Asia Pivot remain more developed, and no new democracy, human rights, or humanitarian policy proposals have been offered." The commission further noted that human rights are not an integrated part of U.S.-China bilateral relations.

The Chinese government maintains a brutal system of slave labor camps on the order of the Soviet gulags. Common criminals languish behind bars with Nobel laureates who dare to question the regime's authority.

China has a thriving business of harvesting and selling for transplant kidneys, corneas and other human organs from executed prisoners, including political prisoners.

Earlier this month, just weeks before the human rights dialogue, the New York Times reported that "The police in Beijing have detained one of China's most prominent rights advocates, the latest in a series of arrests that critics said showed the Communist Party's determination to silence campaigners who have challenged the party to act on its vows to expose official corruption and respect rule of law." The advocate's name is Xu Zhiyong.

The Times continued, "supporters said that his case was likely to attract wider attention as a test of China's beleaguered 'rights defense' movement, which he helped build. That loose network of lawyers, scholars and advocates has sought to use litigation, publicity and petitions to secure political and social rights." The Christian Science Monitor reported that, "Xu is renowned for his public interest legal work on behalf of victims of official injustice, such as children sickened by melamine-tainted formula, and for the care he takes not to demand more than the Chinese Constitution provides for."

All of these examples are symptomatic of a broken system in China. A system infused with corruption and threatened by dissent.

Despite explosive economic growth, China remains a "closed society" when it comes to

information. The Chinese government recognizes that ideas have consequence and they go to great lengths to restrict Chinese citizens' access to information through the "Great Firewall" which censors so-called "offensive" speech.

It is estimated that China employs between 30,000 and 50,000 special Internet police. These police were notably active in the aftermath of the "Arab Spring" as the government blocked Internet search requests for key words like "Egypt" and "Jasmine."

As far back as 2008, Amnesty International rightly noted that "In China the Internet has become a new frontier in the fight for human rights."

And yet the Obama Administration has paid mere lip-service to Internet freedom boasting in speeches of the priority it places on the issue when in fact nearly all of the money they've spent on Internet circumvention has been as a result of congressionally-mandated funding targeting closed societies and the State Department has actually sought to redirect the funding toward less threatening research initiatives as opposed to actual hard-hitting circumvention which poses a real threat to authoritarian regimes.

This is not surprising given that this administration seems less concerned with bringing about reform and change on the part of the Chinese government than it does with embracing the current leadership.

On January 19, 2011, I spoke at a Capitol Hill press conference regarding the visit of then-Chinese president Hu Jintao to the U.S. in which I strongly criticized the administration for granting the Chinese president the distinction of an official state dinner—something which had not happened for 13 years—given that the regime had done nothing to deserve such an honor.

We were joined at the press conference by the wife of Gao Zhisheng. Gao is one of the most respected human rights lawyers in China. He has defended activists and religious minorities and documented human rights abuses in China, including a number of high-profile human rights cases, involving Christians in Xinjiang and Falun Gong practitioners. He has been disbarred and subjected to forced disappearance, torture, illegal house arrest and detention as a result of his work. Currently he is imprisoned in Shaya County Prison in the Xinjiang Uighur Autonomous Region in northwest China, after being incarcerated in December 2011 for allegedly violating the conditions of his suspended three-year sentence. Prior to this, his whereabouts had been unknown for almost 20 months. He has been tortured repeatedly since 2006 and continues to be at high risk of further torture. Nearly eight months ago his older brother was able to visit him in prison. Prior to that it had been nine months since anyone had had confirmation he was even alive. He has not been seen or heard from since.

I have "adopted" Gao as part of a recently launched initiative, the Defending Freedoms Project, led by the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission which seeks to draw attention to the plight of persecuted prisoners of conscience and I am committed to pressing for his release and ultimately his freedom.

Gao is but one of many high profile dissidents presently languishing in prison. In December 2009, the government sentenced human rights and democracy activist Liu

Xiaobo to 11 years in prison due to his involvement in drafting Charter '08, a historic manifesto advocating for democracy and a greater respect for human rights in China. Liu's courage was recognized by the Norwegian Nobel Committee when they awarded him the 2010 Nobel Peace Prize. However, the award ceremony was held with an empty chair as a solemn reminder that the 2010 Nobel Laureate remains behind bars.

Many have predicted that the 21st century will be the Chinese century, but absent dramatic reform at the heart of the Chinese government, such Chinese ascendancy is deeply problematic and America must be clear-eyed about its implications.

This administration has been anything but.

Last year, Chinese dissident Yu Jie wrote an unsettling piece in the Washington Post where he stated, "China is a far greater threat than the former Soviet Union ever was," and "unfortunately, the West lacks visionary politicians, such as Ronald Reagan, to stand up to this threat."

While this administration and this president lack vision, the Chinese people do not.

Before President Obama's recent meeting with Chinese President Xi Jinping, I joined a leading group of human rights organizations and activists in pressing him to raise the fate of a group of Chinese prisoners of conscience dubbed the "China 16," and to call for their immediate and unconditional release. Each has suffered for courageously challenging "the status quo at great cost and peril to themselves and their families."

As is characteristic, their names were never publicly uttered by the president. And we can only guess what happened privately.

Are their names being raised this week in Kunming, China? Are they being quietly whispered in closed door meetings? Will a single person's life change for the better as a result of the human rights dialogue?

Today, in China, there are men and women whose names we do not yet know but who stand shoulder to shoulder with the likes of Sharansky and Solzhenitsyn and other famed dissidents throughout history who have dared to question the tyranny which enslaved them.

Does the Obama Administration stand with them?

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 90TH
BIRTHDAY OF LILLIA ALINE
HARRIS

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask for the House's attention today to recognize Lillia Aline Harris who will celebrate her 90th birthday on August 28th.

Lillia Aline Harris was born to Chester and Estella Warren on August 28, 1923. She was the firstborn of six children, and had three sisters and two brothers. Mrs. Harris worked on her parents' farm while still attending school. She graduated from Heflin High School in 1942.

In May of 1945, Aline married Robert Freeman Harris. Together, Aline and Robert had 3 children, 8 grandchildren and 20 great-grandchildren.

Aline has been an active member of Coldwater United Methodist Church for over 60 years. She is a loving mother, grandmother and great-grandmother, and all who know her speak of her kindness.

