United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, AUGUST 1, 2013 *No. 113*

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
August 1, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable BILL HUIZENGA 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 11:50 a.m.

SENATOR PAUL SIMON WATER FOR THE WORLD ACT OF 2013 (H.R. 2901)

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago, if someone asked what a bow tie-wearing progressive Democrat from Oregon and my colleague TED POE, a cowboy, boot-wearing conservative Republican from Texas, could agree on, you would have said, Not much.

Today, we are partners on an issue, however, that makes sense regardless of your politics: ensuring sustainable, equitable access to clean water for nearly 800 million women, children, and men who don't have it and the 2.5 billion without even the most basic sanitation services. TED POE and I think that politics should stop with water. That's why, today, we are introducing the Paul Simon Water for the World Act of 2013 (H.R. 2901).

Since Congress passed the Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act in 2005, the United States has become a global leader in efforts to increase access to clean water and sanitation, developing and implementing some of the most innovative approaches to help those in greatest need. We must not only maintain this progress but work to further refine and focus the efforts at USAID and at the Department of State by enacting the World Act.

We are committed because dirty water and a lack of sanitation affects all areas of development assistance. This is especially the case when it comes to women and children. More children are killed by waterborne disease than any other. Increasing access to clean water and sanitation has a significant multiplier effect on other areas of development, enabling us to do more with less—critical in a time of constrained budget resources.

Every day, the world has more people but fewer freshwater resources. Our bipartisan legislation will give the United States the capacity to avoid unnecessary loss of life and conflict in the future. It would ensure that water, sanitation, and hygiene programs are reflected in other development assistance; prioritize long-lasting impacts of United States foreign aid dollars; and increase the focusing on monitoring, evaluation, transparency, and capacity building.

Children cannot attend school if they're sick from dirty water. Half the world's hospital beds today are filled with people suffering from waterborne disease needlessly. Hours spent getting water are hours not working or in school.

A lack of clean drinking water has a disproportionate effect on women, who, in developing countries, walk an average of 3.7 miles a day to get water. The estimates are that 40 billion working hours are lost each year in Africa alone—200 million hours today.

Having water means girls can go to school and build a better future. It also reduces the risk of violence and sexual assault. A study by Doctors without Borders found that 82 percent of the women and girls treated for rape in West and South Darfur were attacked while they were gathering water or firewood.

The challenge is not getting easier, because 97 percent of the water on Earth is salty and unfit to drink. Of the 2½ percent, roughly, of the Earth's water that is fresh, two-thirds of that is frozen—locked away in the ice caps and glaciers. Although it's rapidly melting because of climate change, that's not going to help us, because it will be largely salty as well. We've got less than 1 percent of global freshwater available for human use; and because of the demands for growing food, energy and industry, only about one-tenth of a percent is available for people to drink. This tiny fraction is further diminished by deficient or nonexistent water infrastructure. Even in the United States, we waste 6 billion gallons of freshwater every day through leaky pipes. We are entering an era of severe water scarcity that the Department of Defense warns could lead to global insecurity.

In short, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing more fundamental to families and global health than clean water and sanitation. More needs to be done, and it needs to be done well. Taxpayers, understandably, demand better results and greater transparency from foreign aid. This bill provides the tools and incentives to do just that.

We urge our colleagues to adopt our motto—''politics stops at water''—and support this effort. This magnitude will take a team working together, united in the goal of saving lives and improving communities around the world. Please join us in this critical legislation, the Paul Simon Water for the World Act (H.R. 2901).

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.'S MARCH ON WASHINGTON

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, from time to time in our Nation's history, people of faith have stepped forward to call this Nation to something greater. This is steeped in our culture, our tradition, and our founding documents. It goes back to the cross at Cape Henry and to the landing at Plymouth Rock. You see it in our Declaration of Independence and again in the movement to abolish slavery.

Then, in the 1950s and 1960s, it was people of faith who birthed the new civil rights movement. No figure cast a wider shadow on that movement than the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King. This month, we mark the 50th anniversary of one of the most iconic speeches in American history—Dr. King's address at the Lincoln Memorial. It is a great honor for me to stand here today to recollect the words of Dr. King, a man who stands among the heroes of our Nation.

Dr. King was a pastor. He received a divinity degree from Crozer Theological Seminary in Pennsylvania. His call to the ministry led him to the Dexter Avenue Baptist Church in Montgomery, Alabama, where, in the church's basement, he helped to plan the Montgomery bus boycott of 1955. That Dr. King's actions were motivated by his faith in a just God is evident when you read his words.

From the marble steps of the Lincoln Memorial, he used the words of the prophet Isaiah to articulate his dream of an end to injustice and oppression:

> That one day every valley shall be exalted, every hill and mountain shall be made low; the rough places will be made plain, and the crooked places will be made straight; and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together.

Martin Luther King, Jr., looked not for a revolution but for an affirmation of the country's founding principles when he declared:

> That we have come to our Nation's Capital to cash a check. When the architects of our Republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, they were signing a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir. This note was a promise that all men would be guaranteed the inalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

It was not the first time that Dr. King had alluded to the promise of our founding documents. Just 4 months before the March on Washington, in writing from a Birmingham jail, he wrote that African Americans had waited for more than 340 years for their constitutional and God-given rights.

King's letter from a Birmingham jail could not be clearer in its articulation of the moral status of law and the role that religion plays in a just society:

> Now [King wrote] what is the difference between a ''just'' and an ''unjust'' law? How does one determine whether a law is just or unjust? A just law is a manmade code that squares with the moral law of God. An unjust law is a code that is out of harmony with the moral law.

Yes, Dr. King appealed to the Nation's religious roots to encourage social change, and from a Birmingham jail, he encouraged individuals to confront unjust laws:

> [T]here is nothing new [King wrote] about this kind of civil disobedience. It was evidenced sublimely in the refusal of Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego to obey the laws of Nebuchadnezzar, on the ground that a higher moral law was at stake. It was practiced superbly by the early Christians, who were willing to face hungry lions . . . rather than submit to certain unjust laws of the Roman Empire. . . . In our own Nation, the Boston Tea Party represented a massive act of civil disobedience.
>
> We should never forget [King continued] that everything Adolf Hitler did in Germany was ''legal'' and everything the Hungarian freedom fighters did in Hungary was ''illegal.'' It was ''illegal'' to aid and comfort a Jew in Hitler's Germany. Even so, I am sure [King proclaimed] that, had I lived in Germany at the time, I would have aided and comforted my Jewish brothers. If today I lived [King continued] in a Communist country, where certain principles dear to the Christian faith are suppressed, I would openly advocate disobeying that country's anti-religious laws.

King's letter from a Birmingham jail and his ''I Have a Dream'' speech should be required reading for every American high school student and for every Member of Congress.

With the 50th anniversary of Dr. King's speech upon us, it is good to remember his words. It is good to appreciate all that faith in God and the moral law have done to advance the cause of freedom in our country. It is good to reflect on whether policies enacted by government in our time are a step back from, or show a rising intolerance of, the religious freedom that has been instrumental in defining our country and defending our rights.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, AN UMBRELLA ON A RAINY DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman who preceded me for that very powerful message; and it reminds us generally of, really, the elements of our presence here in this House. When we represent the people of this country, it is important that we are lawmakers and that we have the compassion that was evidenced by the movement that Dr. King led and by the movement that he was leading at the time of the tragedy of his death and that was, of course, the Poor People's March in 1968.

I rise today to discuss that capacity and to say that I know that our friends, Republicans and Democrats, can come together around important service elements that this Nation engages in. The Federal Government is an umbrella on a rainy day. It is the engine of the economy. It is the answer to issues such as transportation and housing. It really provides housing to working families. It boosts the middle class and poor families, and it gives jobs to builders and contractors. So that is why, I think, it was quite appropriate for this, unfortunately, poorly driven and constructed Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill to go to its timely death.

How can you with any compassion cut so much money that you cut even the amount of money under the present budget, and you cut 9 percent below the level now mandated by the across-the-board spending cuts by sequestration?

You went below that. This bill was $44.1 billion—shameful—cutting public housing, cutting housing vouchers, cutting opportunities for the homeless, and particularly for our young people. As the cochair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, every day, I note that children in America suffer for a variety of reasons. The Senate, of course, had a bill, which they are pushing through, that was at the $54 billion level—still very far short of the great needs of this community.

So I rise today to say that it landed with a thud, and I think, more importantly, my colleague from Texas—again, from Houston—spoke on the floor of the House about some untimely language on page 52—I remember it—that cut into the light rail system of Houston. It would impact my district. It would stop students at the University of Houston and at Texas Southern University from being able to have access to rail by cutting down on their travel costs because there was a provision in the bill that did not fund just a sector of that light rail.

□ 1015

My colleagues, how can you build light rail when you cut it in the middle, almost like the western movies, where the train rushes up and finds a big hole over the mountains where something has happened and it can't go any further?

It was a bill that was destined to die and should have died because it lacked compassion. I stand here opposing any language that does not fund or find an alternative route in any community's light rail new starts on which that community chooses to move forward. In Houston, we should not be attacked, if you will, for that kind of singular targeting. Our light rail should proceed.

I rise today to again reinforce this question of homelessness by showing this picture, which sates, ''Houston seeks better ways to serve homeless youth,'' and to be able to indicate that in trying to count homeless youth, they were only able to count a tenth, 378. When Houston's leadership went out on streets to try and count them, there were over 4,000. Our school districts say there are 19,000. Yet, we have a home called Little Audrey that the very public dollars that are supposed to be in the HUD funding could fund. We have a directive housing community development near Ratcliff that has a million dollars that could fund this particular facility. Mind you, in a city as large as Houston, there are only four for homeless youth.

I visited Little Audrey. These are the kind of young people who are there:

A young man who lived in a crack house not because he was on crack, but because he had no place else to live. He's found his way to Little Audrey; or the twins whose father died in Hurricane Katrina, were brought here by their mother to Houston, and then the mother died and they were homeless; or a young woman who was abused; or a young man who came and was put out of his house, from Dallas.

Little Audrey is a refuge that would be as helpful to the children that I met with and sat down with as this young man is being helped by Covenant House. Covenant House cannot do it alone. So it is important that communities who receive the public dollars, who, given the opportunity such as the public facilities dollars that the Housing and Community Development office has in the city of Houston, utilize it so we do not have this kind of shame in our community.

I look forward to working with the city Housing and Community Development and the Secretary of Housing to stop youth homelessness in America and to helping these young people. I know we can do it together.

THE TRUTH ABOUT YOSEMITE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlemen from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, Yosemite Valley is a national treasure that was set aside in 1864 with the promise that it would be preserved for the express purpose of ''public use, resort, and recreation.'' Ever since, Americans have enjoyed a host of recreational opportunities and amenities as they come to experience the splendor of the valley.

Now the National Park Service, at the urging of leftist environmental groups, is proposing eliminating many of these amenities, including bicycle and raft rentals, horseback riding rentals, gift shops, snack facilities, swimming pools, and iconic facilities, including the ice skating rink at Curry Village, the art center, and the historic stone bridges that date back to the 1920s.

For generations, these facilities have enhanced the enjoyment of the park for millions of visitors, adding a rich variety of recreational activities amidst the breathtaking backdrop of Yosemite. But today the very nature and purpose of Yosemite is being changed from its original promise of public resort, use, and recreation to an exclusionary agenda that can best be described as ''look, but don't touch.''

As public outrage has mounted, these leftist groups have found willing mouthpieces in the editorial boards of the left-leaning San Francisco Chronicle and Sacramento Bee. It is obvious their editorial writers have either not read the report or are deliberately misrepresenting it to their readers. They say the plan is designed to relieve overcrowding in the park. In fact, this plan compounds the overcrowding.

In 1997, flooding wiped out almost half the campsites in Yosemite Valley. Congress appropriated $17 million to replace these campsites. The money was spent; the campsites were never replaced. That's what's causing the overcrowding—half the campsites for the same number of visitors.

This plan would lock in a 30 percent reduction in campsites and a 50 percent reduction in lodging compared to the pre-flood area. Three swimming pools in the valley give visitors a safe place with lifeguards for their children to cool off in the summer. The park service wants to close two of them. That means packed overcrowding at the remaining pool, pushing families seeking water recreation into the perilous Merced River.

They assure us they're not eliminating all the shops at Yosemite, but only reducing the number of them. Understand the practical impact on tourists. It means they're going to have to walk much greater distances to access these services and then endure long lines once they get there.

Another of the falsehoods is that the plan doesn't ban services like bike rentals, but just moves them to better locations. The government's own report puts the lie to this claim. It specifically speaks to ''eliminating'' and ''removing'' these services. It goes on to specifically state: ''Over time, visitors would become accustomed to the absence of these facilities and would no longer expect them as a part of their experience in Yosemite.'' Their intent could not possibly be any clearer.

We are assured that although bicycle rentals will be—and I'm using the government's word—''eliminated'' from the valley in the interest of environmental protection, visitors will still be free to bring their own bikes. That invites the obvious question: What exactly is the environmental difference between a rented bicycle and a privately owned bicycle?

We're assured in the smarmy words of the Sacramento Bee that the plan merely contemplates relocating raft rentals so they meet visitors at the river. In truth, the plan specifically states that it will ''allow only private boating in this river segment,'' and even then will limit total permits to only 100 per day.

Mr. Speaker, every lover of Yosemite needs to read this report. It proposes breaking the compact between the American people and their government that promised public use, resort, and recreation for all time when the park was established.

My district includes the Yosemite National Park. I represent the gateway communities that depend on park tourism to support their economies. The affected counties and communities are unanimous in their vigorous opposition to this plan; and in a recent phone survey, the people of these communities, who are jealous guardians of Yosemite, expressed opposition to it in numbers well exceeding 80 percent.

Many things need to be done to improve gate access and traffic flow through the park, but destroying the amenities that provide enjoyment for millions of Yosemite visitors each year is not among them.

CLIMATE RESEARCH

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

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, climate change is not a science debate; it never was. As we know, science is never universally agreed upon. It's a constant reexamining of what is deemed the squats quo. Nonetheless, the science surrounding climate change is near universal and it is incontrovertible. Over several decades of study, an overwhelming majority of scientists, including many at NOAA and NASA Goddard, in fact, in my district, as well as researchers worldwide, have concluded that climate change is real, is caused by man, and will have a significant impact on our Earth, it's process, the safety of our public, and our economy. These findings simply must quell the ideological differences and guide our policy decisions with regard to our environment in all due haste.

As a member of the House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, I remain astounded that so much climate denial exists within these Chambers. This doubt is translated into slashing funding for climate research and Earth science research, both short-term and long-term. It's resulted in preventing agencies with the expertise to maintain and develop Earth-observing systems and conduct the analysis necessary to understand our Earth—all slashed.

Just 2 weeks ago, our House Science Committee reported out legislation that would cut NASA's Earth science budget by a third, something like over $600 million. NASA is a major contributor to our U.S. Global Change Research Program, and such a cut would

not only devastate Earth science research, but hamper our ability to understand what is truly a matter of national significance, indeed, global significance.

Unfortunately, my home State of Maryland will suffer disproportionately if this Chamber refuses to act. Maryland has the fourth longest tidal coastline and is the third most vulnerable to sea level rise, one of the major consequences of climate change. Islands and low-lying communities throughout our State will be impacted by rising seas and severe weather events like Hurricane Sandy. Just last week, The Washington Post reported that Maryland's coastal waters could rise 6 feet by the end of this century. This increase could cause flooding in major cities like Baltimore and Annapolis. Areas on the lower half of the Delmarva Peninsula could be especially impacted. While our State has been proactive about preparing for these kind of environmental changes, thermal expansion of our oceans and waterways will pose significant problems for the State, indeed, for our Nation.

But this is not one State's concern; it's a 50–State concern and a global concern.

Goddard Spaceflight Center, which is located just outside my congressional district, is home to a number of climate scientists who are genuinely concerned about observed and predicted trends for the future. This historical trend of warming and sea level ice, in particular, are not fiction or hyperbole. The are, in fact, facts that are indisputable and in many ways terrifying.

I want to bring to your attention image 1 here. In Maryland, the warming trend over 100 years has increased from 2 degrees Fahrenheit to 6.1 degrees, just since 1960. This is significant and concerning warming in just my State. The U.S. trends are equally staggering, and the global trends are even more overwhelming.

But what concerns me even more is this chart here. This chart depicts polar sea ice, which is important to control and moderate global climate. As sea ice melts in the summer, it absorbs the sunlight and warms our poles. What's happening is that, because, according to the National Snow and Ice Data Center, even a slight warming of the poles will quicken the pace of global warming and likely lead to more severe climate patterns. Since 2000, Arctic ice during the summer has been melting at rates that are scaring scientists. Here, what you see is a sharp decline during the summer ice melting. Last year, half of the sea ice actually melted during the summer.

I want to highlight one more thing. Our most conservative models didn't predict what we've actually observed in terms of decline in sea ice thickness. Our climate model simulations have failed to keep up with actual significant loss. This problem is twofold:

First, additional cuts to climate research and gaps in our satellites—and there are gaps because we're not funding them—make these observations even less accurate and weaken our modeling;

Second, the poles are actually warming faster than we ever predicted. It's estimated that by 2020, all the sea ice during the summer will be melted.

It's time for us to act. For the sake of the future generations of our economy, our environment, let's restore climate research capacity. Let's act for future generations.

HONORING THE LIVES OF THIRTY-TWO AMERICAN HEROES

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

Mr. RIGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in this, the people's House, to pay tribute to, to honor, and to remember the lives of 32 American heroes.

Next Tuesday is August 6, and it is the most sobering anniversary in the district I have the privilege to represent. It was on that day in 2011 that enemy fighters in Afghanistan shot down a Chinook helicopter, killing 5 soldiers, 3 airmen, and 24 Navy SEALs. This tragedy marks the heaviest loss of life for our elite Navy SEAL community.

The warriors we lost that day were loving husbands, devoted fathers, brave sons, selfless patriots. While their families struggle with the loss of their own personal hero, our Nation stands with them, and the good folks in Virginia's Second Congressional District stand with them, as well.

□ 1030

Mr. Speaker, men and women have sacrificed for this country at a high cost. I have wrestled with this question, and I do not know why providence calls upon some to give so much, including in cases like this, for young men or young women to give the full measure of sacrifice in defense of our freedom. But I do know this, Mr. Speaker: I know the duty we have to the fallen, and that's to honor and to remember them and to care for their families and to meet our obligation today in this place and across this great land and press on for the freedom and liberty that they indeed gave their life for.

So it is with reverence and respect, Mr. Speaker, and sincere appreciation from one American to the families of the fallen that I will now read the names of these Americans whose lives were taken that day in defense of our country.

These are Navy servicemen killed August 6, 2011:

Jonas B. Kelsall
Louis J. Langlais
Thomas A. Ratzlaff
Craig M. Vickers
Brian R. Bill
John W. Faas
Kevin A. Houston
Matthew D. Mason
Stephen M. Mills
Nicholas H. Null
Robert J. Reeves
Heath M. Robinson
Darrik C. Benson
Christopher G. Campbell
Jared W. Day
John Douangdara
Michael J. Strange
Jon T. Tumilson
Aaron C. Vaughn
Jason R. Workman
Jesse D. Pittman
Nicholas P. Spehar

The five soldiers killed that day:

David R. Carter
Bryan J. Nichols
Patrick D. Hamburger
Alexander J. Bennett
Spencer C. Duncan

And the three airmen killed that day:

John W. Brown
Andrew W. Harvell
Daniel L. Zerbe

Mr. Speaker, as these families continue to struggle with their loss, we continue to pray for them, asking that God will give them a special measure of grace and peace on this day and the days ahead.