Mr. Speaker, please join Mrs. Harris's family, friends, and myself in wishing Aline a Happy Birthday.

48TH ANNIVERSARY OF MEDICARE

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, for the past 48 years, Medicare has provided seniors and the disabled with the quality health care, economic security and peace of mind they deserve. Because of Medicare, millions of Americans have been able to grow old with respect and dignity instead of mounting medical debt and uncertainty.

Let's not forget: Medicare is a family benefit. As a caregiver for my mother, I know firsthand just how important this benefit is to families all over New Mexico and America. Without Medicare, my mother would not be able to get the health care she needs, and there is absolutely no way I would be able to take care of her. Medicare has always been personal to me. It's personal to this day.

This week, House Republicans will vote for the 40th time to repeal the Affordable Care Act. Every vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act is a vote to undermine Medicare. The Affordable Care Act has already strengthened Medicare and saved seniors money by eliminating co-pays for preventive care services, closing the prescription drug 'donut hole' and extending the life of the Medicare Trust Fund by nearly a decade.

Mr. Speaker, on this day and every day, we must remain committed to protecting and strengthening Medicare for today's seniors and for future generations.

HONORING AMBASSADOR LINDY
BOGGS

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life and legacy of Ambassador Lindy Boggs. I was profoundly saddened to learn of her recent passing. Ambassador Boggs was deeply respected for her civility, dignity, and political acumen by those across the political spectrum.

A nine-term Member of Congress and champion of women's rights, Congresswoman Boggs spent much of her time working for civil rights and to address poverty. She and her husband, Congressman Hale Boggs, welcomed civil rights activists into their New Orleans. I personally worked with Congresswoman Boggs on the successful Head Start program when she was a Member of the House of Representatives. I am pleased to recall that I was in consultation with her back when she was working on her Head Start legislation.

Congresswoman Boggs was also responsible for successfully amending the Equal Credit Opportunity Act to protect women from lending discrimination.

After retiring from Congress in 1990, Ambassador Boggs worked with civic and cultural institutions in New Orleans and nationally. More recently, Ambassador Boggs was appointed by President Clinton to serve as U.S. Ambassador to the Holy See at the Vatican. She continued her record of excellence in this role, and I was honored to have had the opportunity to visit her in Rome during her service.

Ambassador Boggs is survived by two children, Thomas Hale Boggs, Jr. and Cokie Roberts, whom I have had the privilege of meeting, as well as eight grandchildren and eighteen great-grandchildren. She will always be remembered in Washington for her extraordinary service and dedication.

IN SUPPORT OF THE NUCLEAR
IRAN PREVENTION ACT

HON. PETER T. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 850, the Nuclear Iran Prevention Act. As the threat of a nuclear-armed Iran looms over the security of the international community, it is essential that the U.S. prevent Iran from realizing its dangerous ambitions. This legislation will broaden economic sanctions, target human rights violators and increase pressure on the Iranian regime to abandon its dangerous pursuits. I am proud to cosponsor this legislation.

Despite existing sanctions, Iran continues to advance its nuclear program with determination. Since 2011, Iran's number of installed centrifuges has doubled and it continues to obstruct international inspectors. The country continues to evade sanctions to profit from its oil production, which in turn funds its nuclear program and state-sponsored terrorism organizations like Hezbollah. In fact, Iran remains the number one state-sponsor of terrorism around the world.

If Iran's pursuit of nuclear weapons goes unchecked, the security of our crucial allies like Israel, the United States and the global community will be in grave danger. With this bill, Congress is sending a clear message to Tehran to abandon its nuclear weapons program, or face the economic consequences. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

HAPPY ANNIVERSARY MEDICARE
AND MEDICAID

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, on the 48th anniversary of Medicare and Medicaid, I rise to voice my strong support for these national treasures and to share with my colleagues the voices of older Americans from around the nation who rely on them.

Before 1965, nearly half of all seniors were uninsured. If they became sick or injured, they were forced to use their savings, rely on their family, or go without needed medical care. Today, Medicare serves over 50 million seniors and persons with disabilities, providing them with the guaranteed benefits that they have earned over their working lives.

Medicare is literally a life-saver. It can be improved—and we did so in Obamacare by lowering drug costs, eliminating cost-sharing for preventive services like colonoscopies and cancer screenings, and coordinating care to improve quality.

Unfortunately, there are some who want to change Medicare not by making it better, but by shifting costs to those who cannot afford it. Some of those proposals involve increased premiums, deductibles and new cost-sharing requirements for home health services. Others—like those in the Republican-passed budget resolution—would radically change Medicare's very structure by turning it into a voucher program and leaving seniors and people with disabilities to bear dramatically higher costs.

I urge my colleagues to consider the critical importance of Medicare and to join me in opposing proposals that would add to the financial burden of seniors and persons with disabilities who are already struggling. Here are some of the voices of those who need Medicare's guaranteed benefits.

Michelle Adams, from Fallston Maryland, has been on Medicare for the past 13 years because she is disabled. If she didn't have Medicare, she says, "I would be in bad shape without my prescription and possibly homeless because I wouldn't be able to afford both my medication and rent."

Madeline Levine from Evergreen, Illinois has diagnosed with breast cancer shortly after she became eligible for Medicare. "Without Medicare, I could not have afforded my treatment," she says. "This gives me a peace of mind that I have protection."

Juandra Drumgold from Dorchester, Massachusetts, depends on her family for a roof over her head and to pay for basic necessities. She says that not being able to work at such an elderly age and having to maintain her health care can be quite costly. If she did not have Medicare, she says, she would have to cut her living expenses even more, making a choice between medication and food.

B. Peter Brandt-Sorheim from Mt. Morris, New York, saw his medical expenses drop by nearly two-thirds once he became eligible for Medicare last year. Before, he had to pay about \$1,625 for a three-month supply of medication, he currently pays \$135. If it weren't for Medicare, he says, "I would be walking on the edge, crossing my fingers, and praying that someone would donate my Insulin medication to me."

Toni Rosenberg of Boca Raton, Florida relies on Medicare for services related to high-blood pressure, lymphedema, and kidney disease. She says, "If it was not for Medicare, I would be dead. If my Medicare benefits were cut or became more expensive, I would have to stop eating. By being single, Medicare has provided me with a safety net. Medicare is not an entitlement—it is something that we've paid into and should have when we 65. Medicare has provided me with not having to choose between eating healthy foods or being able to get my prescriptions. I do not have to worry

about my health because I know I have coverage to take care of me. I am a voice for the people who cannot speak for themselves, please keep your hands off Medicare. My parents and family all fought to have Medicare in our golden years so that my children and grandchildren will have what I have to keep them going in their senior years."