SUPPORT COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANTS

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on behalf of support for funding for the Community Development Block Grants, commonly known here as CDBG funding.

Public-private partnerships are great investments for our communities. And on the central coast of California, as well as in communities all across our country, Community Development Block Grants have long been a critical source of funding for local initiatives. CDBG funding gives nonprofits opportunities to provide locally tailored services in an efficient and effective manner. These nonprofits are then able to leverage additional private funding, giving taxpayer dollars an extra bang for the buck in spending power. It is a win-win for everyone. The investments that are made stimulate and grow our local economies. They improve the quality of life for our working families.

My constituents see CDBG funding at work each day, even though they may not know what it is. It's there working on their behalf. It's the Santa Maria Meals on Wheels program, which delivers nutritious meals to local seniors each day. For many of these seniors, it's the only real meal they'll have in a day.

It's the Thrifty Shopper and Catholic Charities' Community Services, which support mobile food distribution and case management for our neighbors in need.

It is the youth education enhancement programs which provide quality after-school youth education programs. These programs improve reading and

study skills. They promote high school graduation, and foster parent participation in a child's academic life. CDBG supports our local Boys and Girls Clubs, the food bank, and legal aid. It's giving Santa Maria a chance to rehab Oakley Park, which benefits the entire community.

CDBG helps those in need, and it makes life a bit better for everyone. These are investments with real local impacts, and that's why cuts to this program, like the drastic ones we've been debating, also have a direct impact.

Already, important programs like Meals on Wheels are having trouble reaching all those in need due to sequestration cuts. So to slash the program in half will only add to this devastation. These aren't disposable projects. They are truly investments in our people and in our community, and that is why I urge my colleagues to stand with the central coast of California, to stand with communities across this Nation who can't afford the bill the House majority has brought to the floor.

STOP GOVERNMENT ABUSE WEEK

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, this week in the House, we are voting on pieces of legislation that will roll back the Obama administration's overreach. We term this effort Stop Government Abuse Week. Our message to the administration is quite simple: no more wasted tax dollars, no more abuse of power by Federal agencies. The Federal Government must be accountable to the American people, not unelected bureaucrats.

Right now, a senior Federal employee can be placed under investigation for serious misconduct, yet the Federal Government isn't allowed to put that person on leave without pay, meaning they get an extended paid vacation. That's the case with IRS official Lois Lerner, who took the Fifth Amendment and testified before Congress. She's now on paid leave while Congress continues the agency's misconduct investigation.

The Employee Accountability Act, introduced by my friend MIKE KELLY from Pennsylvania, will address this issue. It will allow agencies to place employees on unpaid leave when they are under investigation for serious offenses.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the work the House is doing this week on behalf of the American people. We are sending a very strong message to the Obama administration: enough is enough.

CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk today about important issues involving climate change going on all over America, all over this world. But specifically today, I want to talk about our urban communities. Global warming is expected to increase the frequency and intensity of natural disasters, like wildfires in the West and hurricanes like Sandy on the east coast, and record drought conditions that continue for another year across the Midwest.

But in urban areas, cities like D.C., or my hometown of Minneapolis, we have something known as an urban heat island. Urban heat islands are a serious problem because urban areas tend to have temperatures 5–20 degrees warmer than rural areas, which is known as heat island effect. Heat islands are caused by a lack of natural vegetation, dark colored, impervious roads and concrete, and exhaust from vehicles and industry. As global temperatures increase, urban areas are warming at double the rate of the average global temperature, so this is a real serious issue.

Heat islands drive people to increase their use of air conditioning, which of course has a vicious effect in terms of just increasing an already serious problem. In turn, increasing the air conditioning drives up energy costs and increases power plant emissions, which contributes to the heat island in the first place.

These emissions not only contribute to global warming, they impact human health, increase emissions of carbon monoxide, mercury, and particulate matter, which leads to increased risks of heart attacks, strokes, and asthma. Particulate matter is very fine pieces that are emitted from coal plants. They go up into the air and come down, and we breathe that stuff in.

The effect of extreme heat in urban areas disproportionately affects some Americans as opposed to others. It affects anyone who lives in an urban area. But given the populations of urban areas, it affects certain communities more, including communities of color, low-income communities, and the elderly.

This housing segregation that we have in our country in which you have this disproportionate number of some populations in urban areas, concentrates racial ethnic minorities in dense environments, and that's why we see African Americans experiencing some of these heat-related hazards that have to do with everything from asthma and other sorts of issues like that. The low-income, minority, and elderly are less able to adapt and recover from these extreme climate events and are the communities most at risk from heat island effects and heat waves.

These communities are already plagued by higher pollution than wealthy, white communities. Coal plants, bus depots, and trash incinerators are disproportionately located in these areas that I speak of, and the heat island effect makes it worse.

The high cost of air conditioning, the inability to move into special heat wave shelters increases risk. Urban minorities often have more underlying health issues, such as higher rates of asthma, as I mentioned before, which also creates susceptibility to increased pollutants in these heat islands.

In 1995, a Chicago heat wave killed more than 700 people over 5 days, mostly elderly people who couldn't escape. The European heat wave in 2003 killed 30,000 people, although some estimates put that number as high as 70,000. Socioeconomic disparities will worsen through the health and economic effects of climate change.

As global temperatures continue to rise, heat waves in urban areas are increasing in frequency, duration, and intensity; and the effect on my community of Minneapolis, and urban areas all over this country, will be devastating. This is a serious issue that we need to focus on. We need to do something about it. The time is now.

I want to thank the Safe Climate Caucus for organizing Members to discuss this issue for the public today so we can all come to a greater level of awareness about the true dangers of ignoring global climate change.

SUPPORT PATIENT OPTION ACT

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this government is out of control. It has become too big and too intrusive. It is spending too much. It is taxing too much. It is regulating too much. It is borrowing too much. And it's sticking its ugly nose into our business too much. This must stop.

ObamaCare does every one of those things. This law is as disastrous as a train running full throttle without an engineer, speeding toward a head-on collision and wrecking everything in its tracks.

I come before you today with a solution, my Patient Option Act, H.R. 2900. My Patient Option Act will revitalize American health care, not through government interference but by giving the American people full control over their health care decisions. It will make health care cheaper for everyone. It provides coverage for all Americans, and it will save Medicare from going broke.

My Patient Option Act repeals ObamaCare in its entirety and replaces it with some patient-centered, commonsense solutions. These solutions include 100 percent deductibility for health care expenses for everyone, including insurance; flexibility for individuals and businesses to join associations where there will be a smorgasbord of health care insurance options; expanding health savings accounts that patients will own and control; freedom for consumers to purchase health insurance across State lines; and tax incentives to reward physicians who provide free care to patients who cannot afford health insurance.

My Patient Option Act accomplishes all of this, and more, in just 77 pages.

That's a stark contrast to the over 2,700-page regulatory nightmare of ObamaCare. In fact, ObamaCare's regulations are 2 million words longer than the Bible. Any bill that much longer than the Bible has to be bad for America.

My Patient Option Act is the solution that Americans need and deserve. Unfortunately, the clock is ticking and time has almost run out.

A Georgia businessman recently told me that his insurance premiums for his employees have increased by 40 percent this year, compared to last, due to ObamaCare.

Another Georgia businessman, who is an owner of several fast-food restaurants and currently employs over 200 full-time workers, recently told me that he is seriously considering letting them all go and hiring only part-time employees.

And recently, even President Obama's Health and Human Services Department has admitted that you might not be able to keep your current doctor, even if you want to. If Congress does not act soon, we will be hearing more and more of these same stories.

I'm here to tell all Americans and all American families that it doesn't have to be this way.

Mr. Speaker, if Americans want true, patient-centered, health care reform, then they must contact their Congressman and Senators and urge them to pass my Patient Option Act.

Mr. Speaker, if Americans want lower costs, coverage for everyone, and government out of the way of the doctor-patient relationship, then they must contact their Representatives and urge them to pass my Patient Option Act.

If Americans want full control of their coverage and freedom to make their own decisions in health care, then the Patient Option Act is the only true solution.

We don't have much time; but through the voices of we, the people, the American people, we can work to repeal this disastrous law and replace it with legislation that serves the best interest of my patients and all patients, not government. That's my Patient Option Act.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS IN CONGRESS

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow afternoon we will board our flights back to the district for the August recess. Sadly, we'll be leaving behind a lot of unfinished business.

Just yesterday, the Republican leadership pulled the catastrophe of a transportation and housing appropriations bill because it couldn't even get the votes within their own caucus.

I ask my friends, when are we going to begin to govern and work together?

When we come back from the August recess period, we will have 9 days, just 9 days left until the farm bill extension expires. But we're leaving the House without passing a true farm bill that we can conference, much less appointing any conferees to work out the differences between the two bills. The farmers, ranchers and dairymen expect better in my district.

Uncertainty swirls around the Capitol, but the only thing that seems certain here lately is that we cannot act on anything that the American people want us to that they view as no-brainers.

Take immigration reform. Over half the voters in this country think we should get this done and pass the Senate bill. Yet we are watching the summer fade into fall without even a timeline for when the House will bring up real immigration reform.

It's far too easy for us to throw up our hands and say this place is broken, but that's not why we came to Washington.

No budget, little in appropriations bills, no tax reform, little progress on immigration reform, and no farm bill.

Yet last week, the Republican leaders said that we should, instead, be measured by the laws that we repeal. Okay. Well, on that score, we've exactly repealed zero laws.

I came here to roll up my sleeves and get to work. We have real problems in this country; but we also, I think, share in real bipartisan solutions to fix those problems. All that we need is the green light.

The problem here is that the art of the political compromise has been lost. And it's about time we rediscover that art of the political compromise.

We have divided government. That's not a secret. We've had divided government in the past. And by the way, we're going to have divided government for the next 3½ years.

Let's get real. It's about time that we begin to figure out ways to work together. My hope is that when we go back home we are reminded that every vote here in the House of Representatives, the people's House, is not a litmus test, and that every issue that we deal with should not be looked at in terms of black and white, but in shades of gray.

We have a lot of challenges facing America. I hope, after the August recess, we come back here in September and that we put solving America's problems before our own political agendas.

America cannot afford to continue this three-ring circus. It's about time we begin to work together, ladies and gentlemen.

HONORING MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENT ARMY STAFF SERGEANT TY MICHAEL CARTER

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Army Staff Sergeant Ty Michael Carter, who will be awarded with the Congressional Medal of Honor in recognition of his heroic actions in Afghanistan in 2009.

As the father of a veteran, I am truly honored to represent Staff Sergeant Carter, a resident of Antioch, California. The Medal of Honor is our Nation's highest military award presented for selfless sacrifice and acts of courage above and beyond the call of duty at the risk of his or her life.

Staff Sergeant Carter was born in Spokane, Washington, in 1980 and graduated from North Central High School. After high school, he enlisted in the Marine Corps and served in Japan. He had two additional deployments before being honorably discharged from the Marine Corps in the year 2002.

During this time, Staff Sergeant Carter enrolled in the Los Medanos Community College in California and studied biology. Upon the birth of his first daughter, and after traveling throughout the United States, he enlisted to serve his country as a soldier in the United States Army in the year 2008.

It was on October 3, 2009, when Specialist Carter and the 54 Members of B Troop, 3rd Squadron, 61st Cavalry Regiment came under heavy enemy fire in the Nuristan province of Afghanistan.

At great risk of his own life, Staff Sergeant Carter resupplied ammunition to help his fellow soldiers, provided first aid to a comrade, eliminated enemy troops, and risked his own life to help carry a fellow soldier from harm's way.

The actions that Mr. Carter took during this ambush were critical to the defense of the COP Keating, which was established in 2006 as a provincial reconstruction team camp located near the confluence of the Kushtowz and Landay Sin Rivers.

All of our Nation's servicemembers and their families make great sacrifices, and we can never fully repay them. It's important that we pay tribute to those who show their devotion to the United States through their service and that we ensure those who return home are provided with the services they deserve and have earned.

These brave men and women are committed to one another and to honoring the call of duty to protect our great Nation. We owe them the same respect.

I want to commend Staff Sergeant Carter and all of our Nation's veterans for their courage and dedication to this country. Our Nation has always been able to depend on the selfless actions of men and women in uniform for our very existence.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Staff Sergeant Ty Michael Carter, as well as our servicemen and women, their families and veterans, for their service to the United States.

NATIONAL COACHES DAY

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I also want to recognize the efforts of Madeline Woznick, a 12-year-old student athlete who lives in Lodi, California. Madeline is a competitive swimmer and has worked to bring attention to the hard work and dedication of coaches across the country and is advocating for an annual National Coaches Day.

There are tens of millions of student athletes in the country. Coaches can have a fundamental impact on these students, and I'm grateful for their endeavors to train and mentor the next generation.

Today's students are tomorrow's leaders, and it is important that they have teachers and mentors who inspire and encourage them in their educational pursuits. As Madeline says, coaches motivate and inspire students to better themselves.

In 1972, President Nixon declared October 6 as National Coaches Day, and Madeline is working to ensure that every October 6 is National Coaches Day so their efforts are appreciated and recognized by communities across the country.

I urge my colleagues to join me in applauding Madeline Woznick and coaches across the country.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 55 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

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

God of the Universe, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We ask Your blessing upon those who have worked so hard these past few days. Many issues remain, and their solutions continue to elude. Not all are completely satisfied, but help us all to proceed graciously, remaining vigilant for those values held most dear while being just.

In the days that come, help each Member to understand well and interpret positively, as they are able, the positions of those with whom they disagree. Grant to each the wisdom of Solomon, and to us all the faith and confidence to know that no matter how difficult things appear to be, You continue to walk with our Nation as You have done for over two centuries.

May all that is done today in the people's House be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York 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

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, we're now in the 4th week of the civilian furloughs at the Department of Defense that are wreaking havoc on our national security and the lives of patriotic men and women across this country. Mr. Speaker, I've said repeatedly the decisions that led us here were not the result of strategic analysis but yet another consequence of misguided cuts to our national defense.

Just a few moments ago, we were in a hearing in the Armed Services Committee and a high-ranking member of the Pentagon said that the suggestion that we now know the President made for sequestration was a dumb idea. It was certainly a wrong idea. It was wrong when the President signed it into law, but what is worse is the current position of the White House, that even if the House and the Senate can reach an agreement to fix sequestration and stop these furloughs, that they will not agree to it unless we give the President all the spending he wants in every area of government and increases in taxes in all the areas of government he wants.

Mr. Speaker, this is wrong. We need to address sequestration now for national defense and stop it before it's too late.

NATION-BUILDING AT HOME

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, last week I met with Rich Lowry, the editor of the National Review, whose new book, ''Lincoln Unbound,'' urges the Republican Party to embrace an aspirational agenda of Abraham Lincoln, who led an ambitious program of rail and canal construction.

His book calls to mind the words of Sheila Bair, a George W. Bush administration official, who, in February, urged her fellow Republicans to remember that, from Lincoln's transcontinental railroad to Eisenhower's highway system, Republicans have understood that investing in critical infrastructure projects creates jobs and expands the economy.

Yet the appropriations bill that was on the floor this week would have cut $2 billion from the Department of Transportation. It was a total rejection of the Lincoln-Eisenhower tradition.

We have spent $87 billion rebuilding the infrastructure of Afghanistan and just approved $5 billion more. According to the United States inspector general, supporters of the Taliban and al Qaeda are getting the contracts and ''far too much will be wasted'' due to insufficient oversight.

This, Mr. Speaker, is appalling, and it's time to do nation-building right here at home.

OBAMACARE

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

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, according to the most recently released numbers by the Congressional Budget Office, ObamaCare is now going to cost the American taxpayers nearly $1.4 trillion.

With our national debt sitting at $16.8 trillion and rising every single day, I must ask my colleagues who support this: Can America really afford this?

NUCLEAR IRAN PREVENTION ACT

(Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the dangers of a nuclear Iran are real and represent one of the greatest threats to our country and to our allies.

In addition to the existential threat to our ally, Israel, Iran is a growing source of violence in the Middle East, propping up the Syrian regime, arming Hezbollah, and undermining a fragile peace in Iraq. More troubling, the Iranian regime is pursuing an active nuclear capability, which we cannot allow.

While we have strong laws on the books already, we can and must go even further to isolate the Iranian regime and the major sources of funding that support it. The Nuclear Iran Prevention Act will cripple that country's energy sector and tighten sanctions on Iran's radical leadership and human

rights violators. For the first time, the bill authorizes the President to impose sanctions on any entity that maintains significant commercial ties with Iran.

Without question, we must come together to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon, and I urge my colleagues in the Senate to join us in sending a clear message to the Iranians that we will stand firmly with our friend, Israel, until the Iran regime forsakes this reckless course and rejoins the peaceful community of nations.

ELEVENTH UNANSWERED QUESTION ON BENGHAZI

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I've been asking a series of questions over the last 3 weeks about what happened in Benghazi last September. After a year of investigation, none of the questions have been answered publicly, not one.

Tomorrow is the last day before Congress departs for its August recess, and I plan to resubmit all the questions that I've asked so they are listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for history to see—and history will determine whether the American people ever learned the truth.

Yesterday, I focused my questions on the other U.S. facility that was attacked that night, the CIA annex. Today, I have only one question: Who in the White House knew what was going on in the annex? That's it. One question: Who knew? The Chief of Staff? Then-Deputy National Security Advisor and current CIA Director John Brennan?

Something is just not right.

It is time to honor both those who were killed and the survivors by creating a House select committee and, in the words of the editorial page of The Wall Street Journal, let Benghazi's chips fall.

ANNIVERSARY OF OAK CREEK SHOOTING

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

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, a year ago, the Sikhs at the Oak Creek, Wisconsin, temple, or gurdwara, were peacefully preparing meals for Sunday worship, but that peace was shattered when a 40-year-old neo-Nazi man walked in and began shooting anyone in his path. I stand here today to honor the six victims of this senseless massacre:

Suveg Singh Khattra
Satwant Singh Kaleka
Ranjit Singh
Sita Singh
Paramjit Kaur
Prakash Singh

You will never be forgotten.

Sikhs have been the targets of discrimination and violence. Just this week, the word ''terrorist'' was scrawled against the wall of a gurdwara in Riverside.

In the memory of Oak Creek, we will recommit to fighting against intolerance wherever and whenever it occurs so that the lives of those six brave souls will not be lost in vain.

STOP GOVERNMENT ABUSE

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

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the measures we're bringing to the floor this week aimed at stopping government abuse.

With millions of working middle class Americans struggling, House Republicans have chosen to lead on the issues that matter to them. We've focused on creating jobs, lowering energy prices, offering children a better education, and lessening the burden of regulations and red tape on their lives. This week, we are holding government accountable to them by increasing transparency, cutting waste, and giving them new protections from an out-of-control bureaucracy.

Our plan is to stop the reckless waste of taxpayer dollars with new controls for Federal agency spending and to give new powers to our citizens so that government bureaucrats can be held accountable for any political intimidation or poor customer service that may occur.

These reforms are reforms that our country needs because many in Washington simply have forgotten the most important principle—the Federal Government works for the people and not the other way around.

I'm surprised that the Democratic leaders have urged opposition to several of these commonsense measures. Why do they want to forbid citizens from transparently recording conversations with Federal regulators? You have to ask: Why do they want to keep paying out hefty bonuses to well-compensated executives in these times of fiscal stress and economic restraint? Why is it that the opposition leaders want to keep paying senior Federal officials who are under investigation for serious ethical wrongdoing? Why do they want to use taxpayer dollars to do that? It just defies logic, Mr. Speaker.

The package of bills being brought to the floor this week are common sense, and they should easily garner bipartisan support. There's simply no reason for Members of either party to support megabonuses, expensive paid vacations, and zero accountability measures for Washington bureaucrats.

We are here to represent the people, not the government. Working families in America want to trust their government, and they want to rebuild their faith in our economy. These bills are a much-needed step in the right direction toward accomplishing this goal.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this commonsense legislation. I urge the Senate to join us in this effort and not waste time while these abuses continue.

RECOGNIZING TAFT EARLY LEARNING SCHOOL

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Taft Early Learning School in Uxbridge, Massachusetts, for being named as a Bronze Award Winner in the USDA Healthier School Challenge. This initiative recognizes those schools enrolled in Team Nutrition that have created healthier school environments through promotion of nutrition and physical activity, a program that is now part of First Lady Michelle Obama's Let's Move campaign.

To achieve this challenge, Taft applied for and received a salad bar grant, which enabled them to offer lots of fresh fruit and vegetable choices every day as part of lunch. They incorporated more whole grains and beans into the menu. They hired an experienced cook to make this happen and added extra physical activity every day, which required the creativity and cooperation of the classroom teachers.

I want to congratulate Principal Judi Lamarre, Food Service Director Janice Watt, the teachers, administrative staff, students, and parents for their hard work in improving the food, nutrition, and exercise programs at Taft Early Learning School. This is a big deal, and I'm proud of this important accomplishment.

KEEP THE IRS OFF YOUR HEALTH CARE ACT

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in May, the IRS proved to the American people it cannot be trusted to fairly enforce laws.

As if the intentional targeting of Americans was not troubling enough, ObamaCare will give the IRS even more power in just a short month. That's right, the agency that bullied Americans for exercising their right of free speech will be the same agency involved in enforcing health care. Patients and their doctors should make the decisions that work best for them, not Washington, much less the IRS.

Allowing the IRS to enforce ObamaCare opens the door to more abuse, targeting, and intimidation of Americans. That's why I join my colleagues in support of a commonsense bill, H.R. 2009, Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act, that will stop the IRS from enforcing or implementing any part of ObamaCare.

It's time for our friends across the aisle to listen to the American people.

Keep the IRS out of our lives and out of our health care.

□ 1215

IN MEMORY OF LOIS DEBERRY

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, the United States lost a great citizen and a legend on Sunday when Lois DeBerry passed away. Lois was the Speaker Pro-Temp Emeritus of the Tennessee General Assembly and the longest-serving member of the Tennessee General Assembly. I had the honor to serve with her. She was a great orator, and she was the go-to person of the Tennessee General Assembly on civil rights issues, women's issues, children's issues, education issues, and anything about Memphis. She served with distinction and was recognized all over the country. The Delta Sigma Thetas were valued to her and valued to have her as a member. She was a past president of the National Association of Black Local Elected Officials and respected in the National Conference of State Legislatures.

Yesterday, a flag flew over the Capitol, which I have to present Saturday at her funeral, the day that we celebrate the 50th anniversary of the March on Washington, a march in which Lois participated as a very young person. Her's was a life well lived. She will be missed by all in Memphis and me.

HONORING CHERYL SCOFIELD

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Cheryl Scofield of the USDA Rural Development Office in Wray, Colorado. Cheryl will retire next month as the USDA Rural Development Northeast Area director after 30 years of dedicated service. A fourth-generation Yuma County resident, Cheryl studied at Jones Real Estate College and the University of Colorado, earning a graduate degree in public administration.

After getting her start at Wray State Bank and World Savings Mortgage Company, she took a job with the Department of Housing, but it was at the USDA Rural Development Office where Cheryl spent 31 years as an outstanding and invaluable asset to her agency. Her rural background, education, and true passion for her work gave wind to Cheryl's impressive career.

Outside of work, Cheryl has been an active member of her community—board member, small business development, and a wealth of professional experience she's shared with communities throughout the eastern plains. She's been married to her husband, Delbert, for 41 years. There's not a single community on the eastern plains that Cheryl's work hasn't impacted. Her legacy will live on on every Main Street of eastern Colorado.

Thank you, Cheryl, for your service.

SUPPORT NIH FUNDING

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

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support funding for the National Institutes of Health and to stop the mindless and automatic sequestration cuts.

Earlier this month, I met with Carlos Santos and James Hodge, two young men from Florida. We talked about their sisters, who suffer from cystic fibrosis, and how potential budget cuts to the NIH will drastically affect their lives.

Cystic fibrosis is a chronic disease with no cure. While discoveries from NIH over the past 30 years have helped double the life expectancy of those with cystic fibrosis, there is much more we can do, including finding a cure for this disease in our lifetime.

Because of NIH's groundbreaking research into this disease and others, I ask my colleagues to support funding for NIH. We must secure our Nation's future by making smart investments in our Nation's health.

SUPPORT CANCER RESEARCH

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I recently met with my good friend, Linda Sindt, a former colonel in the United States Air Force from Medford, Oregon. For many years, Linda has served on my service academy nominations board, helping me find honorable young men and women to serve their country in our academies.

This time, though, we discussed a much different issue. Last year, Linda lost her husband, U.S. Air Force Major Duane Sindt, to pancreatic cancer. It's a terrible disease with an extremely low survival rate. We owe it to Linda and other families affected by this disease to help improve treatment and to find a cure.

So last year, with the help of Linda and her fellow advocates, Congress passed and the President signed the Recalcitrant Cancer Research Act, which helps incentivize research and treatment for this horrible disease and others like it. There is still much more work to be done, but we are hopeful we can continue to build upon this effort and find treatments and cures to help patients and families nationwide.

AMERICAN PEOPLE WANT JOBS

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the American people have said loud and clear that what they want the most from Congress is jobs. And what is Congress giving them? Jabs—threats to bring the government to a halt; threats to let the United States Treasury default; threats to slash the funding for mass transit that brings people to their jobs. And the tentacles of sequestration will strangle growth even more. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that sequestration will cost us 900,000 fewer jobs next year.

It's time to stop playing politics with our economy and do the people's work. We need to provide a strong workforce, a strong infrastructure, and manufacturing sectors. We need to provide a living wage to grow the middle class and strengthen America's standing as a leader in education and pioneering research.

But still, our friends on the other side of the aisle are marching to the tune of their own drum when what they should be listening to is the cry of the American people for more jobs.

STOP GOVERNMENT ABUSE

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the legislation that the House is considering this week. The people of eastern and southeastern Ohio sent me to Congress to get the government off their backs, to allow them to create jobs and to earn a living and raise a family without government overreach and interference.

Over the past 2½ years, the Republican-led House has done exactly that on a daily basis. However, some in Washington have not gotten the message. I'm proud to continue supporting legislation that stops government abuse like we've seen in the IRS, restrains a runaway Federal Government that doesn't seem to have any brakes, and that empowers the American people with greater opportunities to pull themselves up by their bootstraps.

The people of eastern and southeastern Ohio want a strong economy that will create a more secure future for them. The House Republican plan to stop government abuse lays the groundwork for more secure jobs and a more secure future with new jobs, more freedom, and expanded opportunities.

LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out against the misguided priorities that are driving the GOP's obstruct, repeal, and repeat agenda, and

to call instead for a new policy that addresses the serious challenges our Nation faces.

When we adjourn tomorrow, Republican leadership will leave behind a staggering record of unfinished business and partisan messaging bills that put politics ahead of the American people's priorities. Since January, Republicans have not even allowed a vote on a real jobs bill. They haven't finished a budget, passed comprehensive immigration reform, restored funding on nutrition programs, or fixed the sequester.

Their aversion to meaningful action is undermining the important economic progress we've made. It's keeping 11 million undocumented immigrants in the shadows, and it's disproportionately harming low-income women and families. Hopefully they will see the light during the August recess and put aside the obstruct, repeal, and repeat agenda and set a new one that answers the public's outcry for action.

IRS CANNOT BE TRUSTED

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare is a train wreck quickly approaching the station near you. This unworkable, unaffordable law will destroy hundreds of thousands of jobs, disrupt the doctor-patient relationship and offer a ''Free Ticket, No Show'' health care system.

According to a recent CBS News poll, 54 percent of Americans disapprove of the health care law, while only 36 percent approve. It is clear the American people have lost faith in the President's government health care takeover bill. The Federal Government, especially the IRS, has betrayed the trust of the American people. Every day, more groups come forward and reveal unfair targeting by the IRS.

House Republicans are acting to protect every American family from the abuse, targeting, and harassment by the IRS. This week, we will vote on the Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act, legislation that bars the IRS from implementing ObamaCare.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this bill and help restore the American people's faith in limiting government.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

I am grateful to welcome the Sunny and Jay Philips family to the Capitol.

HONORING ANDREW WALTER

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a talented educator in my district, Andrew Walter. Mr. Walter is a math teacher at Stagg High School in Stockton, California. He is one of five California finalists for the 2013 Presidential Awards for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching.

For the past 20 years, Mr. Walter has been enriching the lives of youth in San Joaquin County as the chair of the mathematics department, as well as serving as the math, engineering, science, and achievement adviser for pre-engineering students. An education in STEM-related fields is critical for our students to help them survive in these competitive fields.

Mr. Walter has led his Math Engineering Science Achievement, or MESA, team to win the State championships multiple times and the national championship last year with a wind turbine built solely by his high school students.

It is this type of dedication and commitment that will lead to innovation, the creation of good-paying jobs, and keep America as a world leader in these areas.

I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating Andrew Walter not only for his nomination, but everything he has done for his students.

ATTORNEY GENERAL MISLEADS CONGRESS

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address Attorney General Holder misleading Congress with deceptive testimony. If I or any other ordinary citizen did what the Attorney General did, we would be thrown in jail for perjury. In front of the House Judiciary Committee on May 15, Holder said he knew nothing of the targeting of journalist James Rosen, yet Holder himself signed the subpoena for Mr. Rosen's records.

Does the Attorney General suffer from Sergeant Schultz syndrome—where he hears nothing, sees nothing, and knows nothing? How convenient for Mr. Holder—but at what cost to our Constitution?

We are a Nation of laws, but the Attorney General has created an atmosphere of lawlessness in America. Nobody is above the law. He must be held accountable.

As Supreme Court Justice Brandeis said:

> In a government of laws, the existence of the government will be imperiled if it fails to observe the law scrupulously. If government becomes a lawbreaker, it breeds contempt for the law. It invites every man to become a law unto himself. It invites anarchy.

I ask you: Has the Attorney General invited anarchy? I will continue to make my case here in the people's House, at the people's pulpit. I will be back.

SHELTER HOUSING FOR THE HOMELESS

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this is a picture of a homeless young person; 19,000 of them are in Houston, according to 28 school districts. And just think, on the floor of the House before it went thud, there was a housing bill that cut the housing appropriation for homeless and veterans and working Americans to $44.1 billion. But more importantly, under the sequestration amount offered by the Republicans, even the Senate, in a compromise manner, put it at $54 billion.

So I rise today to ask, is anyone speaking for these young people, such as those who reside in a place called Lil Audrey in my district, where I sat down with young people who had lived in a crack house, not because they were on crack, but because that was a place for them to live until they found Lil Audrey? Or the young lady that was abused until she found Lil Audrey? Or the twins who were homeless with no parents until they found Lil Audrey?

I'm going to ask the city of Houston to use its public facilities money, money that it has been blessed to have from the Federal Government Housing and Urban Development, to help build a facility for Lil Audrey, and I'm going to insist that when local communities get Federal dollars that we fight so hard for, to be able to use them creatively to serve people, to serve the taxpayer, to serve the homeless, to serve homeless youth.

How long are we going to have to cry out for young people who suffer from mental concerns and others who have no place to live? I hope Houston will listen, and I hope my friends on the other side of the aisle will have mercy on those who need housing.

END SEX TRAFFICKING ACT—PROSECUTE THE DEMAND

(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. Mr. Speaker, for some of us, growing up was the best of times; simple times; safe times. But life isn't that way anymore for some kids.

Today, young girls, the average age between 12 and 14, are lured into a crooked, despicable business. It's sex trafficking—modern day slavery. Girls have been threatened, raped, forced into selling their bodies on the streets by the worst deviants in our society. Some of these girls are smuggled into the United States by slave traffickers from other countries, and some are from our own neighborhoods.

Sex traffickers should be put into the jailhouse forever. But society must get to the root of the problem: the demand. That's why I have introduced the End

Sex Trafficking Act, along with Representatives MALONEY, GRANGER, and NOLAN. Our bill targets the interstate criminals who purchase sexual acts from child victims and ensures that they, too, are prosecuted as human traffickers. No longer can these deviants hide. Let the long arm of the law punish the child-molesting pedophiles who steal the innocence of children.

And that's just the way it is.

□ 1230

LET'S TURN OFF THE SEQUESTER

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, a word not much known about 2 years ago now is a household word. It is ''to sequester,'' a verb, and ''sequestration,'' a noun.

Today, in the Armed Services Committee, we heard the Republican chair and the Democratic ranking member state in almost unison, Sequestration must end. It is a threat to our great Nation's readiness posture, affects jobs, and the manufacturing base.

DOD alone has 800,000 civilian employees. It is not only defense that's being affected. It is all of the discretionary budget. CBO estimates it will cost about 750,000 jobs this year alone. We saw it earlier this year with the FAA.

We will see how the U.S. Forest Service is affected by 500 firefighters that are lost, 50 to 70 fire engines, and two aircraft.

We will also see 70,000 children lose access to Head Start.

What will it take to turn it off, to quote our HASC ranking member?

We all agree it was not meant to be. It's a mistake. Mr. Speaker, let's turn it off.

THERE IS A BETTER WAY

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, the President is giving speeches on his plan for economic growth. His economic plan is to grow government, regulate more, spend more, and tax more. His speeches will not create jobs.

The economy does not improve when the administration piles on tens of thousands of pages of costly new regulations. Families don't thrive when the only jobs they can find are part-time because of ObamaCare's onerous mandates forcing employers to cut back on hours in order to be able to keep their doors open.

This administration's oppressive regulations cost small businesses, on average, $10,585 per employee. To create jobs and jump-start the economy, we must pull back on unnecessary punitive regulations, hold the bureaucracy accountable, and shrink the size of government and reward, rather than punish, success.

This week we are voting to be able to stop government overreach, stand up for the American people, and give them a fighting chance to be able to succeed, to have access to fair and affordable and effective health care systems, not to have to worry about the Federal Government increasing burdens on their lives, abusing power, and stunting economic growth and putting their jobs at risk.

The American people need this response.

BRING THE AMERICAN JOBS BILL TO THE HOUSE FLOOR

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow begins a long district work period. When I arrive, the number one question will be: Congresswoman WILSON, what are they doing in Washington to help us with unemployment and the economy? What are they doing about sequestration?

I will say, The Republicans have not allowed one vote on serious legislation to create jobs or jobs training programs, not one vote to rebuild our bridges and schools, not one bill to hire more teachers and police officers, and nothing to stop sequestration.

Mr. Speaker, bring the American Jobs bill to the floor. It creates jobs and stops sequestration.

The farm bill is still up in the air. Judicial confirmations are on hold. Immigration reform is still on the radar, and Mr. Snowden is still a fugitive from justice.

Still, all the polls tell us that the number one issue for the American people is jobs and the economy.

Bring the American Jobs Act to the floor. It deserves a vote, and it stops sequestration. Jobs, jobs, jobs should be the mantra of this Congress.

THE GREAT LAKES ECOLOGICAL AND ECONOMIC PROTECTION ACT

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

Mr. JOYCE. Mr. Speaker, the Great Lakes are truly one of the jewels of North America. They contain 20 percent of the world's surface water and provide drinking water for 30 million people. They're also a driver of our economy, as studies have shown 1.5 million jobs are directly connected to the Great Lakes, generating $62 billion in wages.

That's why I'm encouraging my colleagues to support my Great Lakes Ecological and Economic Protection Act. This bill will help ensure we have a healthy Great Lakes, while boosting the economies along the Great Lakes region.

This bill already enjoys bipartisan support, and I hope my colleagues will join me in protecting one of the most precious resources in North America, the Great Lakes.

OBAMACARE

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, as we see ObamaCare go into effect, we see that it is making affordable health insurance a reality for hardworking families. Thanks to ObamaCare, 360,000 small businesses have the right to receive tax credits to help with the cost of providing coverage to their employees.

Thanks to ObamaCare, senior citizens have the right to affordable prescription drugs and free preventative benefits.

Thanks to ObamaCare, millions of young adults have the right to stay on their parents' health insurance until they're 26.

And thanks to ObamaCare, women have the right to no longer be denied coverage because they are sick or have preexisting conditions; and thanks to ObamaCare, women no longer have to pay higher premiums for health insurance just because we're women.

We are finally making great progress in fixing an outdated health care system that has been broken for far too long. Let's not vote to take away the American people's rights.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF SERGEANT CARL MOORE, III

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

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Sergeant Carl Moore, III, from Bigelow, Arkansas, for his continuing service to our country. Sergeant Moore, a fellow Screaming Eagle, is with the 101st Airborne Division.

In early June of this year, Sergeant Moore was wounded while on patrol in Afghanistan. A bullet struck him under his arm, puncturing one of his lungs and grazing his spine.

Sergeant Moore is currently at Tampa Polytrauma Rehabilitation Center where he is recovering. He's unable to walk, but he has feeling in his legs and toes, and his prognosis is good.

I pray for Carl's speedy recovery so he can get back to enjoying the things he loves. My thoughts go out to his parents, Carl and Teresa, of Conway, Arkansas, and his wife, Heather, and their 4-year-old daughter, Addison.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in thanking Sergeant Moore for his service and saluting all who have served and continue to serve our Nation.

HONORING THE LIFE OF LILLIAN KAWASAKI

(Mr. LOWENTHAL asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I sadly come before the Congress to recognize and honor a person that I loved very much, Lillian Kawasaki. Lillian Kawasaki was a dedicated public servant, a respected community leader, a beloved wife, a sister, and she was a dear, dear friend of mine.

Sadly, on July 18, Lillian passed away, and a memorial service will be held this Saturday, August 3.

Lillian was a generous soul. Her generosity of self always was done with grace and enthusiasm. She engendered tremendous respect and love from all who knew her. She possessed an infectious smile. Her laugh made everybody feel better.

Her work for the last two decades was on environmental efforts, first with the Port of Los Angeles, and then with the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power. It brought not only recognition to her throughout California but also throughout the Nation.

She was an expert on water issues and when she passed away was a member of the Water Replenishment District, elected.

Long Beach has lost one of its finest. I, and countless others in California, already miss Lillian. She will not be forgotten.

OBAMACARE

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the bad news on ObamaCare just keeps rolling in. As if it's not bad enough that the IRS will be helping run ObamaCare, Maryland announced last Friday that health insurance premiums will go up 25 percent next year under ObamaCare.

Whatever happened to the President's promise that premiums would go down, not up? Just another empty promise?

Maryland's middle class families, already struggling to pay their health insurance premiums, will see their policies cost over $1,000 more next year under ObamaCare. Many will just drop their insurance, and that will just increase the long lines we already see in our crowded emergency rooms.

Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare is a disaster. We should repeal it before it does more damage to our hardworking middle class taxpayers and before it destroys even more jobs.

CELEBRATING AMERICA'S IMMIGRANT HERITAGE

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, last week I joined my colleagues in a bipartisan trip to New York City to celebrate America's immigrant heritage. Together, we sailed toward the Statue of Liberty and Ellis Island.