Harlan Lang from La Plata, Maryland, has been on Medicare for twelve years. He says, "If I did not have Medicare coverage, the quality of my life would change terribly, because if I was in a crisis, I would not be able to make it without the coverage. I believe so strongly in Medicare, it is so important to me. I cannot afford to be without the coverage. Healthcare is so expensive; I wish it was even better."

Rosie Woods lives in Richmond Virginia. "I have been enrolled in Medicare for twenty years. Medicare has helped me to save on my prescriptions," she says. "My health issues for which I am receiving treatment covered through Medicare is for cholesterol and I had a stroke in 2012. If I did not have Medicare my quality of life would change because I would have to go on the soup line. If my Medicare benefits were cut or if I was charged more, I would have to give up a whole lot. It would be a lot of stress that I would have to go through. Taking care of my home will be hard with the expenses. We work very hard for them to take money out of our checks expecting the benefits to be there when we retire."

Barbara Bonfield of Birmingham, Alabama has been enrolled in Medicare for eleven years. She says, "Medicare has helped me on most of my expenses. My husband died of a heart attack at the age of 64. At the age of 65, I was diagnosed with breast cancer and I am a survivor, Medicare was my primary insurer. Medicare has kept me well and it is a vital part of my community, without Medicare coverage I probably would not be alive today, it has kept me alive. If my Medicare benefits were cut or if I was charged more, I would be spending a lot of money to obtain my health care. I would have to re-adjust to everything (travel, food etc.). The last thing that I would have to reduce is my medications. I am very aware of the rising cost of medical care in this country and it is good to know that the Affordable Care Act will reduce the medical cost.

Cynthia Ochs Saur from Melbourne, Florida says, "I reside in Florida and have been enrolled in Medicare for four years. I have had two wellness exams for breast cancer and a lot of health issues which were treated thanks to Medicare. If I did not have Medicare coverage my quality of life would change quite a bit. If my Medicare benefits were cut or if I were charged more, I would have to give up other necessities in order to pay for the help for my medical problems. I would not be able to survive in many ways and would suffer greatly."

Bruce Russell, Sr. is from Missoula, Montana and has been enrolled in Medicare for five years. He says, "Two weeks ago I was operated on for a growth on my neck, had a colonoscopy test done and one growth was removed—neither one was cancerous. If I did not have Medicare coverage I would die young. My sister had severe arthritis and shingles, she put up with the pain for three years until she was enrolled in Medicare. People who retire on fixed incomes without medical insurance face serious quality of life issues

daily when they do not have the benefits of Medicare which they worked for.”

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 2013
MONTGOMERY AMERICAN ANGELS

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention today to pay

special tribute to a group of young people in my Congressional district from Montgomery, Alabama. These girls, the Montgomery American Angels All Star Team, will be traveling to Alexandria, Louisiana, this week to play in the Dixie Youth Softball World Series.

Although they are ages nine and 10, these girls have shown tremendous maturity and skill both on and off the field. They currently hold the titles of Dixie Youth Softball Angel Division X-Play District Runner-ups and Dixie Youth Softball Angel Division X-Play State Champs. By winning both their Division and

State titles, they will now represent the great state of Alabama in the World Series.

These 12 girls and their three coaches have become the first Angels team from Montgomery American to ever advance to the World Series. They will be traveling over 500 miles from home in the hopes of winning a World Series Title.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating this team and wishing them the best of luck as they travel to the Dixie Youth Softball World Series.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S6029–S6082

Measures Introduced: Sixteen bills and five resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1385–1400, and S. Res. 202–206. **Pages S6071–72**

Measures Passed:

Douglas A. Munro Coast Guard Headquarters Building: Senate passed H.R. 2611, to designate the headquarters building of the Coast Guard on the campus located at 2701 Martin Luther King, Jr., Avenue Southeast in the District of Columbia as the “Douglas A. Munro Coast Guard Headquarters Building”. **Pages S6081–82**

Reverse Mortgage Stabilization Act: Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2167, to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to establish additional requirements to improve the fiscal safety and soundness of the home equity conversion mortgage insurance program, and the bill was then passed. **Page S6082**

Authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 44, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run. **Page S6082**

National Whistleblower Appreciation Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 202, designating July 30, 2013, as “National Whistleblower Appreciation Day”. **Page S6082**

National Lighthouse and Lighthouse Preservation Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 204, designating August 7, 2013, as “National Lighthouse and Lighthouse Preservation Day”. **Page S6082**

National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month: Senate agreed to S. Res. 205, expressing support for the designation of September 2013 as National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month. **Page S6082**

National Prostate Cancer Awareness Month: Senate agreed to S. Res. 206, designating September 2013 as “National Prostate Cancer Awareness Month”. **Page S6082**

Measures Considered:

Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act: Senate continued consideration of S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, taking action on the following amendments and motion proposed thereto: **Pages S6051–52**

Pending:

Murray (for Cardin) Modified Amendment No. 1760, to require the Secretary of Transportation to submit to Congress a report relating to the condition of lane miles and highway bridge deck. **Page S6051**

Coburn Amendment No. 1750, to prohibit funds from being directed to federal employees with unpaid Federal tax liability. **Page S6051**

Coburn Amendment No. 1751, to prohibit Federal funding of union activities by Federal employees. **Page S6051**

Coburn Amendment No. 1754, to prohibit Federal funds from being used to meet the matching requirements of other Federal Programs. **Page S6051**

Murphy Amendment No. 1783, to require the Secretary of Transportation to assess the impact on domestic employment of a waiver of the Buy America requirement for Federal-aid highway projects prior to issuing the waiver. **Page S6051**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Thursday, August 1, 2013. **Page S6051**

A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at approximately 9:30 a.m., on Wednesday, July 31, 2013; that the pending amendments be set aside and Senator Paul be recognized to offer Amendment No. 1739; that there be 60 minutes of debate equally divided between the proponents and opponents; that upon the use or yielding back of time, Senate vote on or in relation to Paul Amendment No. 1739; and that no points of order or second-degree amendments be in order to Paul Amendment No. 1739 prior to the vote. **Page S6082**

Power Nomination—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that the cloture motion with respect to the nomination of Samantha Power, of Massachusetts, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations during her tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, be withdrawn and that at a time to be determined by the Majority Leader, notwithstanding Rule XXII, in consultation with the Republican Leader, Senate begin consideration of the nomination; that there be two hours for debate equally divided between the proponents and opponents; that following the use or yielding back of time, Senate vote, without intervening action or debate, on confirmation of the nomination; that no further motions be in order; and the Senate then resume legislative session.