We stared down those dark, cascading waterfalls at the 9/11 Memorial, and remembered our ancestors at the Museum of Jewish Heritage and the African burial grounds. All around us were reminders of how people came to America, by choice or not, sometimes not by choice, but then hoping for a better life.

Our country has been the better because of it. Whether it's the laborers who built our bridges or the scientists and leaders who made their mark in history, we couldn't be where we are today without immigrants.

I was reminded of that as I witnessed a naturalization ceremony; 82 people from 27 countries became new Americans that day, and you could see their beaming faces.

Immigration is at our core, the moral fiber that binds us together and makes us stronger. Congress now has a responsibility to pass an immigration bill that is worthy of our rich heritage.

Let's write the next chapter of American history, one that our children and our grandchildren can be proud of.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 367, REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT OF 2013; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2009, KEEP THE IRS OFF YOUR HEALTH CARE ACT OF 2013; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM AUGUST 3, 2013, THROUGH SEPTEMBER 6, 2013; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2879, STOP GOVERNMENT ABUSE ACT

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 322 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 322

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 367) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2009) to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from enforcing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. House Resolution 292 is laid on the table.

SEC. 4. On any legislative day during the period from August 3, 2013, through September 6, 2013, —

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

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

(c) bills and resolutions introduced during the period addressed by this section shall be numbered, listed in the Congressional Record, and when printed shall bear the date of introduction, but may be referred by the Speaker at a later time.

SEC. 5. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 4 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 6. Each day during the period addressed by section 4 of this resolution shall not constitute a calendar day for purposes of section 7 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1546).

SEC. 7. Each day during the period addressed by section 4 of this resolution shall not constitute a legislative day for purposes of clause 7 of rule XIII.

SEC. 8. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2879) to provide limitations on bonuses for Federal employees during sequestration, to provide for investigative leave requirements for members of the Senior Executive Service, to establish certain

procedures for conducting in-person or telephonic interactions by Executive branch employees with individuals, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 9. Upon passage of H.R. 2879, the following bills shall be laid on the table: H.R. 1541, H.R. 2579, and H.R. 2711.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1245

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my good friend, the gentlelady from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for consideration of H.R. 367, the REINS Act; H.R. 2009, the Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act; and H.R. 2879, the Stop Government Abuse Act.

The rule provides a structured rule for consideration of the REINS Act, allowing debate time for 12 of 23 amendments submitted. In addition, the rule incorporates a technical correction to the bill from Chairman SESSIONS. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Judiciary Committee.

Additionally, the rule provides a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 2009, the Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act, and provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Furthermore, the rule provides a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 2879, the Stop Government Abuse Act, and provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the rule provides floor management tools to be used during the August recess.

Mr. Speaker, America's job creators have struggled against strong headwinds to recover. In fact, since President Obama took office, 131 new major regulations, costing at least $70 billion, have been added to America's regulatory system.

Under current law, Congress only has the power to disapprove regulations put forward by the executive branch. H.R. 367 flips that presumption on its head. Any major regulation estimated to cost over $100 million would need to be approved by Congress and must be given an ''up-or-down'' vote within 70 legislative days.

In his State of the Union address, President Obama said:

To reduce barriers to growth and investment, when we find rules that put an unnecessary burden on businesses, we will fix them.

H.R. 367 does just that. It allows Congress to decide whether major rules place unnecessary burdens on job creators.

The second bill covered by this rule, Mr. Speaker, would prohibit the Treasury Department, including the IRS, from implementing or enforcing any provision of ObamaCare. In the last few months, the American people have learned that the IRS has targeted and intimidated Americans exercising their First Amendment rights. Given the recent scandal and the massive amount of sensitive information the IRS is required to collect under ObamaCare, it's completely inappropriate for the IRS to be given this responsibility.

A recent poll showed that 53 percent of Americans want ObamaCare repealed entirely. Mr. Speaker, health care decisions should be made by a patient and his or her doctor, not Washington bureaucrats.

The final bill covered by this rule, H.R. 2879, was extensively debated on the floor yesterday. In fact, it combined three bills, all aimed at limiting government and returning that power back to the people. This bill accomplishes three major objectives:

First, it caps bonuses for Federal employees at a maximum 5 percent of their salary through the end of fiscal year 2015. With Federal officials furloughing employees due to sequestration, the government should not, at the same time, be handing out millions of dollars in bonuses to other employees;

Second, this bill allows for senior Federal officials under investigation for serious misconduct to be put on unpaid leave. Under current law, agencies have little recourse but to put officials on paid leave, where they can collect a paycheck for months or even years while the investigation occurs;

Finally, this bill allows for citizens to record their meetings and telephone exchanges with Federal regulatory officials. In my home State of Oklahoma, along with 37 other States, this is already the case. However, 12 States require all parties involved in the conversation to consent to recording. This bill would allow individuals in all 50 States to record their conversations when meeting with Federal officials acting in their official capacity.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 367, H.R. 2009, and H.R. 2879 all express the views of my constituents. They're increasingly concerned and opposed to an intrusive and expansive government that seeks to tell them what they can and cannot do. These bills seek to stem the tide of crushing regulation and rein in an overbearing Federal bureaucracy.

I urge support for the rule and the underlying bills, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank my colleague for yielding me the 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is the final week that the House will be in session before we begin our recess. I don't like to call it recess since we work as hard at home, but this is probably the last time we'll get together until we come back in the fall. As the clock runs out on another legislative session, we are voting for the 40th time to repeal or to undermine the Affordable Care Act.

By now, we all know how today's debate will end. The majority will pass the bill, the Senate will refuse to take it up, and we will have wasted, again, the public's time and their patience. And then they will adjourn for August recess, only to return in September with issues like jobs, immigration reform, and sequestration left unsolved, as they are today.

The other night, I was watching comedian Stephen Colbert on his program. He was talking about the number of times we've voted to try to repeal health care. He had a good idea for the Republicans. He said, Obviously, you're not going to be able to do it if you say you're going to repeal health care, so he suggested that a bill be written that is titled, ''This is Not Another Repeal of ObamaCare, We Swear, But Don't Look Inside It, Just Sign It Act.'' If you put that act out, maybe you would get somewhere with it.

Some speculated the GOP is desperate to get rid of this law because they know it is working and will work better as it gets fully implemented and they know they have firmly planted their feet on the wrong side of history once again. I can't comment on their motivation, but it's clear that millions of Americans are using this law because of the incredible benefits that it provides.

I was really stunned by the last speaker on the 1-minutes this morning talking about Maryland, because we just got the statistics from Maryland. The health plans are better than ever. Just last week, Maryland announced their rates are going to be among the lowest in the country, and not, as he said, a 20 percent increase.

Nevada announced a young adult will be able to purchase a catastrophic health insurance plan for less than $100.

And I said last week, when we had the other vote to get rid of health care, New York had just come out with wonderful news on the exchanges. Seventeen insurers had applied to provide insurance in the State of New York, and it would cause those premiums to fall by more than 50 percent. And we join 11

other States with the same kind of news. It's happening all over America.

For those States that decided not to do an exchange and are going to let the government do it, fine. I think they'll do okay there. Maybe we'll move closer to single-payer, which is what we should be doing.

Sixty-two days from now, those new exchanges will open their doors and they're going to provide millions of Americans with secure and affordable health care. For the very first time, insurers are going to be barred from denying coverage because of a preexisting condition and barred from placing lifetime and yearly limits on an individual's health care. They are sending checks back to customers all over the country, because the new law requires them to spend 80 percent of the premium dollar on health care. And since far less than 80 percent is spent, many companies are doing rebates, and people are getting those checks.

I really can't go on much further without talking about what it is we are doing here today. I think it's somewhat historical, but it may not be the first time. It's probably not. I have not had the pleasure before of doing a rule which consists of five bills with very little in common being stuffed into one because the House, basically, imploded yesterday. I've done all of the rules on health care repeal. If I had a machine, I could just press ''repeat'' and walk out of the room and do the same speech over and over again.

The other day I asked Dr. McDermott, who's a psychiatrist, ''What do you call someone or one group that does the same thing over and over and over again, anticipating a different result?'' and he gave me the psychiatric definition for that.

□ 1300

We all know that today's vote is not a single thing except another cynical attempt to score political points. As we go to our districts this August, the question is whether or not the majority will double down on their failed agendas in September and continue the irresponsible attempts to repeal the health care law. If they do, they will be escalating their brinksmanship to a new level and risking a government shutdown simply because they don't want to compromise.

Already, as you know, Members of the majority are threatening to shut down the government if the Affordable Care Act is not repealed. That does show kind of an act of desperation, doesn't it? In fact, a dozen Republican Senators have signed a letter vowing to vote against a continuing resolution—that we have to have because nobody got their work done—that funds the Affordable Care Act, and more than 60 House Republicans have called on the majority's leadership to defund the Affordable Care Act in any continuing resolution that comes before the House.

Instead, I want the majority to make a change here. My fellow Kentuckian, HAL ROGERS, who is the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, yesterday made it plain to everybody that this is all a hoax. He talked about sequestration and the impossibility of bringing a transportation bill that scarcely has enough money to maintain what roads we have, and it imploded on the floor when nobody would vote for it. While we're out on recess, please think about this, and think about what sequestration is doing in the United States.

I hope you read former Senator Byron Dorgan's article in The New York Times talking about the devastation on the Indian reservations because of the money that we owe them by treaty, which is being lost through sequestration; the people who are doing health research at the National Institutes of Health, where they tell me in the human genome project that they are very close to finding a cure for cancer, but now they have to stop it. As a scientist, I can promise you, you do not turn research off and on like a faucet. And think of all the people who can't get their treatment because of sequestration. Think of all the people who live in this area and work for this government and keep this government working, many of them two members of the family on the Federal payroll, who have suffered as much in that family as a 40 percent pay cut.

And the bills that are in here today, again, saying to the Federal employees: We don't value you for anything. We've already passed legislation in here that hurts their pensions. They haven't had a raise in 4 years. What we're saying now, if this bill passes today, is that they can be fired without cause and that their phones will be tapped by any citizen in the United States. I really am concerned about what's going on here.

We talk about too much regulation. I want to close with something I mentioned last night at the Rules Committee because I realize most Americans don't know it. But let me talk about under-regulation.

In the food market, chickens are inspected 100 at a time—100 a minute going through the conveyor belt. They're covered with barnyard debris and feces and whatever else. One person is inspecting them as 100 of them go by. So what's going to happen now they have decided to regulate? They will have to do 140 chickens a minute.

Recently, The Washington Post had a front-page story that stunned me to the core. It said that a young food inspector, working for the government, his lungs bled out and he died from the chemicals that he inhaled from his chicken inspection days. Now, after the chicken goes through a conveyor belt, it goes into a bath of cool water and Clorox. Then it's ready to be packaged and all plastic-ed up and have it for dinner. Is that overregulation? For heaven's sakes, give me more regulation than that.

But I want to urge my colleagues today to vote ''no'' on this rule, the underlying legislation, and quit this farce in the House of Representatives.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I want to quickly respond, if I may, to a couple of points my good friend made.

First, I want to begin by agreeing with her because, quite frankly, as I've stated publicly on many occasions, I don't believe a government shutdown is a good idea either. I think that's not a responsible political tactic. And while my good friend has been concerned that some people in my party have advocated that, I would also express a similar concern, quoting press reports that some advisors to the President have recommended that, should we send a so-called ''continuing resolution'' that funded the government that did not repeal sequester, he should veto it and that would shut down the government.

So I think there's been a little bit of irresponsible discussion about shutting down the government—which, with my friend, I agree, is never a good idea—that's come from both sides of the aisle.

In terms of her observations about sequestration, as an appropriator, again, we probably find some common ground here. I would like to see us also get rid of sequestration, but I'd like to do it by redistributing the cuts to the nondiscretionary side of the budget where I think they belong. We need to keep the savings—that's why the deficit is coming down—but there are certainly smarter and better ways to do that. And if the President is willing to do that, I suspect he would find a willing negotiating partner on our side of the aisle.

In fact, though, many of my friends advocate what is effectively a third tax increase this year. We had a tax increase with the so-called ''fiscal cliff.'' When all the Bush tax cuts ended, the President used that to raise taxes. We have a tax increase this year associated with his health care plan kicking in that's major. And now my friends on the other side of the aisle want a third tax increase to keep the government open and operating. We think we can spend money better and smarter, and that we ought to continue to reduce spending, not increase the burdens on the American people.

Finally, I want to talk to my friend, who discussed ObamaCare, and she's absolutely right; we certainly would like to repeal it, and we certainly have tried to make that point repeatedly. Frankly, her disagreement is not with us so much as it is with the American people. This is an extraordinarily unpopular law. No poll has ever shown that more people like it than dislike it; quite the opposite. People would like to see it repealed. It's simply not a very good idea. Frankly, we're seeing signs of that right now. The President himself, in a signature piece of legislation, had to ask that the business mandates actually be pushed back by a

year. We would like to help him in that, and we'd like to do it for individuals as well, but that suggests this was certainly a bill not ready for prime time.

A former Presidential candidate—I very seldom quote Howard Dean in agreement, but he had an interesting piece in The Wall Street Journal this week on why the central cost-control mechanism of ObamaCare—the Independent Payment Advisory Board—simply wouldn't work. Now, that's not us; that's criticism from somebody that probably supports a national health care plan of some kind.

Finally—and I think this does get overlooked in a debate, and I want to end my comments on a point of agreement, because while we have voted repeatedly to repeal, there have actually been times that we have, on both sides of the aisle, agreed—and agreed with the President—about changing this bill.

In the last couple of years, we have actually passed seven pieces of legislation when we were in the majority—they obviously had to go through a Democratic Senate and to the President's desk—that changed or modified ObamaCare—and saved, by the way, about $62 billion. My friends, after ramming that legislation through, looked at the so-called 1040s that were going to be attached to every $600 purchase and said, you know, you guys are right, that's a really bad idea. The President thought so too. And we got rid of it.

We also got rid of the assisted living portion of it, the so-called ''CLASS Act'' that was just financially unsustainable. Why? Secretary Sebelius looked at it and said, you know, this really isn't going to work. And I'll bet you sooner or later we'll get a medical device tax elimination down here on this floor—people on both sides know it's nuts to be taxing people's wheelchairs and oxygen cans because they're sick and use that to fund health care, and I'll bet you we can probably find common agreement on that.

So, while we would like to repeal, we certainly are willing to work when we find common areas and continue to try and improve a very flawed product.

With that, I'd like to yield such time as he may consume to my good friend and fellow Rules Committee member from Florida (Mr. NUGENT).

Mr. NUGENT. I thank my good friend on the Rules Committee, a member that I have the pleasure of serving with.

Today, I rise in support of House Resolution 322 and the underlying legislation, H.R. 367, the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Security Act. I want to thank my friend for bringing this forward as the rule. But this is better known as the REINS Act. The underlying legislation would bring much-needed reform to our broken regulatory process.

Now, my good friend from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) talked about chickens—and she mentioned it last night. But the issue really, what she's talking about when you're talking about the number of chickens being observed by the USDA, this is the President. They want to increase the number. They want to go to a private system. So I agree that it's a bad idea. But maybe the REINS Act could actually help in that particular instance because you could bring it back to this House to talk about it because, as a valued member of the Rules Committee, she brought up a good idea.

But somewhere along the line we have lost sight of what Congress' responsibility in the role of regulation is all about. Through the years, we have delegated away our responsibility. We gave it to unelected bureaucrats to make decisions that have far-ranging effects on the American people. I'm pretty sure that our Founding Fathers really didn't envision us doing that; that bureaucrats are going to decide the fates of small businesses and industries. That's exactly what we let happen because it was easy—it's easier. And all too often, in making regulations in D.C., we just aren't in touch with how that actually affects real Americans, real jobs in this country.

We all hear from folks back home about how regulations passed in D.C. are preventing their businesses from growing and expanding. It's a common refrain, Mr. Speaker.

The REINS Act, however, would return us to the vision our Founding Fathers had for this institution and for this Nation. It does so by ensuring that any major rule—that's a rule that has over $100 million in impact to our economy—receive approval from this body and from the Senate before it actually goes into the process of regulation.

Certainly, regulations with an impact this large deserve to have our attention, our review, and ultimately our blessing by our vote. Frankly, they deserve more than just a public comment period that regulatory agencies give the public. For that reason, I urge support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

I'll just give you one anecdote, Mr. Speaker. Back home, we have a cement kiln that produces cement for use all over the United States; employs 200 people right there. And I come from a county today that still has unemployment of 8.9 percent. What the EPA is looking to do is put those businesses out of existence.

When I talked to the folks that actually run the cement kiln, they said, Rich, we can just go across the border into Mexico, where they don't have any restrictions on air pollution, and we can do it cheaper because we don't have to have the pollution controls. But you know what, that air doesn't stop at the border, it comes back into the United States. So when you force companies out—and we have some of the strongest and most stringent EPA requirements for air and water—when you force those companies to leave our country, take the jobs with them, we still breathe dirtier air than we would have. So there has got to be a common ground.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, let me take just a second to say another case of un-regulation is the fertilizer plant blowing up in West, Texas, that had not been inspected in over 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

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

Mr. HOYER. I thank the ranking member of the Rules Committee, my friend, Ms. SLAUGHTER, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from Oklahoma. But I say that this House is not working. And the American people are angry with all of us, 100 percent of us.

The gentleman from Florida just said ''surely we can find common ground.'' The gentleman talked about shutting down the government being an unreasonable response, although many in his party promote that. The President's not promoting it; the President is against it. You know our side is against that. Surely, we can reach common ground.

Yesterday, we had eight bills on the floor on suspension. The public doesn't know process, I understand that—they're not too interested in hearing about process. But suspensions make for short debates and no amendments, no ability to make changes in those bills. That's why they were offered on suspension.

□ 1315

Apparently, three of those bills were pulled because they didn't think they had the votes. I don't think they had the votes either—''they'' being the majority.

So what did they do in their pursuit of a transparent ''let the House work its will'' pledge that they had made to the American public when they sought control, being in the majority? They've gone to the Rules Committee. One rule, five bills. How can you debate five different bills with rules, whether the rules are correct? And what are those rules? Closed, no amendments, limited discussion.

Yesterday, we had an appropriations bill on the floor. It was pulled. It was pulled, as I predicted it would be, because the Republican majority cannot get its act together. It disagrees with itself. It is a deeply divided party.

I was just on television, and they played a clip of Rush Limbaugh before that, and Rush Limbaugh said ''we ought not to compromise because we don't have anything in common with them''—meaning Democrats. My response was: ''Oh, I think Rush Limbaugh is wrong.''

We are all Americans, and we are all elected here by Americans to serve

them and to serve their country, to serve our communities and our neighbors, and to try to do things that make sense. Americans elected all of us from different places, different interests.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I say this because, Mr. Speaker, the American people need to know what's happening.

They pulled the Transportation-Housing bill. I wasn't for that bill as it came out of committee, nor were any Democrats that voted on it in committee, but they brought it to the floor and then pulled it. Nine days from tomorrow, nine legislative days from tomorrow, we are going to have that issue of how we are going to fund government and keep it running.

The Senate just a few minutes ago refused to allow the Senate—because the Republican Party voted ''no'' on bringing debate to close after days of debate and discussion, and they voted ''no'' to take the HUD bill up for discussion.

So in both Houses the Republican Party has abandoned the appropriations process. Now, I've just said that.

HAL ROGERS, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, a conservative Republican, says this:

''I am extremely disappointed with the decision to pull the bill from the House calendar today. The prospects of passing this bill in September are bleak at best, given the vote count on passage that was apparent this afternoon. With this action, the House has declined to proceed on the implementation of the very budget it adopted'' without a single Democratic vote.