Page S6052

Jones Nomination—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that upon disposition of Paul Amendment No. 1739 to S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, Senate resume consideration of the nomination of Byron Todd Jones, of Minnesota, to be Director, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, and that Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination.

Page S6082

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 54 yeas to 44 nays (Vote No. EX. 190), Kent Yoshiho Hirozawa, of New York, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board.

Pages S6031–36, S6036–49

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 64 yeas to 34 nays (Vote No. 189), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination.

Page S6031

By 54 yeas to 44 nays (Vote No. EX. 192), Nancy Jean Schiffer, of Maryland, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board.

Pages S6049–50

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 65 yeas to 33 nays (Vote No. 191), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination.

Pages S6049–50

By 59 yeas to 38 nays (Vote No. EX. 194), Mark Gaston Pearce, of New York, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board.

Page S6051

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 69 yeas to 29 nays (Vote No. 193), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination.

Pages S6050–51

Harry I. Johnson III, of Virginia, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of five years expiring August 27, 2015.

Page S6051

Philip Andrew Miscimarra, of Illinois, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of five years expiring December 16, 2017.

Page S6051

Nomination Received: Senate received the following nomination:

Nicholas Christopher Geale, of Virginia, to be a Member of the National Mediation Board for a term expiring July 1, 2016.

Page S6082

Messages from the House:

Page S6066

Measures Referred:

Pages S6066–67

Measures Placed on the Calendar:

Pages S6029, S6067

Measures Read the First Time:

Page S6067

Executive Communications:

Pages S6067–68

Executive Reports of Committees:

Pages S6068–71

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages S6072–73

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Pages S6073–80

Additional Statements:

Pages S6064–66

Amendments Submitted:

Pages S6080–81

Notices of Hearings/Meetings:

Page S6081

Authorities for Committees to Meet:

Page S6081

Privileges of the Floor:

Page S6081

Record Votes: Six record votes were taken today. (Total—194)

Pages S6031, S6049–51

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 8:13 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, July 31, 2013. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S6082.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Defense approved for full committee consideration an original bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Admiral Cecil E.D. Haney, USN for reappointment to the grade of admiral and to be Commander, United States Strategic Command, and Lieutenant General Curtis M. Scaparrotti, USA to be general and Commander, United Nations Command/Combined Forces Command/United States Forces Korea, both of the Department of Defense, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Stephen Woolman Preston, of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel, Jon T. Rymer, of Tennessee, to be Inspector General, Susan J. Rabern, of Kansas, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Financial Management and Comptroller, Dennis V. McGinn, of Maryland, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Energy, Installations, and Environment, all of the Department of Defense, and 2,256 nominations in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps.

WALL STREET REFORMS

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine mitigating systemic risk in financial markets through Wall Street reforms, after receiving testimony from Mary Jo White, Chair, Securities and Exchange Commission; and Gary Gensler, Chairman, Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

HEALTH CARE COSTS

Committee on the Budget: Committee concluded a hearing to examine health care costs, focusing on recent progress and remaining challenges, after receiving testimony from Len M. Nichols, George Mason University College of Health and Human Services Center for Health Policy Research and Ethics, Fairfax, Virginia; and Kavita K. Patel, The Brookings Institution Engelberg Center for Health Care Reform, and Joseph R. Antos, American Enterprise Institute, both of Washington, DC.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 134, to arrange for the National Academy of Sciences to study the impact of violent video games and violent video programming on children, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. Res. 157, 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, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 267, to prevent, deter, and eliminate illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing through port State measures;

S. 269, to establish uniform administrative and enforcement authorities for the enforcement of the High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act and similar statutes, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 376, to reauthorize the National Integrated Drought Information System, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 839, to reauthorize the Coral Reef Conservation Act of 2000;

S. 921, to amend chapter 301 of title 49, United States Code, to prohibit the rental of motor vehicles that contain a defect related to motor vehicle safety;

S. 1068, to reauthorize and amend the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Commissioned Officer Corps Act of 2002, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1072, to ensure that the Federal Aviation Administration advances the safety of small airplanes and the continued development of the general aviation industry, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1254, to amend the Harmful Algal Blooms and Hypoxia Research and Control Act of 1998;

S. 1317, to authorize the programs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal years 2014 through 2016, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1344, to promote research, monitoring, and observation of the Arctic, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1353, to provide for an ongoing, voluntary public-private partnership to improve cybersecurity, and to strengthen cybersecurity research and development, workforce development and education, and public awareness and preparedness, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

The nominations of Jannette Lake Dates, of Maryland, Bruce M. Ramer, of California, Brent Franklin

Nelsen, of South Carolina, Howard Abel Husock, of New York, and Loretta Cheryl Sutliff, of Nevada, all to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Thomas C. Carper, of Illinois, to be a Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors, Thomas Edgar Wheeler, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission, Mark E. Schaefer, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, and nominations for promotion in the United States Coast Guard.