He went on to say—Mr. ROGERS, conservative, Kentucky, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Republican:

Thus, I believe that the House has made its choice: sequestration—and its unrealistic and ill-conceived discretionary cuts—must be brought to an end.

The Ryan budget was unrealistic when it was considered on this floor. Mr. ROGERS voted for that budget. He knew then it was unrealistic. He knew then it could not be implemented.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I predicted then that if you took every Democrat out of the House and every Democrat out of the Senate, that that budget could not be implemented through the appropriations process and through the Ways and Means process, and I was right.

Yes, we need to seek common ground. We are hurting the economy, we are undermining the confidence of the American people and, indeed, we are undermining the confidence of our international partners.

TOM COLE sits here representing the Rules Committee. I want to tell everybody in America TOM COLE is a reasonable Member of this House. He's been a leader of this House. He wants to see common ground, in my view, so I do not criticize him.

But I say, Mr. Speaker, as you tap the gavel, time is not only running out on STENY HOYER, time is running out on this House, time is running out on America, time is running out on the patience of Americans that their House is not working.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we are witnessing on full display the utter failure of Republicans to govern as the majority.

Yesterday, after the Speaker and Majority Leader pulled the Transportation, Housing, and Urban Development appropriations bill from the floor, because they didn't have the votes to pass it, chairman HAL ROGERS of the Appropriations Committee—that is, Republicans' top appropriator—issued a scathing rebuke to his party's own sequester strategy.

He wrote:

With this action, the House has declined to proceed on the implementation of the very budget it adopted just three months ago. Thus, I believe that the House has made its choice: sequestration—and its unrealistic and ill-conceived discretionary cuts—must be brought to an end.

Not my words, Mr. Speaker, but the Republican chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

What a shame that we are now harming our national security and limiting our ability to protect the most vulnerable people in America through this sequester process.

It is also hurting our economic recovery, as the nonpartisan CBO has estimated it could cost us as many as 1.6 million jobs that would have been created by the end of the next fiscal year—and 1.3 percentage points of added GDP.

The sequester is a result of Congress stalling on tough decisions and an insistence by tea party Republicans on divesting from America and dismantling the foundations of the American Dream.

And it has been embraced by the Republican leadership as their singular approach to deficits.

But the sequester is not a rational or responsible solution.

It was never meant to be.

The mere threat of sequester was intended to be so severe that it would compel both parties to cooperate and find a balanced alternative.

Now, like Chairman ROGERS, many Republicans are growing tired of the sequester and are ready to compromise.

But not the Republican leadership, and that is very sad.

The complete implosion of their appropriations strategy demonstrates that, in order to pass appropriations or any substantive legislation, Republicans will have to compromise and work with Democrats in a bipartisan way.

It is sad and shameful that we are about to adjourn for a 5-week district work period, leaving critical business to create jobs and tackle deficits unfinished, while Republicans waste this Congress's time on a 40th vote to repeal ObamaCare.

When we return in September, I hope Republicans will see this week's appropriations debacle as their own appropriations chairman has—and abandon their reckless support for the sequester.

Let us focus now on seeking bipartisan compromise and the big, balanced solution that will restore fiscal sanity and give American families and businesses the certainty they deserve.

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

My friend—and he is my friend—I think is really one of the great speakers of this Chamber. I mean that with all sincerity.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COLE. But this isn't the Senate. We don't have unlimited debate over here, so he's kind of stretching it a little bit, but it's always worth listening to.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. I will certainly yield to my friend.

Mr. HOYER. I used to be the majority leader, and the thing that I hated losing most was my magic 1 minute, because as the gentleman will recall, it was an unlimited 1 minute.

Mr. COLE. And I want to say, my friend, the gentleman, exercised it to the extreme, but he's always worth listening to.

I want to underscore a point my good friend made, because I do agree with you very much about government shutdown. I don't think that's a responsible tactic. I've seen it advocated from time to time from people on both sides of the aisle. We've had reports of it from advisors to the President. I certainly wouldn't suggest the President would agree with that. But I hope we don't get there, and I will pledge to work with my friend to make sure that we do not.

I also think, though, that we ought to recognize that we have worked together on some occasions. My friend and I worked together on the fiscal cliff, we worked together on violence against women, we worked together on Sandy, we worked together, actually, on the CR in March. So there are times when we can come together.

We are working together now. I suspect the President will soon sign the Student Loan Act, an act that was originated on our side—problems were on the Senate side—and passed. Eventually, they came around and saw the same thing the way the President and we saw it on this side of the aisle.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman will yield, I say respectfully to my friend, we think the President sent down a piece of legislation similar to yours, correct. But we both worked together; you're right.

Mr. COLE. We did. I appreciate that, and we found common ground. I hope we can again.

But also when we're lectured a little bit on rules—and, look, we both wear

these hats occasionally—I will remind my friends, when they were in the majority, the rules under which they brought a massive health care bill to this floor with almost no debate, a massive stimulus, billions of dollars, with essentially no debate and no consideration, the Dodd-Frank rule.

So whatever sins have been committed on our side of the aisle, I would suggest this is one where you need to look at the log in your own eye in terms of the size and scope of that legislation and the rules that accompany them.

Mr. HOYER. Will my friend yield on that point?

Mr. COLE. I will yield to the gentleman on that.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman is correct. Both sides have done it. But you will recall, your side criticized us very substantially and said you would not do it. That I think is the difference. But both sides, you're absolutely correct, have brought rules that have been closed and limited in their scope.

Mr. COLE. Reclaiming my time, I seriously doubt that you have never said we wouldn't do this. I've heard the same thing when we talk about debt ceiling where we know the rules get reversed from time to time.

So I think this legislation—and I think it's very significant legislation—but I don't think it ranks with either of the three examples that I gave in which this body was not given the opportunity. Frankly, I think the Republican majority is here today largely because that's the way the House was operated the way the last time my friends had an opportunity to do that.

But regardless of that, I appreciate my friend's remarks as always. I always enjoy the exchange, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. WAXMAN. I thank the gentlelady for yielding to me some time to talk about one specific bill that this rule would allow the House to consider.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge a ''no'' vote on the rule and a ''no'' vote on the underlying bill. It's called the REINS Act, Regulations From the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act.

What does that mean? Well, that's a bill that says anytime there's a regulation adopted pursuant to a law that we passed that costs over a certain amount of money, Congress is going to pass the regulation. Well, that just delays things and means special interests can get in here and stop those regulations that are needed to protect the public health and the environment.

I want to give an example. I asked the Rules Committee to make in order that this particular bill shouldn't stop proposed FDA food safety regulations. Well, they didn't even allow me to offer that amendment.

But the reason I wanted to offer that amendment and the reason this bill is not a good bill, is that foodborne illnesses, we are seeing outbreaks striking often and more frequently, and that can happen to anybody, Democrat or Republican. Foods we never thought would have imagined to be unsafe—everything from spinach to peanut butter—have sickened an untold number of Americans. Our food supply has also become increasingly globalized, which poses another danger. So 50 percent of our fresh fruit and 20 percent of our fresh vegetables are imported, and this imported food is responsible for a large share of the number of foodborne illness outbreaks. Since 2011, eight of the 19 multi-State outbreaks were from imports.

So what did Congress do? Well, we said we've got to do something about it, and we adopted a bill on a bipartisan basis called the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act. It passed in 2010. That law provided FDA the power to set a way to police the food supply and make significant improvements throughout the food chain from the farm to the dinner table to stop these unsafe foods.

FDA has been working hard to comply with this mandate. This year, they issued three proposed rules that would implement some of the key pieces of the food safety legislation.

One rule would require farmers to comply with science-based standards for safe production and harvesting of produce. Another would require companies that process or package foods to implement preventive systems to stop outbreaks before they occur.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield an additional minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. The purpose of these rules are to stop and prevent the outbreak of foodborne illnesses.

Last week, FDA issued a proposed rule to mandate that importers demonstrate that the food they bring into the country is safe. Well, these rules will not be allowed to go into effect until Congress—both the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States with all their committees and subcommittees—meet to consider the regulations that FDA adopted. While they're doing all of that, we'll be exposed to foodborne illnesses.

My amendment would make this process of the REINS bill unnecessary as it applies to this particular area, but it illustrates why the REINS bill is not well thought through. Congress shouldn't have to adopt every regulation if we adopt a law saying to an agency ''adopt regulations based on the science, adopt regulations to enforce the law.''

I would urge we oppose the rule and oppose the REINS bill as well.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

□ 1330

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, there were 87 new Members elected in the last session of the Congress—about half of them Republicans, about half of them Democrats. I'll tell you what, we all got the same message in the last election, and that was that the people in this country had had it with gridlock and partisanship, and they wanted to see some more collaboration, some cooperation, some problem-solving, fixing things, getting things done.

There is so much that we agree on. I mean, our roads are in need of repair; our bridges are literally falling down; the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer; the middle class is getting crushed, and we all want to rebuild this middle class; there are millions of people who are unemployed every day, and there are millions more who are underemployed.

Mr. Speaker, I'm a businessman. I've been a business owner, responsible for the bottom line and for getting things done in my business. I've got to tell you, if we weren't getting the job done, we wouldn't be going on a 5-week recess, vacation—or whatever it is you want to call it. There are so many pressing needs, and we are scheduled to be in session for 9 days in September, and we know what those Mondays and Tuesdays are like. We know what happens here. So we're looking at about 3 or 4 days, and what have we got to deal with? We have to deal with appropriations, the budget, the farm bill, the jobs bill, immigration, transportation, the debt ceiling—and there are Members of this Congress who are calling for a shutdown of the Federal Government.

So I wanted to address just two things today. One is to postpone, or delay, this recess; and let's take up a couple of things. Like I said, our bridges are falling down. Let's take up the SAFE Bridges Act that Congressman RAHALL has offered. Let's take up the American Jobs Act that the President has offered. Let's put people to work in this country. Let's support Congresswoman SLAUGHTER's motion to defeat the previous question, and let's amend it to allow for the consideration of the SAFE Bridges Act.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to a member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, what is particularly frustrating about what we are doing here today is that this is a colossal waste of time. We are taking up five bills that are going nowhere in the Senate. The President has already issued veto threats on all of them. These are just press releases that the Republican National Committee has decided would be good things for Republican Members to release in their

districts. None of this stuff is meaningful. It's going nowhere.

We are also repealing the Affordable Care Act for the 40th time. When the gentleman says that the Affordable Care Act is not popular, I will remind him that we had a referendum on the Affordable Care Act—it was called a Presidential election. The last time I checked, Mitt Romney was not in the White House. I think he's out on his yacht somewhere, but he's certainly not in the White House.

So we are doing this meaningless stuff, and we have 9 legislative days left before the end of the fiscal year, before we approach a government shutdown, and we have people on the other side of the aisle—people running for President on the other side of the aisle—publicly bragging about how they want to shut the government down.

Now, I have great respect for the gentleman from Oklahoma. I think he is a reasonable, rational, good Member of this Congress. I wish there were more like him on his side of the aisle, but there aren't. In fact, the Republican Party is being ruled by the fringe right-wing elements of that party—those who are pushing for a shutdown, those who are saying compromise on nothing, those who helped defeat the farm bill, those who, quite frankly, are insisting on budget numbers that are so unbelievably low for things like our infrastructure that they had to pull the Transportation-HUD bill from the floor yesterday.

We ought to be fixing sequester. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, on our side of the aisle, has an alternative to sequester. We ought to vote on it. My Republican friends haven't allowed a vote on an alternative to sequester all year—nothing. We ought to go to conference on the budget so that we can actually get a budget so that we can have reasonable numbers on our appropriations bills that we can pass and be proud that we're doing something to put people back to work. We are doing nothing in this House. We ought not go on recess until we do the people's business.

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

Mr. Speaker, we did have a referendum on ObamaCare. Do you know what we got? We got a split decision because, while the American people certainly reelected the President, they also reelected a Republican House. That's a hard thing to achieve in what my friends would regard as a great Presidential victory. We had 435 different referendums about this. So the American people, for whatever reason, either wanted the debate to continue or certainly didn't want to leave the President, as they did in 2009 and 2010, with essentially total control over the legislative branch. They didn't like what they saw then, and I don't think they would like what they would see if that were to happen.

As for our friends in the Senate, letting them decide what the agenda is going to be in the House, I think, is, quite frankly, a mistake. They don't get a lot done over there. Every now and then, though, they'll surprise you.

I remember hearing these same arguments about the Student Loan Act in that, gosh, what we were planning and proposing, even though it was relatively close to what the President proposed, was never going to happen. In fact, if you'll remember at one point and if I recall correctly, I think the President, himself, issued a veto threat against the legislation. So, had we followed our friend's advice, everybody's student loans in America would be skyrocketing right now.

Every now and then, you just have to go out and fight for the things that you believe in; and, amazingly, sometimes the United States Senate will come around, and, occasionally, the President of the United States will change his mind or at least will decide this was close enough to be good enough.

So I would suggest we just continue to get up every day as we all do, to work as best we can for the things that we believe in, and at the end of the day—believe me—the American people will make a judgment, and we'll see what happens.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM), a member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule.

Every weekend, I go home to New Mexico, and my constituents always ask me: What's going on in Congress? What is Congress doing to create jobs and grow the economy and end the sequester?

There are currently 2,000 constituents in my district who are getting furloughed every week, and they want to know. There are countless teachers, construction workers, small business owners, and first responders; and they want to know. Unfortunately, the answer is ''nothing'' because of the House Republican leadership. They simply cannot govern.

Yesterday, Republicans pulled the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill from the schedule, illustrating that the sequester and the Republican budget are not feasible. Tomorrow, we will adjourn for a 5-week district work period, and we still haven't passed a jobs bill or a budget that replaces the sequester or that reduces the deficit, and we haven't passed comprehensive immigration reform. Instead of addressing any of these critical issues, House Republicans have decided that it's more important to vote one more time to repeal the Affordable Care Act—for the 40th time.

Mr. Speaker, New Mexicans and Americans want Congress to focus on jobs and economic growth.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to a number of points my friends have made about the issue of sequester. I simply want to remind them whose idea it was. If they have any doubt, they should read the Bob Woodward book, ''The Price of Politics,'' or follow the lively correspondence that came after the book was published.

The reality is that the idea of sequester was the President's proposal. He proposed it; he advocated for it; he signed it into law. Now we hear from our friends, gosh, the Republicans won't undo it or we didn't really mean that it would actually ever happen.

We've had this discussion before. The simple truth is that we are willing to renegotiate where the cuts come from. We actually agree with our friends on that. What they're not willing to do is to actually reduce spending. That's essentially what the debate is about.

This is the method that the President recommended, signed and advocated for. If he wants to undo it—something, by the way, this House twice in the last term did, but our friends in the Senate never picked it up, and the President never came up with a counteroffer, so we're sort of still waiting over here—and if the President would like to redistribute the cuts, I have no doubt the Speaker would like to talk to him. But the idea that we're just going to simply undo it and lose all the savings, I think, is also unlikely to occur.

So let's sit down. We all know there are better ways to do this. We're willing to do that on our side, but we are not willing to raise taxes, and we are not willing to lose savings.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS), a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Ms. TITUS. I thank the gentlelady for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule and the underlying bills. I am especially disappointed that my amendment to H.R. 367, the REINS Act, wasn't made in order.

My amendment would have protected women and children from the delay and obstructionism in this bill by exempting the Family Medical Leave Act, the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act, the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act, and the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act from the bill's intrusive provisions.

These four laws safeguard the economic, social, and physical well-being of women and children in Nevada and across the country. They give mothers the chance to care for a new child, ensure that our students have access to nutritious food, protect the rights of students with disabilities, and help women fight for equal pay for equal work.

My amendment would have offered the Republicans a chance to be reasonable and to dial back their war on the most vulnerable in our country.

H.R. 367, like the other bills being considered under this rule, would hinder our government's ability to serve the people, and it is simply a waste of valuable time. I urge my colleagues to reject it.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), a member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. I thank the gentlelady from New York for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, instead of bickering over partisan pieces of legislation that will go nowhere, we should be working to fix the sequester and hammer out a budget that creates jobs, grows our middle class, and responsibly reduces the deficit.

We should be taking up a well-funded Transportation and Housing appropriations bill rather than the draconian measure that drastically underfunded projects like those in my home district, such as the Elgin-O'Hare and the Barrington Road and Interstate 90 interchange. We need to make investments to rebuild our bridges, to improve our infrastructure, and to keep our children safe. We should be working on comprehensive immigration reform that is practical, fair, and humane. Reform with a pathway to citizenship will expand our workforce, secure our borders, and bring in new revenue to help us balance our budget.

I was sent to Washington to work on legislation that creates jobs and tackles the deficit. I don't want to leave for a 5-week district work period without taking some action on our critical, unfinished business.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, we will offer on our side an amendment to the rule that allows the House to consider the SAFE Bridges Act, which funds emergency repairs and creates countless American jobs. We are about to go into a 5-week break; and so far, the Congress has done nothing to end sequestration or to create jobs for the country. My amendment will prevent the House from going home until we have done the job we were sent here to do.

To discuss our proposal, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. LARSEN), a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support Ranking Member SLAUGHTER's motion to call up the SAFE Bridges Act.

In May, a portion of a bridge on Interstate 5 in my district collapsed into the Skagit River. Like most of my constituents, I've driven over that bridge hundreds of times. The fact that no one died when it collapsed was a blessing, but not everyone has been so lucky. My colleagues will remember in 2007 when a bridge spanning the Mississippi River in Minneapolis crashed down during rush hour, killing 13 people and injuring 145.

So, today, I want to ask my colleagues a very simple question: Should not Americans be able to drive across a highway bridge with the reasonable expectation that it will not crumble away from underneath them?

There are 67,000 bridges in our country that are rated structurally deficient—67,000 bridges. When those bridges fall, it isn't just the unlucky few on those bridges who suffer. Whole economies that rely on safe and efficient transportation suffer. The I–5 bridge across the Skagit River doesn't just connect Burlington and Mount Vernon. It connects the entire west coast and carries millions of dollars' worth of trade every day between Canada and the U.S.

□ 1345

Here's the good news: we know how to build safe bridges. There are thousands of civil engineers devoting their lives today to building good structures that don't fall down, but we need to pay for them. We need to maintain our bridges until they're old and replace them when we need to. We can't wait for them to crumble into the water below.

In light of this obvious need, how much has this Congress done to improve bridge safety or invest in infrastructure?

Mr. Speaker, that was the sound of how much congressional action has been taken—nothing.

Just yesterday, house leadership pulled the Transportation appropriations bill because they couldn't find enough Republicans to support its draconian cuts. Instead of rushing home, we should take up the SAFE Bridges Act introduced by Mr. RAHALL to immediately invest in bridges. Rather than repealing ObamaCare for the 40th time this Congress, we should invest in our infrastructure for the first time.

If you think your constituents should be able to drive over a bridge without wondering whether it will crumble beneath them, then this Congress must act on robust transportation funding.

Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD a State-by-State funding table under the SAFE Bridges Act.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

ESTIMATED DISTRIBUTION OF $2,750,000,000 FOR EACH OF FISCAL YEARS 2013 AND 2014 BASED ON THE DRAFT BILL, STRENGTHEN AND FORTIFY EXISTING BRIDGES ACT OF 2013

State	Estimated FY 2013	Estimated FY 2014	Estimated Total
ALABAMA	34,528,552	34,528,552	69,057,105
ALASKA	10,150,614	10,150,614	20,301,227
ARIZONA	14,438,937	14,438,937	28,877,874
ARKANSAS	28,254,401	28,254,401	56,508,803
CALIFORNIA	232,052,224	232,052,224	464,104,449
COLORADO	15,902,404	15,902,404	31,804,807
CONNECTICUT	126,132,725	126,132,725	252,265,450
DELAWARE	8,962,416	8,962,416	17,924,832
DIST. OF COL.	20,403,500	20,403,500	40,806,999
FLORIDA	46,328,630	46,328,630	92,657,259
GEORGIA	24,586,058	24,586,058	49,172,116
HAWAII	17,770,494	17,770,494	35,540,988
IDAHO	7,397,016	7,397,016	14,794,031
ILLINOIS	88,159,721	88,159,721	176,319,441
INDIANA	37,906,433	37,906,433	75,812,866
IOWA	31,283,878	31,283,878	62,567,756
KANSAS	22,117,236	22,117,236	44,234,472
KENTUCKY	38,179,080	38,179,080	76,358,160
LOUISIANA	123,906,912	123,906,912	247,813,824
MAINE	18,533,603	18,533,603	37,067,205
MARYLAND	63,577,346	63,577,346	127,154,692
MASSACHUSETTS	137,288,383	137,288,383	274,576,767
MICHIGAN	49,782,579	49,782,579	99,565,158
MINNESOTA	22,911,312	22,911,312	45,822,625
MISSISSIPPI	20,657,648	20,657,648	41,315,297
MISSOURI	63,319,326	63,319,326	126,638,651
MONTANA	7,815,085	7,815,085	15,630,171
NEBRASKA	15,165,106	15,165,106	30,330,212
NEVADA	2,891,304	2,891,304	5,782,609
NEW HAMPSHIRE	15,442,851	15,442,851	30,885,702
NEW JERSEY	137,486,038	137,486,038	274,972,076
NEW MEXICO	5,953,606	5,953,606	11,907,212
NEW YORK	341,675,601	341,675,601	683,351,202
NORTH CAROLINA	63,124,530	63,124,530	126,249,060
NORTH DAKOTA	3,830,998	3,830,998	7,661,997
OHIO	111,055,549	111,055,549	222,111,097
OKLAHOMA	39,269,408	39,269,408	78,538,816

ESTIMATED DISTRIBUTION OF $2,750,000,000 FOR EACH OF FISCAL YEARS 2013 AND 2014 BASED ON THE DRAFT BILL, STRENGTHEN AND FORTIFY EXISTING BRIDGES ACT OF 2013—Continued

State	Estimated FY 2013	Estimated FY 2014	Estimated Total
OREGON	54,382,275	54,382,275	108,764,549
PENNSYLVANIA	250,234,865	250,234,865	500,469,731
RHODE ISLAND	37,487,542	37,487,542	74,975,083
SOUTH CAROLINA	21,911,959	21,911,959	43,823,919
SOUTH DAKOTA	6,903,255	6,903,255	13,806,510
TENNESSEE	29,951,857	29,951,857	59,903,714
TEXAS	73,722,532	73,722,532	147,445,064
UTAH	6,055,018	6,055,018	12,110,037
VERMONT	9,894,077	9,894,077	19,788,153
VIRGINIA	84,581,236	84,581,236	169,162,472
WASHINGTON	79,795,827	79,795,827	159,591,654
WEST VIRGINIA	28,908,317	28,908,317	57,816,633
WISCONSIN	14,616,136	14,616,136	29,232,273
WYOMING	3,313,600	3,313,600	6,627,199
TOTAL	2,750,000,000	2,750,000,000	5,500,000,000

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. May I inquire if my colleague has more speakers?

Mr. COLE. I do not have any more speakers, and I'm prepared to close whenever my friend is.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I shall close, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As we speak, sequestration is hitting very hard in communities all across the country. Federal employees are furloughed; important investments in science, technology, public health, and defense are being curtailed; children are being shut out of Head Start. Meanwhile, the majority has repeatedly refused to repeal the sequester and have failed to pass a single job bill creation into law.

The American people need us to stop these political games and get down to work creating jobs and rebuilding this economy. Now is not the time to adjourn Congress, and we should not leave here until we have produced real results for the American families that are truly struggling to get by.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment into the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' to defeat the previous question and to vote ''no'' on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

In closing, I want to begin by reminding my friends whose idea sequester was. It was the President of the United States.

The President likes to take some credit—and in some ways he deserves some—for our budget deficit coming down. Frankly, after four trillion-dollar deficits in a row, a Republican Congress came into office and that deficit is now moving down. It's about half of what it was. We've worked with the President to actually achieve something he said he wanted to, which is lower the deficit. He likes to take credit for it.

Second, I'd like to also remind my friends, Mr. Speaker, in closing, that I think these bills really are good bills. They provide important checks on the expanding power of the executive branch. How many times have all of us gone home and been regaled with tales of bureaucrats that are simply out of control or rules that make no sense or have an enormous economic impact? It happens all the time. That needs to change.

Senator Daniel Webster described the Federal Government as ''made by the people, made by the people, and answerable to the people.'' I would suggest we've forgotten the last of these three phases, ''answerable to the people.'' That's what these bills are about, trying to make the Federal Government more responsive and more answerable to the people. The underlying bills recognize just that and restore the power of governance to elected officials, not to unaccountable Washington bureaucrats.

I would urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, when the Committee on Rules filed its report (H. Rept. 113–187) to accompany House Resolution 322 the Committee was unaware that the waiver of all points of order against consideration of H.R. 2879 included:

A waiver of clause 9(a)(2) of rule XXI , prohibiting consideration of a bill or joint resolution not reported by a committee, unless the chair of each committee of initial referral has caused a list of congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, and limited tariff benefits in the bill or a statement that the proposition contains no congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to its consideration. The required statement from the chair of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, the primary committee of jurisdiction, was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dated July 31, 2013. However, the required statement from the chair of the Committee on the Judiciary, which also received an additional referral, was submitted for printing on August 1, 2013. Both statements provide that H.R. 2879 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits.

A waiver of clause 11 of rule XXI, prohibiting the consideration of a bill or joint resolution which has not been reported by a committee until the third calendar day (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such a day) on which such measure has been available to Members, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner. While the text of the bill is substantially identical to the three bills previously debated in the House on July 31, 2013, H.R. 2879 was not introduced until later that day.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 322 OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 10. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2428) to direct the Secretary of Transportation to assist States to rehabilitate or replace certain bridges, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill

SEC. 11. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill specified in section 10 of this resolution.

SEC. 12. It shall not be in order to consider a concurrent resolution providing for adjournment or adjournment sine die unless the House has been notified that the President has signed legislation to provide for the creation of American jobs.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to

offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R–Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

The Republican majority may say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: ''Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.''

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: ''Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ENERGY CONSUMERS RELIEF ACT OF 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 1582.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 315 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. 1582.

Will the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER) kindly take the chair.

□ 1353

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. 1582) to protect consumers by prohibiting the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating as final certain energy-related rules that are estimated to cost more than $1 billion and will cause significant adverse effects to the economy, with Mr. YODER (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, July 31, 2013, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 113–174 offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) had been postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. WOODALL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 113–174.

Mr. WOODALL. 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 2, lines 11 through 17, amend subparagraph (D) to read as follows:

(D)(i) an estimate of the total benefits of the rule and when such benefits are expected to be realized;

(ii) a description of the modeling, the calculations, the assumptions, and the limitations due to uncertainty, speculation, or lack of information associated with the estimates under this subparagraph; and

(iii) a certification that all data and documents relied upon by the Agency in developing such estimates—

(I) have been preserved; and

(II) are available for review by the public on the Agency's Web site, except to the extent to which publication of such data and documents would constitute disclosure of confidential information in violation of applicable Federal law;

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to talk about an amendment that recognizes that knowledge is power.

So often today, we've talked about what we can do to make the government more accountable to the people. One of those things is entailed in the underlying bill that says, for these big rules that make a big difference, tell us what it is that you did. How did you come to this decision that this is the rule that you want to implement? My amendment goes one step further and asks for the underlying data on which that decision was made. We want to know what those calculations were.

It's going to be a good step forward if we can get agencies to share with us their modeling, but one step further would be those calculations that went into the modeling and came out of the modeling. What about the underlying data, Mr. Chairman? How in the world can we be in a conversation with the American people as the Congress with the agencies if we don't have access to the underlying data?

This is not a trade secret. This is not private information. This is the information that the agency uses to promulgate these rules that will then govern the entire United States of America. We simply say, if the disclosure of that data won't violate any laws, if it won't violate any trade secrets, if it's not going to be in violation of any applicable Federal laws, share that with America, post that on your Web page so that anyone who is interested in understanding how it is that these decisions that often go on behind closed doors, that often go on without the oversight of the public, not just what did you decide, but how did you decide it.

It's very difficult, whether you're a Republican or whether you're a Democrat, to hold the considered experts at these agencies accountable if you can't see the underlying data that went into their calculations. It's a simple amendment that says please share that with us. We're not questioning your expertise. We simply want to be a part of that process.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, as I rise in opposition to this amendment, the supporters would claim that it's about transparency. What it's really about is not transparency. It's about a way to block or delay critical EPA rules. That's what this whole bill is all about. The amendment does the same thing. They use

rhetoric about transparency to cloud the amendment's true impact.

The amendment would prevent EPA from using the best science available when implementing its public health laws. It accomplishes this by not allowing EPA to rely on any scientific study unless the agency can publish, on its Web site, all of the underlying data associated with that study.

Today, EPA prides itself on using the best science available. The Agency understands that ideology will not stand the test of time, but science will; and their rules and regulations have to be based on the science, so they gladly inform stakeholders and the public about the studies upon which they rely.

The underlying data to peer-reviewed studies is often not published. That's because the data sets underlying peer-reviewed scientific studies are the property of the scientists that spend their careers gathering that information. The EPA cannot require the scientists to give up their private information. Oftentimes, those studies involve going to a lot of people and trying to find out the impact of certain exposure to pollutants. Those people agree to the study on the basis that this information about them will not be made public. But this amendment would say it would be impossible for EPA to use gold-standard scientific studies available to them unless they post this other data on their Web site.

Why do we want to prevent EPA from using high-quality scientific studies to set new pollution standards?

□ 1400

This is an issue that came up many years ago. In 1997, EPA used a study conducted by researchers at Harvard to set a new air quality standard for particulate matter. They did a rigorous peer-reviewed study that was conducted over a period of 16 years. The Harvard people showed conclusively that exposure to particulate matter in the air can kill people, while polluters said: We don't want EPA to issue this rule, it's going to cost us money.

So they said that EPA should publish all of the Harvard scientists' data, claiming that the scientists were keeping a secret. Well, the data is the work product and property of the Harvard scientists, not EPA. The agency couldn't release that information. They're relying on the Harvard scientists to give independent scientists access to the data after the scientists signed a confidentiality agreement. So independent scientists spent the next 3 years reanalyzing the data, and came to exactly the same conclusion.

There should be no objection to EPA relying on studies like this one. It's a long-term study with a huge sample. This is exactly the kind of rigorous review we expect of EPA. I urge opposition to this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to say nothing can be further from the truth. There is a specific provision in this amendment that says you shall not disclose anything for which the disclosure would violate your commitments under Federal law. All we're asking is for whatever EPA saw, whatever the agency saw to make their decision. If it was good enough for the agency, shouldn't it be good enough for Congress as well?

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY).

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand why somebody would object to this. The bill is about transparency, and this amplifies that transparency. EPA can impose rules which cost tens or even hundreds of billions of dollars on the U.S. economy. Those expenses translate into jobs lost.

Having access to the underlying information, and the estimates of cost and benefits, is critical to know why that is. And as my colleague said, there is no reason to have to reveal information about individuals. And let me just point to the medical literature. In the medical literature, there is a push that when the Federal Government funds research, that that underlying data is made subject, is made available to the general public. When the FDA reviews drugs, FDA will look at underlying data. So why would we require it for medications, which obviously affect many people, but not for the EPA. Having methodology which is transparent is absolutely essential in modern scientific literature. I don't see why there is an objection to it unless the hope is that EPA can satisfy an ideological bent without having to justify it.

This amendment will provide more transparency for EPA's billion-dollar rules. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the amendment and ''yes'' on the underlying bill. The American people cannot afford to have jobs shipped overseas or have their economy otherwise wrecked. More rationality, transparency, and accountability must be brought to the EPA and its rulemaking process.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that EPA does not have this underlying data. It doesn't belong to EPA. It belongs to the scientists who did the study.

Consider this issue in a different context. If a pharmaceutical manufacturer wants to bring a new product to market, they would never be required to post all of their underlying data on the public Web site in order for FDA to rely on it. There's no other agency that would be held to such an unreasonable requirement as this amendment would impose on EPA. They review the data, but they don't put it on their Web site. EPA does not have the underlying data, and they can't require that the owners of the underlying data who did the study, often based on confidential agreements for those who participate in the study, they can't require that study be given to them. They are relying on the scientific data and the study results.

I think all this would do is make it more difficult for EPA to protect the public health.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time to say that I think I speak for most of America that says I understand the government has to make decisions, but since the government is making those decisions on my behalf, shouldn't the government share with me the data that it uses to make those decisions?

The gentleman says this is going to hold EPA to a higher standard than the other agencies. I would say to the gentleman, you can look forward to me being back with this same amendment for absolutely every agency.

All we're saying is if you've seen the data, if you've utilized the data, if you believe this is sound enough science on which to base a regulation that is going to cost not $1, not $100, not $1,000, not $1 million, but more than $1 billion, isn't it worth sharing with the American people how you reached that conclusion?

Mr. Chairman, the work that we do here, we should be proud enough of to share with absolutely anyone who asks. This is about transparency. And even if you don't support the underlying bill—I'm a strong supporter, but even if you don't—you should support in the context of transparency providing the underlying materials to the American public that went into this decisionmaking process.

Mr. Chairman, this is a great step forward as a transparency tool for the American public to restore that faith in government that has been lost.

I rise in strong support of the underlying bill and ask my colleagues to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. FORTENBERRY). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 5 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 113–174.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. 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:

At the end of the committee print, add the following section:

SEC. 5. PROHIBITION ON USE OF SOCIAL COST OF CARBON IN ANALYSIS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law or any executive

order, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency may not use the social cost of carbon in order to incorporate social benefits of reducing carbon dioxide emissions, or for any other reason, in any cost-benefit analysis relating to an energy-related rule that is estimated to cost more than $1 billion unless and until a Federal law is enacted authorizing such use.

(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''social cost of carbon'' means the social cost of carbon as described in the technical support document entitled ''Technical Support Document: Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866'', published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon, United States Government, in May 2013, or any successor or substantially related document, or any other estimate of the monetized damages associated with an incremental increase in carbon dioxide emissions in a given year.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I have an amendment in order that would prohibit the EPA from using ''social cost of carbon'' estimates for any energy-related rule that costs more than $1 billion unless and until a Federal law is enacted authorizing such use.

The administration slipped into a rule about microwave ovens a new prediction for the cost of carbon dioxide between now and the year 2300. Despite the profound implications to the economy and the families who make a living from coal, there was no public debate, no stakeholder comment, no vote in Congress on this new estimate.

In southwestern Pennsylvania, coal is our heritage. It fires the steel mills that built the Empire State Building, the St. Louis Arch, and the Golden Gate Bridge. But that heritage and prosperity is threatened by this new regulation. We've already seen what the social cost of the war on coal is today—the cost is jobs.

Three weeks ago, more than 380 workers at the Hatfield's Ferry and Mitchell power plants in Pennsylvania were told they are losing their jobs. The plants had to shut down under EPA regulations after they had spent hundreds of millions of dollars in new environmental modernizations.

More than 15 organizations representing workers and stakeholders endorse my amendment because these groups share my concern that this bypassed congressional oversight and will put hundreds of thousands of miners, boilermakers, factory workers, laborers, railroaders, electricians, operating engineers, steamfitters and machinists out of work.

My amendment says Congress, not the EPA, decides regulations by considering what this means to the families and workers. The EPA's policies have real-world consequences. Annual coal production in central Appalachia is dropping sharply—by more than half in just 5 years' time. There are towns where mines are shutting down, where a staggering 41 percent of the residents fall below the poverty line.

The social cost of carbon and the wider war on coal is a war on the American worker and their family.

Let me show you the real cost of the EPA's rules. Those who oppose this amendment ignore the health effects on those living in poverty, who are twice as likely to have a risk of depression, asthma, obesity, diabetes, heart attacks, and other health effects. Poverty leads to devastated communities, early death, and lost dreams of a generation of Americans and their children.

Many of us can remember Bobby Kennedy's walk through those broken Appalachian coal towns back in the 1960s to illustrate the abject poverty where families and children were living. I worked and volunteered in those towns, trying to help families hang on to some sort of semblance of hope in a hard-scrabble life.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Too often their hope failed, and now history is about to repeat itself. First, jobs are lost by the tens of thousands and, after that, the hundreds of thousands. And when people lose their jobs, we give them unemployment compensation. They go hungry; we give them food stamps. They lose unemployment; we give them welfare. They lose their homes; we give them public housing. They lose their dignity and pride, and the government has nothing left to give—nothing—when all these folks ever really wanted was a job—a job and a chance for the American dream not shattered by the EPA.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. WAXMAN. The Murphy amendment denies that carbon pollution is harmful. It prohibits the Environmental Protection Agency from considering the costs of climate change when analyzing the impacts of its rules. According to this amendment, the cost of carbon pollution is zero. Well, that's science denial at its worst. We are telling EPA the cost of carbon pollution is zero. It's like waving a magic wand. We are going to decree that climate change imposes no costs at all.

The House Republicans can vote for this amendment. They can try to block EPA from recognizing the damage caused by climate change, but they cannot overturn the laws of nature. We should be heeding the warnings of the world's leading climate scientists, not denying reality.

In the real world, scientific instruments accurately measure the levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere and the levels trapped in ancient ice. Those measurements tell us that carbon dioxide levels just hit 400 parts per million this spring, and that's the highest levels in the last 3 million years. In the real world, higher levels of heat-trapping carbon pollution are warming the planet and changing the climate. We are experiencing more record-breaking temperatures, worse droughts, longer wildfire seasons with more intense wildfires, and an increased number of intense storms, more flooding, and rapidly rising sea levels. Pretend it doesn't happen. Pretend that's not the reality.

On the other hand, as the proponent of this amendment suggested, let's look at the impact on the family that may lose its job. Well, I think that ought to be under consideration, but let's not have an amendment that would ignore the cost of carbon pollution.

We are seeing the effect of climate change not some time in the future but right now. And we're being told it's not going to get better by itself; it's going to get worse. Scientists have been telling us for years. EPA and other Federal agencies have a responsibility to calculate the cost of climate change and take them into account when they issue new standards. That's common sense, and that was the clear message from the Government Accountability Office when it added climate change to its high-risk list earlier this year, and that's exactly what the Obama administration is doing.

□ 1415

They have an interagency task force that worked, over the course of several years, to estimate the cost of the harm from carbon pollution. It incorporated the latest scientific and technical information.

I'm sorry people lose their jobs, but they don't have to lose their jobs. If an industry is told to reduce carbon emissions, they don't have to fire people. They can develop and buy the technology that would reduce that pollution.

So to help those polluters not have to do that, we're going to pretend there's no cost. Mr. MURPHY's amendment would require the government to assume zero harm, zero cost from carbon pollution and climate change.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment. It's based on magical thinking. Don't be a science-denier. Vote against the amendment.

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have left on our side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs.