PUBLIC LANDS, FORESTS, AND MINING BILLS

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining concluded a hearing to examine S. 37, to sustain the economic development and recreational use of National Forest System land and other public land in the State of Montana, to add certain land to the National Wilderness Preservation System, to release certain wilderness study areas, to designate new areas for recreation, S. 343, to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in Clark County, Nevada, for the environmental remediation and reclamation of the Three Kids Mine Project Site, S. 364, to establish the Rocky Mountain Front Conservation Management Area, to designate certain Federal land as wilderness, and to improve the management of noxious weeds in the Lewis and Clark National Forest, S. 404, to preserve the Green Mountain Lookout in the Glacier Peak Wilderness of the Mount Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest, S. 753, to provide for national security benefits for White Sands Missile Range and Fort Bliss, S. 1169, to withdraw and reserve certain public land in the State of Montana for the Limestone Hills Training Area, S. 1300, to amend the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 to provide for the conduct of stewardship end result contracting projects, S. 1301, to provide for the restoration of forest landscapes, protection of old growth forests, and management of national forests in the eastside forests of the State of Oregon, S. 1309, to withdraw and reserve certain public land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior for military uses, H.R. 507, to provide for the conveyance of certain land inholdings owned by the United States to the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona, H.R. 862, to authorize the conveyance of two small parcels of land within the boundaries of the Coconino National Forest containing private improvements that were developed based upon the reliance of the landowners in an erroneous survey conducted in May 1960, H.R. 876, to authorize the continued use of certain water diversions located on National Forest System land in the Frank Church-

River of No Return Wilderness and the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness in the State of Idaho, and H.R. 993 and S. 509, bills to provide for the conveyance of certain parcels of National Forest System land to the city of Fruit Heights, Utah, after receiving testimony from Katherine G. Hammack, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations, Energy, and Environment, and Roger M. Natsuhara, Acting Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Energy, Installations, and Environment, both of the Department of Defense; Ned Farquhar, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Land and Minerals Management; and Leslie Weldon, Deputy Chief, National Forest System, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

NUCLEAR WASTE ADMINISTRATION ACT

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine S. 1240, to establish a new organization to manage nuclear waste, provide a consensual process for siting nuclear waste facilities, ensure adequate funding for managing nuclear waste, after receiving testimony from Ernest J. Moniz, Secretary of Energy; Sally Young Jameson, National Conference of State Legislatures, Bryantown, Maryland; Joe Garcia, National Congress of American Indians, Ohkay Owingeh, New Mexico; David C. Boyd, Minnesota Public Utilities Commission, St. Paul, on behalf of the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC) Committee on Electricity; Chuck Smith, Jr., Aiken County, North Augusta, South Carolina, on behalf of the Energy Communities Alliance; Marvin S. Fettel, Nuclear Energy Institute, and Geoffrey H. Fettus, Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc., both of Washington, D.C.; and David Lochbaum, Nuclear Safety Project, Chattanooga, Tennessee, on behalf of the Union of Concerned Scientists.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Kenneth J. Kopocis, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Administrator for the Office of Water, James J. Jones, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Administrator for the Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention, and Avi Garbow, of Virginia, to be General Counsel, all of the Environmental Protection Agency.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Morrell John Berry, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to Australia, Patricia Marie Haslach, of Oregon, to be Ambassador to the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Reuben Earl Brigety, II, of Florida, to be Representative to the African Union, with the rank and status

of Ambassador, Daniel A. Clune, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Patrick Hubert Gaspard, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Republic of South Africa, Stephanie Sanders Sullivan, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Republic of the Congo, Joseph Y. Yun, of Oregon, to be Ambassador to Malaysia, Linda Thomas-Greenfield, of Louisiana, to be Assistant Secretary for African Affairs, James F. Entwistle, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Nigeria, David D. Pearce, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to Greece, John B. Emerson, of California, to be Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Germany, John Rufus Gifford, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to Denmark, Denise Campbell Bauer, of California, to be Ambassador to Belgium, and James Costos, of California, to be Ambassador to Spain and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to Andorra, all of the Department of State.

Also, committee announced the following subcommittee assignments:

Subcommittee on International Operations and Organizations, Human Rights, Democracy, and Global Women's Issues: Senators Boxer (Chair), Shaheen, Durbin, Coons, Kaine, Paul, Risch, Rubio, and Johnson (WI).

Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs: Senators Cardin (Chair), Murphy, Boxer, Udall (NM), Markey, Rubio, Johnson (WI), Flake, and McCain.

Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South and Central Asian Affairs: Senators Kaine (Chair), Boxer, Cardin, Coons, Durbin, Risch, Rubio, Johnson (WI), and McCain.

Subcommittee on African Affairs: Senators Coons (Chair), Durbin, Cardin, Shaheen, Udall (NM), Flake, McCain, Barrasso, and Paul.

Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere and Global Narcotics Affairs: Senators Udall (NM) (Chair), Kaine, Boxer, Shaheen, Murphy, McCain, Rubio, Barrasso, and Paul.

Subcommittee on European Affairs: Senators Murphy (Chair), Shaheen, Markey, Cardin, Durbin, Johnson (WI), Risch, Flake, and Barrasso.

Subcommittee on International Development and Foreign Assistance, Economic Affairs, International Environmental Protection, and Peace Corps: Senators Markey (Chair), Udall (NM), Coons, Murphy, Kaine, Barrasso, Risch, Flake, and Paul.

Senators Menendez and Corker are ex officio members of each subcommittee.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Steve A. Linick, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, Matthew Winthrop Barzun, of Kentucky, to be Ambassador to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, David Hale, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Lebanon, Liliana Ayalde, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Federative Republic of Brazil, Evan Ryan, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs, Kirk W.B. Wagar, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Singapore, who was introduced by Senator Nelson, Daniel A. Sepulveda, of Florida, to be Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Communications and Information Policy in the Bureau of Economic, Energy, and Business Affairs and U. S. Coordinator for International Communications and Information Policy, Terence Patrick McCulley, of Washington, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Cote d'Ivoire, James C. Swan, of California, to be Ambassador to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, John R. Phillips, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Italian Republic, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Republic of San Marino, Kenneth Francis Hackett, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Holy See, and Alexa Lange Wesner, of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Austria, all of the Department of State, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

STANDARD ESSENTIAL PATENT DISPUTES

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights concluded a hearing to examine standard essential patent disputes and antitrust law, after receiving testimony from Suzanne Munck, Chief Counsel for Intellectual Property and Deputy Director, Office of Policy Planning, Federal Trade Commission; A. Douglas Melamed, Intel Corporation, Santa Clara, California; Donald J. Rosenberg, Qualcomm Incorporated, San Diego, California; and John D. Kulick, The Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Incorporated, Standards Association, New York, New York.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 22 public bills, H.R. 2847–2868; and 5 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 46–47; and H. Res. 319–321 were introduced. **Pages H5172–74**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H5174–76**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 850, to impose additional human rights and economic and financial sanctions with respect to Iran, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 113–177, Pt. 1);

H.R. 2226, to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 relating to State consultation on removal and remedial actions, State concurrence with listing on the National Priorities List, and State credit for contributions to the removal or remedial action, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 113–178, Pt. 1);