CAPITO), the number two coal-producing State in America.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of my colleague Mr. MURPHY's amendment and in opposition to the EPA's arbitrary, backdoor approach to regulating carbon dioxide emissions. These regulations would and are having a catastrophic effect on jobs and economic activity across the country, especially in our coal-producing States such as West Virginia and Pennsylvania.

The administration's new Social Cost of Carbon calculation is nothing more than a gimmick used to circumvent Congress so that job-killing regulations and an anti-domestic energy agenda can move forward.

Perhaps to no one's surprise, just as the administration is stepping up its efforts to issue regulations aimed at closing existing plants and stopping new ones, it decided, without public comment or transparency, to increase the cost of carbon by 44 percent. The fact is, U.S. carbon emissions from the energy sector have fallen in the last 4 of 5 years.

I am not willing to sacrifice West Virginia jobs to the administration's ideological efforts. I ask my colleagues to put jobs ahead of politics and pass the Murphy amendment.

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

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

Mr. BARTON. I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Murphy amendment, and I also want to say we should vote for that in conjunction with the gentleman from Georgia's amendment that was just heard previously.

If you walk into a greenhouse anywhere in America, do you know what the average carbon concentration will be? It won't be 350 parts per million. It won't be 400 parts per million. It will be over 1,000 parts per million. We have records that indicate the CO_2 concentration in the upper atmosphere has been as high as 5,000 to 6,000 parts per million in the past.

The gentleman from California and those adherents of his philosophy would have you believe that having a carbon concentration between 350 and 400 parts per million is somehow cataclysmic. Nothing could be further from the truth.

And this new cost of carbon calculation that the EPA and the DOE have begun to include needs to be, at a minimum, made transparent. I think it's fine until we have the facts that it shouldn't be allowed at all.

So vote for the Murphy amendment.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, this is not my philosophy that would lead me to urge that we reduce carbon emissions. It's based on the science. Thousands of peer-reviewed scientific studies have indicated that carbon causes problems. It causes health effects, and it threatens the climate.

The homeowners in Arizona, Texas, Colorado, and California who have seen their homes ravaged by drought-stoked wildfires know the cost of carbon pollution. The families of brave firefighters know the cost of carbon pollution.

The farmers and ranchers suffering the effects of prolonged drought, many of whom have lost entire crops or been forced to sell their livestock, know the cost of carbon pollution. And the thousands who lost businesses and homes after Hurricane Sandy slammed into the east coast know the cost of carbon pollution.

That cost is not based on a philosophy. It's based on the science and the reality.

Reject this magical-thinking amendment. Don't be a science-denier. Vote against the amendment and the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this isn't about denying science; this is about denying jobs and denying opportunity.

The underlying amendment here is supported by the boilermakers, the electrical workers, the operating engineers, the carpenters, and United Mine Workers, the American Energy Alliance, National Mining Association, National Taxpayers Union, and Chamber of Commerce because they want jobs and they don't want poverty.

And poverty, Mr. Chairman, is the number one threat to the environment. Poverty is the number one threat to public health. It's time Congress took charge of regulations and not unregulated divisions of the government.

Mr. Chairman, I ask Members to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. WAXMAN. 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 Pennsylvania will be postponed.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) having assumed the chair, Mr. FORTENBERRY, 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. 1582) to protect consumers by prohibiting the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating as final certain energy-related rules that are estimated to cost more than $1 billion and will cause significant adverse effects to the economy, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

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

□ 1435

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) at 2 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.

ENERGY CONSUMERS RELIEF ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 315 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. 1582.

Will the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1436

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. 1582) to protect consumers by prohibiting the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating as final certain energy-related rules that are estimated to cost more than $1 billion and will cause significant adverse effects to the economy, with Mr. FORTENBERRY (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 amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 113–174, offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY), had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 113–174 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. WAXMAN of California.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded

vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) 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 vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 230, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 428]

AYES—183

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

NOES—230

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—20

Campbell
Collins (GA)
Goodlatte
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
Hudson
King (IA)
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Pallone
Pelosi
Richmond
Rogers (MI)
Ruppersberger
Sensenbrenner
Wasserman Schultz
Young (FL)

□ 1502

Messrs. KINGSTON, POSEY, and CUELLAR changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. O'ROURKE changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 428, I inadvertently voted "yes," when my intention was to vote "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) 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 will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 224, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 429]

AYES—182

Andrews
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—224

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)

Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—27

Campbell
Carter
Collins (GA)
Delaney
Frelinghuysen
Goodlatte
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
Hudson
King (IA)
Lewis
Luetkemeyer
McCarthy (NY)
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Nadler
Pallone
Pelosi
Richmond
Rogers (MI)
Ruppersberger
Rush
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Wasserman Schultz
Young (FL)

□ 1508

Mr. LARSEN of Washington changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 429, the Connolly/Kildee amendment 3, had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 429, The Connolly/Kildee Amendment 3, had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) 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 will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 234, noes 178, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 430]

AYES—234

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—178

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Michaud
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—21

Campbell
Carter
Collins (GA)
Goodlatte
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
Hudson
King (IA)
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Pallone
Pelosi
Richmond
Rogers (MI)
Ruppersberger
Sensenbrenner
Wasserman Schultz
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HULTGREN) (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1513

Messrs. ENGEL and GRIJALVA changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY) having assumed the chair, Mr. HULTGREN, 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. 1582) to protect consumers by prohibiting the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating as final certain energy-related rules that are estimated to cost more than $1 billion and will cause significant adverse effects to the economy, and, pursuant to House Resolution 315, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Yes, I am opposed.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Capps moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1582 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

At the end, add the following section:

SEC. 5. PROTECTING THE HEALTH OF CHILDREN AND SENIORS.

This Act shall not apply with respect to rules that will result in reduced incidence of cancer, premature mortality, asthma attacks, or respiratory disease in children or seniors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer the final amendment to the bill, and I want to be clear—passage of this amendment will not prevent passage of the underlying bill. If it's adopted, my amendment will be incorporated into the bill, and the bill will immediately be voted upon.

As currently written, H.R. 1582 would cripple the ability of the Environmental Protection Agency to protect the water we drink and the air we breathe. My amendment simply ensures that the EPA can continue to protect children and seniors from the harmful impacts of pollution. My friends across the aisle claim this bill is about transparency, but let's call it what it is—just another attempt to block the EPA from doing its job.

This bill makes no sense on so many levels. It's redundant and it's unnecessary. It gives the Energy Secretary unprecedented authority to veto EPA rules, and it allows for the indefinite delays of EPA rulemaking. Our top priority should be the health of our children and of our families, not the bottom line of the polluting energy companies.

It's scary to think how many EPA protections that we now take for granted would have been delayed or derailed if this bill were law. Consider the recently finalized Mercury and Air Toxics Standards. Before these rules, there were no Federal standards limiting power plant emissions of toxic pollutants like mercury and arsenic. As we know, these toxic pollutants are really poisons. They cause a variety of serious health problems in people of all ages. They affect brain development in children, and they can cause serious birth defects when pregnant women are exposed. That's why EPA put restrictions on these toxic emissions—restrictions that protect future generations and set them up for success while also reducing preventable health care costs. If H.R. 1582 had been law, these rules could have been delayed indefinitely or could not have happened at all.

Mr. Speaker, my friends across the aisle talk frequently about the financial costs of these and other EPA actions, but what about the health care costs—costs that all of us pay when these preventable ailments occur—and what about the human costs of inaction?

Delaying the air toxics standards for just an additional 1 year would have resulted in more than 11,000 heart attacks, more than 120,000 asthma attacks, more than 12,000 more hospital and emergency room visits, and up to 25,300 lives lost due to smog, due to soot, due to toxic air pollution—and that's just in 1 year. Mr. Speaker, people should be more important than profit.

My amendment speaks to just this. It would simply shield the rules that protect the health of children and of seniors from this dangerous bill. If my colleagues are serious about protecting our children and our seniors, they should have no trouble supporting this amendment.

More than anyone, children and seniors rely on the EPA to do its job of protecting public health and the environment. The Mercury and Air Toxics rule and others like it are helping children and families across the Nation live healthier, longer lives. Perhaps polluters find these rules inconvenient, but the American people certainly don't. They want clean air to breathe. They want clean water to drink, and they want the peace of mind that comes from strong public health standards.

My amendment ensures that protecting the health of our children and seniors never takes a back seat to the financial interests of our polluters. So I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and make sure that the health and well-being of our children and seniors always come first.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order, and I claim the time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, this bill doesn't cripple anything. Laws that are currently on the books stay on the books. The problem is that the EPA uses bad science. I say that not as a Republican. I say that as quoting other scientists.

For example, a gentleman who is a former member of the Harvard School of Public Health testified: ''EPA's statistical approach is fraught with numerous assumptions and uncertainties.'' A physician from the Colorado School of Public Health said that the way that EPA uses statistics ''is also highly misleading to policymakers.''

I will make the point. You cannot be pro-family unless you are pro-environment, and you cannot be pro-environment unless you are pro-family, but you can't be either unless you first have a strong and healthy economy. Now, the Energy Consumers Relief Act simply puts a check on the billion-dollar energy rules that may hurt American families and cost American jobs.

If you support transparency and good government, you should support this bill. If you support protecting American families and consumers from higher energy costs, you should support H.R. 1582. If you support having the prosperity needed for families and for environmental health protections, you should support H.R. 1582. If you are pro-jobs, pro-economic growth and anti-poverty, you should support H.R. 1582.

I urge you to vote ''no'' on this motion to recommit. I urge you to support the Energy Consumers Relief Act.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on the passage of H.R. 1582, if ordered; ordering the previous question on House Resolution 322; adoption of House Resolution 322, if ordered; and the motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 1897.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 188, noes 221, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 431]

AYES—188

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

NOES—221

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—24

Blumenauer
Campbell
Collins (GA)
Goodlatte
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
Hudson
King (IA)
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Pallone
Pelosi
Rahall
Richmond
Rogers (MI)
Ruppersberger
Sensenbrenner
Wasserman Schultz
Woodall
Young (FL)

□ 1532

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 181, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 432]

AYES—232

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—181

Andrews
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle

Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—20

Campbell
Collins (GA)
Goodlatte
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
Hudson
King (IA)
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Pallone
Pelosi
Richmond
Rogers (MI)
Ruppersberger
Sensenbrenner
Wasserman Schultz
Young (FL)

□ 1539

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 367, REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT OF 2013; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2009, KEEP THE IRS OFF YOUR HEALTH CARE ACT OF 2013; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM AUGUST 3, 2013, THROUGH SEPTEMBER 6, 2013; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2879, STOP GOVERNMENT ABUSE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 322) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 367) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2009) to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from enforcing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010; providing for proceedings during the period from August 3, 2013, through September 6, 2013; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2879) to provide limitations on bonuses for Federal employees during sequestration, to provide for investigative leave requirements for members of the Senior Executive Service, to establish certain procedures for conducting in-person or telephonic interactions by executive branch employees with individuals, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 191, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 433]

YEAS—222

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—191

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

NOT VOTING—20

Campbell
Collins (GA)
Goodlatte
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
Hudson
King (IA)
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Pallone
Pelosi
Richmond
Rogers (MI)
Ruppersberger
Sensenbrenner
Wasserman Schultz
Young (FL)

□ 1547

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 189, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 434]

YEAS—223

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—189

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

NOT VOTING—21

Campbell
Collins (GA)
Goodlatte
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
Hudson
Huffman
King (IA)
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Pallone
Pelosi
Richmond
Rogers (MI)
Ruppersberger
Sensenbrenner
Wasserman Schultz
Young (FL)

□ 1554

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FAREWELL REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE JO BONNER

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

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, as many of our colleagues know, tomorrow will mark my last day to walk onto this House floor as a Member of the United States House of Representatives.

Since I announced my plans to leave this place in late May, a place where I have been so privileged and honored to work for the last 28 years—18 as a staffer and the last 10½ as a Representative—the past few days and weeks, as you might imagine, have been rather poignant.

So many of you, my friends and colleagues on both sides of the aisle, have been so very kind to offer an encouraging word, or to extend heartfelt good wishes as I begin a new chapter in my life as the vice chancellor of government relations and economic development for the University of Alabama system. To each and every one of you who have been so generous with your words, thoughts, and even a few prayers, I want to thank you from the bottom of my heart.

A few of you have even asked if I have any parting wisdom to offer, and I won't share these with my colleagues, I wouldn't do that to you, but I would like to speak for just one minute to the American people.

You know, one of the reasons I so rarely come to the House floor and speak is because my father, who died when I was 13, always told me, my brother, and sister that if you listen to the words of others instead of listening to your own words, you'll learn a lot more. So I've tried to follow my father's advice.

The other reason I so rarely take your time to listen to my thoughts is because of my very first speech on the House floor. With your indulgence, I will share it briefly with you.

Everyone remembers your first House speech, I'm sure, when you were a newly minted Member of Congress. Mine was unforgettable for a different reason. It was back in early 2003 when the House was debating the Healthy Forests bill. I remember it as though it were yesterday.

Like most freshmen, I served on several committees, and I was actually in a Budget Committee hearing all day long when I got a call from the chairman of the Ag Committee, BOB GOODLATTE. He said:

Joe, you need to get over on the House floor because you're getting ready to make your first speech.

One of our colleagues, who's still here and will remain anonymous, was about to offer an amendment to the Healthy Forests bill that would have stripped the $250,000 provision that I had inserted to do research on insects, on pine beetles that we don't care for in south Alabama and throughout the country, and he was going to strip it and take it for a project that was near and dear to him in his district.

□ 1600

As I was running over to the Capitol, I did what you would have done: I called my wife and told her to get the kids in front of the TV set, turn on the VCR, and I said to my daughter, Lee, who was 7 at the time, and my son, Robins, who was 5, I said, ''Daddy is about to make his first speech on the House floor.''

My staff had given me some beautiful words that day. They were somewhere

between the Gettysburg Address and the Kennedy inauguration.

But as so often is the case here on the floor, instead of having 5 or 10 minutes to speak, Chairman GOODLATTE gave me 90 seconds. So I put aside my prepared remarks; and, instead, I spoke from the heart, or from the top of my head.

I said, ''Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the amendment from the gentleman from California and to urge support for the underlying bill.''

I went on to say, ''Now, if I represented pine beetles, I would actually support the gentleman's amendment, because, if I were a pine beetle, I would like it. He would take the money we've put in there and redirect it to a program out in his district in California.

''But I don't represent pine beetles. I represent hardworking men and women who own a few acres and they grow pine trees. And pine beetles are a real threat to a healthy forest.''

You know, if I'd only stopped there, I would have made a good first impression. But like so many new politicians who didn't know when to stop, I said, ''You know, we have a real problem with incest in south Alabama.''

I said, ''In fact, I would venture a guess that we have more problems with incest in my district in Alabama than in any other congressional district in America.''

Chairman GOODLATTE was going like that, and I thought he was saying preach on, brother, preach on. Instead, he was urging me to shut up.

So I got back to my office, thinking I'd delivered one of the best speeches on insects ever made, and my staff said, ''Jo, in about 2 minutes you just reinforced in the minds of all Americans what we have a problem with in south Alabama.''

That's the other reason that I don't often speak on the House floor. But, fortunately for me, these wonderful people who work here taking note of every word knew what I meant to say, not what I did say.

I tell that story, Mr. Speaker, in closing, for this one reason: you all laughed at that story, as so many others have over the years. And a little laughter from time to time is good medicine, as the doctor says.

Perhaps our country needs to laugh a little more often, as well, and stop yelling at each other and work closer together.

For sure, our great country has many daunting challenges facing us. Sadly, all across our land, there's anger, there's frustration and concern on both sides of the political spectrum about what's going on or what's not going on.

Public approval of this body which we are all so honored to serve in is at or near an all-time record low.

But if I could say one parting word to the American people, it would be this: the men and women that you've elected to represent you in this, the people's House, have different views and positions on the very issues that you have different views and positions on.

And, by and large, and with rare exception, these are men and women of courage, of integrity, of decency, and they serve, along with many, many men and women, as staff, who work here, oftentimes in the shadows of the spotlight. They serve for the same reason, a common love of country.

Make no mistake. SAM JOHNSON loved America when he was being brutally beaten and held against his will as a prisoner of war for over 7 years in Vietnam, often wondering whether he would ever see his family again.

And JOHN LEWIS loved his country when he was beaten and bloodied, fighting for the civil rights of all Americans as he was crossing the Edmund Pettus Bridge in the city I was born in, Selma.

And just like Sam and John, every other Member here, Democrat, Republican, liberal, conservative, we all work for the American people with the singular goal of making our country a better, more perfect Union, even though sometimes, as humans, we fail to meet your expectations.

This is especially true of our leadership, on both sides of the aisle, who often have one of the toughest jobs, trying to corral the strong will of 435 Members of Congress who come from all parts of America to try to do the right things. To my committee chairmen and ranking members, and all of the people I've served with, I owe you my debt of gratitude.

In closing, I want to express my last expression to the wonderful people of south Alabama for giving me the opportunity to work for you for the last 10½ years as your Congressman.

I came to this job having studied at the feet of two of the most outstanding men I know. Jack Edwards and Sonny Callahan, like me, came to office as a Representative from Alabama, but they left office as statesmen. And anything that my staff or I have ever been able to do for the people of my district, it's been to build on the legacy of those two great men.

Lastly, I would like to say this: the people of my district have afforded me a rare honor in Alabama, one of only 167 people, men and women, to ever serve in this body. The rest of us, only 10,000-plus, men and women, have ever had the privilege of being called a representative of the people.

I would be extremely remiss if I didn't say a special thank you to my wife, Janee, our daughter, Lee, and my son, Robins, who, like they were 10½ years ago, are back home in Alabama listening to your daddy talk about incest.

Thank you for your love and support. May God bless you, and may God bless America.