H.R. 2279, to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act relating to review of regulations under such Act and to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 relating to financial responsibility for classes of facilities, with an amendment (H. Rept. 113–179, Pt. 1);

H.R. 2318, to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 with respect to the applicability of the Act to Federal facilities, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 113–180, Pt. 1);

H.R. 698, to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish safeguards and standards of quality for research and transplantation of organs infected with human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) (H. Rept. 113–181, Pt. 1);

H.R. 2094, to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the preference given, in awarding certain asthma-related grants, to certain States (those allowing trained school personnel to administer epinephrine and meeting other related requirements) (H. Rept. 113–182);

H.R. 313, to amend title 5, United States Code, to institute spending limits and transparency requirements for Federal conference and travel expenditures, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 113–183);

H.R. 2711, to amend title 5, United States Code, to establish certain procedures for conducting in-person or telephonic interactions by Executive branch employees with individuals, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 113–184, Pt. 1); and

H.R. 2855, making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 113–185).

Page H5172

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Culberson to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H5095**

Recess: The House recessed at 12:28 p.m. and reconvened at 2 p.m. **Page H5098**

Recess: The House recessed at 2:21 p.m. and reconvened at 3:04 p.m. **Page H5101**

Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2014: The House began consideration of H.R. 2610, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014. Consideration is expected to resume tomorrow, July 31st. **Pages H5101–45, H5149–70**

Agreed to:

Griffin (AR) amendment that increases funding, by offset, for operational expenses of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration by \$500,000; **Pages H5117–23**

Latham amendment that makes a technical correction relating to funding for the Research and Innovative Technology Administration; **Pages H5124–25**

Speier amendment that increases funding, by offset, for aviation safety activities by \$500,000; **Pages H5128–29**

Wolf amendment that strikes section 123; **Pages H5132–34**

Gallego amendment that removes the funding cap of \$10,778,000 for the Office of Intelligence, Security and Emergency Response (by a recorded vote of 317 ayes to 92 noes, Roll No. 419); **Pages H5123–24, H5138**

Young (AK) amendment that exempts Alaska and Hawaii from the per passenger subsidy cap of \$500 for the essential air service program (by a recorded vote of 239 ayes to 175 noes, Roll No. 420); **Pages H5125–26, H5138–39**

Castor (FL) amendment that increases funding, by offset, for the Housing and Urban Development Office of Field Policy and Management by \$3,000,000; **Pages H5152–53**

Capito amendment that increases funding, by offset, for the community development block grant program by \$350,000,000; **Pages H5153–54**

Latham amendment that makes a technical correction relating to funding for Project-Based Rental Assistance; **Pages H5161–62**

Grayson amendment that increases funding for the creation and promotion of translated materials and other programs that support the assistance of persons with limited English proficiency in utilizing the services provided by HUD by \$150,000; and **Pages H5164–68**

Broun (GA) amendment that reduces funding for salaries and expenses of the Federal Maritime Commission by \$100,000 and applies the savings to the spending reduction account. **Page H5168**

Rejected:

Broun (GA) amendment that sought to eliminate funding for Capital and Debt Service Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation and apply the \$600,000,000 in savings to the spending reduction account; **Pages H5134–35**

Grayson amendment that sought to cap the per passenger subsidy for essential air service at \$250 (by a recorded vote of 191 ayes to 224 noes, Roll No. 421); **Pages H5126, H5139–40**

McClintock amendment (No. 4 printed in the Congressional Record of July 26, 2013) that sought to eliminate the essential air service program and apply the \$100,000,000 in savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 166 ayes to 248 noes, Roll No. 422); **Pages H5126–28, H5140**

Hastings (FL) amendment that sought to increase funding for NextGen and operations planning activities by \$3,497,000 (by a recorded vote of 154 ayes to 258 noes, Roll No. 423); **Pages H5129–30, H5140–41**

Hastings (FL) amendment that sought to designate \$870,031,000 for NextGen facilities and equipment (by a recorded vote of 109 ayes to 300 noes, Roll No. 424); **Pages H5130, H5141–42**

Hastings (FL) amendment that sought to designate \$61,960,000 for NextGen research and development (by a recorded vote of 116 ayes to 295 noes, Roll No. 425); and **Pages H5130–32, H5142–43**

Broun (GA) amendment that sought to reduce funding for Rental Housing Assistance by \$5,000,000 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account. **Pages H5162–63**

Withdrawn:

Nadler amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have increased funding, by offset, for the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS program by \$29,000,000 and **Pages H5158–60**

Al Green (TX) amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have increased funding for Fair Housing Activities by \$12,500,000. **Pages— H5163–64**

Point of Order sustained against:

Nadler amendment that sought to increase funding for Capital Investment Grants by \$127,283,000 and **Pages H5135–36**

Nadler amendment that sought to increase funding for renewals of expiring section 8 tenant-based annual contributions contracts by \$1,000,000,000. **Pages H5157–58**

Proceedings Postponed:

Garrett amendment that seeks to eliminate grants to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority and apply the \$125,000,000 in savings to the spending reduction account; **Pages H5136–38, H5143–45**

Velázquez amendment that seeks to increase funding, by offset, for housing counseling assistance by \$10,000,000; **Page H5154**

Barber amendment that seeks to increase funding, by offset, for rental voucher assistance for use through a supported housing program administered in conjunction with the Department of Veterans Affairs by \$1,000,000; **Pages H5154–56**

Broun (GA) amendment that seeks to reduce funding for Homeless Assistance Grants by \$55,000,000 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account; and **Pages H5160–61**

Broun (GA) amendment that seeks to reduce funding for salaries and expenses of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation Office of Inspector General by \$4,800,000. **Pages H5168–70**

H. Res. 312, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 2397) and (H.R. 2610) was agreed to on Tuesday, July 23rd.

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

School Access to Emergency Epinephrine Act: H.R. 2094, to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the preference given, in awarding certain asthma-related grants, to certain States (those allowing trained school personnel to administer epinephrine and meeting other related requirements); **Pages H5145–47**

Collectible Coin Protection Act: H.R. 2754, to amend the Hobby Protection Act to make unlawful the provision of assistance or support in violation of that Act; and **Pages H5147–48**

Amending the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to reauthorize the volunteer programs and community partnerships for the benefit of national wildlife refuges: H.R. 1300, amended, to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to reauthorize the volunteer programs and community partnerships for the benefit of national wildlife refuges. **Pages H5148–49**

Board of Trustees of the Open World Leadership Center—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Member on the part of the House to the Board of Trustees of the Open World Leadership Center: Representative Moran. **Page H5171**

Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment, upon the recommendation of the Minority Leader, of the following individual on the part of the House to the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance for a term of four years: Mr. Fred Hurst of Flagstaff, AZ. **Page H5171**

Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Members on the part of the House to the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China: Representatives Kaptur and Honda. **Page H5171**

Japan-United States Friendship Commission—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Member on the part of the House to the Japan-United States Friendship Commission: Representative McDermott. **Page H5171**

House Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Members to the House Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards: Representatives Davis (CA), Sherman, and Richmond. **Page H5171**

Discharge Petition: Representative Stockman presented to the clerk a motion to discharge the Committee on Rules from the consideration of H. Res. 306, providing for the consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 36) establishing a select committee to investigate and report on the attack on the United States consulate in Benghazi, Libya (Discharge Petition No. 4).

Quorum Calls—Votes: Seven recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H5138, H5138–39, H5139–40, H5140, H5140–41, H5141, H5142. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12 noon and adjourned at 10:21 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Full Committee began a markup on H.R. 2810, the "Medicare Patient Access and Quality Improvement Act of 2013";

and H.R. 2844, the "Federal Communications Commission Consolidated Reporting Act of 2013".

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 31, 2013

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: business meeting to consider S. 1376, to improve the Federal Housing Administration and to ensure the solvency of the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: to hold hearings to examine energy drinks, focusing on exploring concerns about marketing to youth, 2:30 p.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks, to hold hearings to examine S. 398, to establish the Commission to Study the Potential Creation of a National Women's History Museum, S. 524, to amend the National Trails System Act to provide for the study of the Pike National Historic Trail, S. 618, to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct certain special resource studies, S. 702, to designate the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor as "The Last Green Valley National Heritage Corridor", S. 781, to modify the boundary of Yosemite National Park, S. 782, to amend Public Law 101–377 to revise the boundaries of the Gettysburg National Military Park to include the Gettysburg Train Station, S. 869, to establish the Alabama Black Belt National Heritage Area, S. 925, to improve the Lower East Side Teneament National Historic Site, S. 995, to authorize the National Desert Storm Memorial Association to establish the National Desert Storm and Desert Shield Memorial as a commemorative work in the District of Columbia, S. 974, to provide for certain land conveyances in the State of Nevada, S. 1044, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to install in the area of the World War II Memorial in the District of Columbia a suitable plaque or an inscription with the words that President Franklin D. Roosevelt prayed with the United States on D–Day, June 6, 1944, S. 1071, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make improvements to support facilities for National Historic Sites operated by the National Park Service, S. 1138, to reauthorize the Hudson River Valley National Heritage Area S. 1151, to reauthorize the America's Agricultural Heritage Partnership in the State of Iowa, S. 1157, to reauthorize the Rivers of Steel National Heritage Area, the Lackawanna Valley National Heritage Area, the Delaware and Lehigh National Heritage Corridor, and the Schuylkill River Valley National Heritage Area, S. 1168, to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to limit overbroad surveillance requests and expand reporting requirements, S. 1252, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the

Missisquoi River and the Trout River in the State of Vermont, as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, S. 1253, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain segments of the Farmington River and Salmon Brook in the State of Connecticut as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, H.R. 674, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating prehistoric, historic, and limestone forest sites on Rota, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, as a unit of the National Park System, H.R. 885, to expand the boundary of the San Antonio Missions National Historical Park, H.R. 1033 and S. 916, bills to authorize the acquisition and protection of nationally significant battlefields and associated sites of the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812 under the American Battlefield Protection Program, and H.R. 1158, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to continue stocking fish in certain lakes in the North Cascades National Park, Ross Lake National Recreation Area, and Lake Chelan National Recreation Area, 2:30 p.m., SD-366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: to hold hearings to examine strengthening public health protections by addressing toxic chemical threats, 9:30 a.m., SD-406.

Committee on Finance: Subcommittee on Energy, Natural Resources, and Infrastructure, to hold hearings to examine principles for energy tax reform, 2:30 p.m., SD-215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on European Affairs, to hold hearings to examine where Turkey is headed, focusing on Gezi Park, Taksim Square, and the future of the Turkish model, 3 p.m., SD-419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: business meeting to consider S. 1356, to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to strengthen the United States workforce development system through innovation in, and alignment and improvement of, employment, training, and education programs in the United States, and to promote individual and national economic growth, the nominations of Robert F. Cohen, Jr., of West Virginia, and William Ira Althen, of Virginia, both to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, Catherine Elizabeth Lhamon, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of Education for Civil Rights, and any pending nominations, 10 a.m., SD-608.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: business meeting to consider S. 1398, to require the Federal Government to expedite the sale of underutilized Federal real property, S. 1360, to amend the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012, including making changes to the Do Not Pay initiative, for improved detection, prevention, and recovery of improper payments to deceased individuals, S. 1276, 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, H.R. 1162, to amend title 31, United States Code, to make improvements in the Government Accountability

Office, S. 1348, to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act, H.R. 1171, to amend title 40, United States Code, to improve veterans service organizations access to Federal surplus personal property, S. 233, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 815 County Road 23 in Tyrone, New York, as the "Specialist Christopher Scott Post Office Building", S. 668, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 Main Street in Brockport, New York, as the "Staff Sergeant Nicholas J. Reid Post Office Building", S. 796, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 302 East Green Street in Champaign, Illinois, as the "James R. Burgess Jr. Post Office Building", S. 885, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 35 Park Street in Danville, Vermont, as the "Thaddeus Stevens Post Office", S. 1093, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 130 Caldwell Drive in Hazlehurst, Mississippi, as the "First Lieutenant Alvin Chester Cockrell, Jr. Post Office Building", and the nominations of John H. Thompson, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of the Census, Department of Commerce, and Katherine Archuleta, of Colorado, to be Director of the Office of Personnel Management, 10 a.m., SD-342.

Subcommittee on Emergency Management, Intergovernmental Relations, and the District of Columbia, to hold hearings to examine how prepared the National Capital Region is for the next disaster, 2 p.m., SD-342.

Committee on Indian Affairs: to hold hearings to examine S. 235, to provide for the conveyance of certain property located in Anchorage, Alaska, from the United States to the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium, S. 920, to allow the Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa in the State of Minnesota to lease or transfer certain land, and S. 1352, the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-determination Reauthorization Act of 2013, 2:30 p.m., SD-628.

Committee on the Judiciary: to hold hearings to examine strengthening privacy rights and national security, focusing on oversight of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) surveillance programs, 9 a.m., SH-216.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: to hold hearings to examine preserving the rights of servicemembers, veterans, and their families in the financial marketplace, 10 a.m., SR-418.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Full Committee, markup on Interior and Environment and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2014, 11 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, Full Committee, hearing entitled "The War on Poverty: A Progress Report", 12:30 p.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 2810, the "Medicare Patient Access and Quality Improvement Act of 2013"; and H.R. 2844, the "Federal Communications Commission Consolidated Reporting Act of 2013", 11:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy, hearing entitled “Oversight of DOE’s Strategy for the Management and Disposal of Used Nuclear Fuel and High-Level Radioactive Waste”, 2 p.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa, hearing entitled “The Iran-Syria Nexus and its Implications for the Region”, 2:30 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency: and Subcommittee on Transportation Security, hearing entitled “TSA Integrity Challenges: Examining Misconduct by Airport Security Personnel”, 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 1123, the “Unlocking Consumer Choice and Wireless Competition Act”; H.R. 2542, the “Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act of 2013”; H.R. 2641, the “Responsibly And Professionally Invigorating Development Act of 2013”; and H.R. 2655, the “Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act of 2013”, 11 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 255, to amend certain definitions contained in the Provo River Project Transfer Act for purposes of clarifying certain property descriptions, and for other purposes; H.R. 553, to designate the exclusive economic zone of the United States as the “Ronald Wilson Reagan Exclusive Economic Zone of the United States”; H.R. 623, the “Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium Land Transfer Act”; H.R. 908, the “Green Mountain Lookout Heritage Protection Act”; H.R. 930, the “New Philadelphia, Illinois, Study Act”; H.R. 1168, to direct the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Land Management, to convey to the City of Carlin, Nevada, in exchange for consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States, to any Federal land within that city that is under the jurisdiction of that agency, and for other purposes; H.R. 1170, to direct the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Reclamation, to convey, by quitclaim deed, to the City of Fernley, Nevada, all right, title, and interest of the United States, to any Federal land within that city that is under the jurisdiction of either of those agencies; H.R. 1526, the “Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act”; H.R. 1684, the “Ranch A Consolidation and Management Improvement Act”; H.R. 1818, the “Polar Bear Conservation and Fairness Act of 2013”; H.R. 1963, the “Bureau of Reclamation Conduit

Hydropower Development Equity and Jobs Act”; H.R. 2388, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to take certain Federal lands located in El Dorado County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians, and for other purposes; H.R. 2463, the “Target Practice and Marksmanship Training Support Act”; H.R. 2650 the “Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Non-Intercourse Act of 2013”; H.R. 2728, the “Protecting States’ Rights to Promote American Energy Security Act”; 10:30 a.m., 1320 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on Energy Policy, Health Care and Entitlements, hearing entitled “Oversight of the IRS’s Legal Basis for Expanding ObamaCare’s Taxes and Subsidies”, 10:15 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 367, the “Regulations From the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2013”; and H.R. 2009, the “Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act of 2013”, 3 p.m., H-313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Research and Technology, hearing entitled “The Frontiers of Human Brain Research”, 11 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime, hearing entitled “How to Improve the Efficiency, Safety, and Security of Maritime Transportation: Better Use and Integration of Maritime Domain Awareness Data”, 11 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Human Resources, hearing entitled “Improving the Safety Net: Better Coordinating Today’s Maze of Programs to Ensure Families Receive Real Help”, 2 p.m., 1100 Longworth.

Joint Meetings

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: to hold hearings to examine implications for economic development in Central Asia, focusing on if the government can create the necessary conditions for more trade and exchange, including infrastructure development, efficient customs regimes and reliable transportation networks, 2 p.m., 340, Cannon Building.

Joint Economic Committee: to hold hearings to examine how tax reform can boost economic growth, focusing on lessons from Reagan, 2 p.m., SD-G50.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Wednesday, July 31

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, July 31

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will continue consideration of S. 1243, Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, and vote on or in relation to Paul Amendment No. 1739, at approximately 10:45 a.m.

Following disposition of Paul Amendment No. 1739 to S. 1243, Senate will resume consideration of the nomination of Byron Todd Jones, of Minnesota, to be Director, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination.

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Continue consideration of H.R. 2610—Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2014.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Barber, Ron, Ariz., E1159
Bordallo, Madeleine Z., Guam, E1154
Brady, Robert A., Pa., E1157
Brownley, Julia, Calif., E1153
Bustos, Cheri, Ill., E1154
Clarke, Yvette D., N.Y., E1162
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1161
Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E1154
Conyers, John, Jr., Mich., E1158
Costa, Jim, Calif., E1158
Deutch, Theodore E., Fla., E1157
Faleomavaega, Eni F.H., American Samoa, E1156, E1160, E1162

Foxx, Virginia, N.C., E1156
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E1159
Huffman, Jared, Calif., E1157
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E1164
Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E1159
King, Peter T., N.Y., E1165
Kingston, Jack, Ga., E1153
Loebsack, David, Iowa, E1154
Long, Billy, Mo., E1155
Lowenthal, Alan S., Calif., E1160
Lujan Grisham, Michelle, N.M., E1164
McCarthy, Carolyn, N.Y., E1155, E1159
McCollum, Betty, Minn., E1160
Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E1157
Meadows, Markk, N.C., E1153

Miller, Jeff, Fla., E1162
Beto O'Rourke, Tex., E1156
Radel, Trey, E1155
Rice, Tom, S.C., E1161
Rogers, Mike, Ala., E1164, E1166
Sarbanes, John P., Md., E1155
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E1165
Sinema, Kyrsten, Ariz., E1161
Smith, Jason T., Mo., E1157
Whitfield, Ed, Ky., E1161
Wolf, Frank R., Va., E1161, E1162
Young, Todd C., Ind., E1153



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Printing Office, at www.fdsys.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.