VIETNAM HUMAN RIGHTS ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1897) to promote freedom and democracy in Vietnam, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 405, nays 3, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 435]

YEAS—405

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)

Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Petri	Simpson
Lummis	Pingree (ME)	Sinema
Lynch	Pittenger	Sires
Maffei	Pitts	Slaughter
Maloney, Carolyn	Pocan	Smith (MO)
Maloney, Sean	Poe (TX)	Smith (NE)
Marchant	Polis	Smith (NJ)
Marino	Pompeo	Smith (TX)
Massie	Posey	Smith (WA)
Matheson	Price (GA)	Southerland
Matsui	Price (NC)	Speier
McCarthy (CA)	Quigley	Stewart
McCaul	Radel	Stivers
McClintock	Rahall	Stockman
McCollum	Rangel	Stutzman
McDermott	Reed	Swalwell (CA)
McGovern	Reichert	Takano
McHenry	Renacci	Terry
McIntyre	Ribble	Thompson (CA)
McKeon	Rice (SC)	Thompson (MS)
McKinley	Rigell	Thompson (PA)
McMorris Rodgers	Roby	Thornberry
McNerney	Roe (TN)	Tiberi
Meadows	Rogers (AL)	Tierney
Meehan	Rogers (KY)	Tipton
Meng	Rohrabacher	Titus
Messer	Rokita	Tonko
Mica	Rooney	Tsongas
Michaud	Ros-Lehtinen	Turner
Miller (MI)	Roskam	Upton
Miller, Gary	Ross	Valadao
Moore	Rothfus	Van Hollen
Moran	Roybal-Allard	Vargas
Mullin	Royce	Veasey
Mulvaney	Ruiz	Vela
Murphy (FL)	Runyan	Velázquez
Murphy (PA)	Rush	Visclosky
Nadler	Ryan (OH)	Wagner
Napolitano	Ryan (WI)	Walberg
Neal	Salmon	Walden
Negrete McLeod	Sánchez, Linda T.	Walorski
Neugebauer	Sanchez, Loretta	Walz
Noem	Sanford	Waters
Nolan	Sarbanes	Watt
Nugent	Scalise	Weber (TX)
Nunes	Schakowsky	Webster (FL)
Nunnelee	Schiff	Welch
O'Rourke	Schneider	Wenstrup
Olson	Schock	Westmoreland
Palazzo	Schrader	Whitfield
Pascrell	Schwartz	Williams
Pastor (AZ)	Schweikert	Wilson (FL)
Paulsen	Scott (VA)	Wilson (SC)
Payne	Scott, Austin	Wittman
Pearce	Scott, David	Wolf
Perlmutter	Serrano	Womack
Perry	Sessions	Woodall
Peters (CA)	Sewell (AL)	Yarmuth
Peters (MI)	Shea-Porter	Yoder
Peterson	Sherman	Yoho
	Shimkus	Young (AK)
	Shuster	Young (IN)

NAYS—3

Broun (GA)	Jones	Meeks

NOT VOTING—25

Butterfield	Hudson	Richmond
Campbell	King (IA)	Rogers (MI)
Cleaver	Lewis	Ruppersberger
Collins (GA)	McCarthy (NY)	Sensenbrenner
Garrett	Miller (FL)	Wasserman Schultz
Goodlatte	Miller, George	Waxman
Herrera Beutler	Owens	Young (FL)
Holt	Pallone	
Horsford	Pelosi	

□ 1612

MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STOP GOVERNMENT ABUSE ACT

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 322, I call up the bill (H.R. 2879) to provide limitations on bonuses for Federal employees during sequestration, to provide for investigative leave requirements for members of the Senior Executive Service, to establish certain procedures for conducting in-person or telephonic interactions by Executive branch employees with individuals, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2879

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Stop Government Abuse Act''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents is as follows:

TITLE I—COMMON SENSE IN COMPENSATION

SEC. 101. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this title—

(1) the term ''employee'' means an employee (as defined by section 2105(a) of title 5, United States Code) holding a position in or under an Executive agency;

(2) the term ''Executive agency'' has the meaning given such term by section 105 of title 5, United States Code;

(3) the term ''discretionary monetary payment'' means—

(A) any award or other monetary payment under chapter 45, or section 5753 or 5754, of title 5, United States Code; and

(B) any step-increase under section 5336 of title 5, United States Code;

(4) the term ''covered compensation'', as used with respect to an employee in connection with any period, means the sum of—

(A) the basic pay, and

(B) any discretionary monetary payments (excluding basic pay),

payable to such employee during such period;

(5) the term ''basic pay'' means basic pay for service as an employee; and

(6) the term ''sequestration period'' means a period beginning on the first day of a fiscal year in which a sequestration order with respect to discretionary spending or direct spending is issued under section 251A or section 254 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and ending on the last day of the fiscal year to which the sequestration order applies.

SEC. 102. LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(1) no discretionary monetary payment may be made to an employee during any sequestration period to the extent that such payment would cause in a fiscal year the total covered compensation of such employee for such fiscal year to exceed 105 percent of the total amount of basic pay payable to such individual (before the application of any step-increase in such fiscal year under section 5336 of title 5, United States Code) for such fiscal year; and

(2) except as provided in subsection (b), during any sequestration period, an agency may not pay a performance award under section 5384 of title 5, United States Code, to the extent that such payment would cause the number of employees in the agency receiving such award during such period to exceed 33 percent of the total number of employees in the agency eligible to receive such award during such period.

(b) WAIVERS.—For the purposes of any sequestration period—

(1) the head of any agency may, subject to approval by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, waive the requirements of subsection (a)(2); and

(2) the head of any agency may waive the requirements of subsection (a)(1) with respect to any employee if the requirements of such subsection would violate the terms of a collective bargaining agreement covering such employee, except that this paragraph shall not apply to any employee covered by a collective bargaining agreement that is renewed on or after the date of enactment of this title.

(c) NOTIFICATION.—In the case of an agency for which the Director of the Office of Personnel Management grants a waiver under subsection (b)(1), the agency shall notify the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate of the percentage of career appointees receiving performance awards under section 5384 of title 5, United States Code, and the dollar amount of each performance award.

(d) APPLICATION.—This section shall apply to any discretionary monetary payment or performance award under section 5384 of title 5, United States Code, made on or after the date of enactment of this title.

SEC. 103. REGULATIONS.

The Office of Personnel Management may prescribe regulations to carry out this title.

TITLE II—GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE ACCOUNTABILITY

SEC. 201. SUSPENSION FOR 14 DAYS OR LESS FOR SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE EMPLOYEES.

Paragraph (1) of section 7501 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(1) 'employee' means—

''(A) an individual in the competitive service who is not serving a probationary or trial period under an initial appointment or who has completed 1 year of current continuous employment in the same or similar positions under other than a temporary appointment limited to 1 year or less; or

''(B) a career appointee in the Senior Executive Service who—

''(i) has completed the probationary period prescribed under section 3393(d); or

''(ii) was covered by the provisions of subchapter II of this chapter immediately before appointment to the Senior Executive Service;''.

SEC. 202. INVESTIGATIVE LEAVE AND TERMINATION AUTHORITY FOR SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE EMPLOYEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 75 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SUBCHAPTER VI—INVESTIGATIVE LEAVE FOR SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE EMPLOYEES

''§ 7551. Definitions

''For the purposes of this subchapter—

''(1) 'employee' has the meaning given such term in section 7541; and

''(2) 'investigative leave' means a temporary absence without duty for disciplinary reasons, of a period not greater than 90 days.

''§ 7552. Actions covered

''This subchapter applies to investigative leave.

''§ 7553. Cause and procedure

''(a)(1) Under regulations prescribed by the Office of Personnel Management, an agency may place an employee on investigative leave, without loss of pay and without charge to annual or sick leave, only for misconduct, neglect of duty, malfeasance, or misappropriation of funds.

''(2) If an agency determines, as prescribed in regulation by the Office of Personnel Management, that such employee's conduct is flagrant and that such employee intentionally engaged in such conduct, the agency may place such employee on investigative leave under this subchapter without pay.

''(b)(1) At the end of each 45-day period during a period of investigative leave implemented under this section, the relevant agency shall review the investigation into the employee with respect to the misconduct, neglect of duty, malfeasance, or misappropriation of funds.

''(2) Not later than 5 business days after the end of each such 45-day period, the agency shall submit a report describing such review to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.

''(3) At the end of a period of investigative leave implemented under this section, the agency shall—

''(A) remove an employee placed on investigative leave under this section;

''(B) suspend such employee without pay; or

''(C) reinstate or restore such employee to duty.

''(4) The agency may extend the period of investigative leave with respect to an action under this subchapter for an additional period not to exceed 90 days.

''(c) An employee against whom an action covered by this subchapter is proposed is entitled to, before being placed on investigative leave under this section—

''(1) at least 30 days' advance written notice, stating specific reasons for the proposed action, unless—

''(A) there is reasonable cause to believe that the employee has committed a crime for which a sentence of imprisonment can be imposed; or

''(B) the agency determines, as prescribed in regulation by the Office of Personnel Management, that the employee's conduct with respect to which an action covered by this subchapter is proposed is flagrant and that such employee intentionally engaged in such conduct;

''(2) a reasonable time, but not less than 7 days, to answer orally and in writing and to furnish affidavits and other documentary evidence in support of the answer;

''(3) be represented by an attorney or other representative; and

''(4) a written decision and specific reasons therefor at the earliest practicable date.

''(d) An agency may provide, by regulation, for a hearing which may be in lieu of or in addition to the opportunity to answer provided under subsection (c)(2).

''(e) An employee against whom an action is taken under this section is entitled to appeal to the Merit Systems Protection Board under section 7701.

''(f) Copies of the notice of proposed action, the answer of the employee when written, and a summary thereof when made orally, the notice of decision and reasons therefor, and any order effecting an action covered by this subchapter, together with any supporting material, shall be maintained by the agency and shall be furnished to the Merit Systems Protection Board upon its request and to the employee affected upon the employee's request.

''SUBCHAPTER VII—REMOVAL OF SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE EMPLOYEES

''§ 7561. Definition

''For purposes of this subchapter, the term 'employee' has the meaning given such term in section 7541.

''§ 7562. Removal of Senior Executive Service employees

''(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law and consistent with the requirements of subsection (b), the head of an agency may remove an employee for serious neglect of duty, misappropriation of funds, or malfeasance if the head of the agency—

''(1) determines that the employee knowingly acted in a manner that endangers the interest of the agency mission;

''(2) considers the removal to be necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States; and

''(3) determines that the procedures prescribed in other provisions of law that authorize the removal of such employee cannot be invoked in a manner that the head of an agency considers consistent with the efficiency of the Government.

''(b) An employee may not be removed under this section—

''(1) on any basis that would be prohibited under—

''(A) any provision of law referred to in section 2302(b)(1); or

''(B) paragraphs (8) or (9) of section 2302(b); or

''(2) on any basis, described in paragraph (1), as to which any administrative or judicial proceeding—

''(A) has been commenced by or on behalf of such employee; and

''(B) is pending.

''(c) An employee removed under this section shall be notified of the reasons for such removal. Within 30 days after the notification, the employee is entitled to submit to the official designated by the head of the agency statements or affidavits to show why the employee should be restored to duty. If such statements and affidavits are submitted, the head of the agency shall provide a written response, and may restore the employee's employment if the head of the agency chooses.

''(d) Whenever the head of the agency removes an employee under the authority of this section, the head of the agency shall notify Congress of such termination, and the specific reasons for the action.

''(e) An employee against whom an action is taken under this section is entitled to appeal to the Merit Systems Protection Board under section 7701 of this title.

''(f) Copies of the notice of proposed action, the answer of the employee when written, and a summary thereof when made orally, the notice of decision and reasons therefor, and any order effecting an action covered by this subchapter, together with any supporting material, shall be maintained by the agency and shall be furnished to the Merit Systems Protection Board upon its request and to the employee affected upon the employee's request.

''(g) A removal under this section does not affect the right of the employee affected to seek or accept employment with any other department or agency of the United States if that employee is declared eligible for such employment by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management.

''(h) The authority of the head of the agency under this section may not be delegated.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 75 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 7543 the following:

''SUBCHAPTER VI—INVESTIGATIVE LEAVE FOR SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE EMPLOYEES

''7551. Definitions.
''7552. Actions covered.
''7553. Cause and procedure.

''SUBCHAPTER VII—REMOVAL OF SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE EMPLOYEES

''7561. Definition.
''7562. Removal of Senior Executive Service employees.''.

SEC. 203. SUSPENSION OF SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE EMPLOYEES.

Section 7543 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting ''misappropriation of funds,'' after ''malfeasance,''; and

(2) in subsection (b), by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

''(1) at least 30 days' advance written notice, stating specific reasons for the proposed action, unless—

''(A) there is reasonable cause to believe that the employee has committed a crime for which a sentence of imprisonment can be imposed; or

''(B) the agency determines, as prescribed in regulation by the Office of Personnel Management, that the employee's conduct with respect to which an action covered by this subchapter is proposed is flagrant and that such employee intentionally engaged in such conduct;''.

SEC. 204. MISAPPROPRIATION OF FUNDS AMENDMENTS.

(a) REINSTATEMENT IN THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE.—Section 3593 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2), by inserting ''misappropriation of funds,'' after ''malfeasance,''; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''or malfeasance'' and inserting ''malfeasance, or misappropriation of funds''.

(b) PLACEMENT IN OTHER PERSONNEL SYSTEMS.—Section 3594(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''or malfeasance'' and inserting ''malfeasance, or misappropriation of funds''.

TITLE III—CITIZEN EMPOWERMENT

SEC. 301. AMENDMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part III of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 79 the following:

''CHAPTER 79A—SERVICES TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

''Sec.
''7921. Procedure for in-person and telephonic interactions conducted by Executive Branch employees.

''§ 7921. Procedure for in-person and telephonic interactions conducted by Executive Branch employees

''(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to ensure that individuals have the right to record in-person and telephonic interactions with Executive agency employees and to ensure that individuals who are the target of enforcement actions conducted by

Executive agency employees are notified of such right.

''(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) the term 'telephonic' means by telephone or other similar electronic device; and

''(2) the term 'employee' means an employee of an Executive agency.

''(c) CONSENT OF EXECUTIVE AGENCY EMPLOYEES.—Participation by an employee, acting in an official capacity, in an in-person or telephonic interaction shall constitute consent by the employee to a recording of that interaction by any participant in the interaction.

''(d) NOTICE OF RIGHTS WHEN FEDERAL EMPLOYEES ENGAGED IN CERTAIN ACTIONS.—A notice of an individual's right to record conversations with employees shall be included in any written material provided by an Executive agency to the individual concerning an audit, investigation, inspection, or enforcement action that could result in the imposition of a fine, forfeiture of property, civil monetary penalty, or criminal penalty against, or the collection of an unpaid tax, fine, or penalty from, such individual or a business owned or operated by such individual.

''(e) OFFICIAL REPRESENTATIVE.—Any person who is permitted to represent before an Executive agency an individual under this section shall receive the same notice as required under subsection (d) with respect to such individual.

''(f) NO CAUSE OF ACTION.—This section does not create any express or implied private right of action.

''(g) DISCIPLINARY ACTION.—An employee who violates this section shall be subject to appropriate disciplinary action in accordance with otherwise applicable provisions of law.

''(h) PUBLIC INFORMATION CONCERNING RIGHT TO RECORD.—

''(1) POSTING ON AGENCY WEB SITES.—Within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, each Executive agency shall post prominently on its Web site information explaining the right of individuals to record interactions with employees.

''(2) OMB GUIDANCE.—Within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Office of Management and Budget shall issue guidance to Executive agencies concerning implementation of paragraph (1).''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for part III of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 79 the following:

''79A. Services to members of the public ..... 7921''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2879 and include extraneous materials thereon.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, H.R. 2879, the Stop Government Abuse Act, combines three bills that were each voice voted out of my committee. They are H.R. 1541, the Common Sense in Compensation Act; H.R. 2579, the Government Employee Accountability Act; and H.R. 2711, the Citizen Empowerment Act.

The Common Sense in Compensation title of this bill brings common sense to the policies of governing employee bonuses while still providing agencies flexibility to recognize outstanding performance.

Madam Speaker, 75 percent of senior executives will receive bonuses of at least $6,000 while more than 650,000 defense employees are in the midst of 11 furlough days. This sends the wrong message to our Federal workforce. The men and women of the Federal workforce work hard—all of them.

Some of them do exceptional work, and bonuses are not only an incentive but a recognition. But these bonuses come on top of annual salaries ranging from $119,554 to over $179,000. Going in the range of $30,000 or more sends a message to many of our Federal workforce—in fact, Madam Speaker, most of our Federal workforce—that people at the top get even more.

Following the President's decision to impose a 2-year pay freeze, the administration issued a memo limiting the amount available to pay bonuses for fiscal years 2011 and 2012. Moreover, this past February, the administration issued a memo limiting bonuses to those legally required. In June, the administration suspended rank awards for senior leaders. H.R. 1541 builds on the President's initiatives.

The Government Employee Accountability title of the bill helps ensure Senior Executive Service employees are held accountable for their actions while maintaining due process rights. From Jeff Neely at GSA to Lois Lerner at the IRS, the Oversight and Government Reform Committee has uncovered numerous examples of high-ranking government officials engaging in behavior that certainly seems to be contrary to the principles of public service.

When people come before Congress and cannot even answer questions as to what they have done in their official capacity by ''taking the Fifth'' and find themselves fully paid for not working, it sends the wrong message to the vast majority of Federal workers. In some cases, these employees could face civil or criminal penalties.

In the private sector, these behaviors would be grounds for serious disciplinary action and, likely, termination. But in the Federal bureaucracy, that isn't what happened. Only in Washington could these employees be not terminated but, instead, placed on administrative leave with full pay, full benefits, and accruing additional retirement.

This bill provides agencies with additional tools to use when senior managers behave badly. It does not require these tools be used, but it makes them available. A similar version of this bill was passed by the House by a vote of 402–2 in the last Congress.

The final title of the bill before us today consists of the text of House Resolution 2711, the Citizen Empowerment Act, as reported from my committee. This legislation protects individual citizens from harassment, intimidation, and inappropriate behavior by a few Federal officials representing agencies such as the IRS, EPA, and the SEC.

Unfortunately, these few bad actors at agencies have, from time to time, threatened, intimidated, coerced, lied, or violated the public trust. And yet, in 12 out of our 50 States, citizens are not empowered to unilaterally record these conversations for their own protection. In 38 States, they may. We simply seek, in this bill, to harmonize across the government a predictability. When intimidation and wrong behavior happens, we need to make sure that there is a simple solution that every American can avail themselves of.

This bill ensures individuals have a right to record in-person meetings and telephone calls with Federal employees, including regulatory officials engaged in enforcement activities that can lead to the imposition of fines and penalties. In essence, what this bill does is provide consistency on behalf of the Federal employees acting in their official capacity. I want to make that very clear, Madam Speaker.

Federal employees today don't have an easy answer. In some States—38 of them—they can be recorded; in one State, they may be recorded; and in 11 States, they are likely not to be recorded because, in fact, it requires their advance permission. Uniformity across the Federal workforce is a good thing. We believe that it also will tell every member to treat people the same, whether they live in a State where they may be recorded or not.

I encourage all Members to support these three bills and remind all that these passed on a voice vote out of our committee and were not considered controversial in the previous Congress.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2879 and to the failure of this House to address the issues of real concern to the American people and the people of my district.

Congress has been in session now for more than 200 days, and yet we have not passed a single bill to create a single job. The government must be funded by October, yet House Republicans have refused to appoint conferees to resolve a budget resolution after repeatedly calling for regular order.

After bringing to the floor a farm bill that gutted the SNAP program on which tens of millions of hungry Americans depend, including 17 million children, the majority brought a T-HUD appropriations measure that would have gutted the Community Development Block Grant program, the HOME

program, Amtrak, and the effort to modernize our Nation's air traffic control system. It became clear this week, however, that the majority did not have the votes to pass it.

We could be working today to end the damaging cuts imposed by the Ryan budget, which the Republican chairman of the Appropriations Committee called ''unrealistic and ill-conceived.'' That's the Republican chairman of the Appropriations Committee. Instead of working on any of these issues, we're wasting the last days remaining before a 5-week recess on a measure that threatens to impede our Nation's law enforcement efforts and continues senseless attacks on our Nation's civil servants.

H.R. 2879, the bill before us now, was thrown together last night from the ruins of three bills the majority did not have the votes to pass yesterday. The Rules Committee had to call an emergency meeting last night to push this bill through, and no amendments are being allowed.

So what would this legislation do? First and foremost, it would undermine our Nation's law enforcement activities. In fact, this bill should more appropriately be called the ''Ignoring the Concerns of Law Enforcement Act.'' It would allow individuals to record telephone calls and in-person conversations with Federal employees, including Federal law enforcement agents, without their knowledge. The Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, the National Association of Assistant United States Attorneys, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation Agents Association have all written letters opposing these provisions.

The Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association wrote:

> This legislation puts law enforcement activities at risk and does a disservice to the brave men and women who are asked to put their lives on the line to protect us from terrorists and criminals.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation Agents Association wrote:

> This proposal risks undermining criminal investigations by reducing the willingness of individuals to cooperate with law enforcement, and would result in the creation of recordings of law enforcement conversations that could jeopardize sensitive and important criminal and counterterrorism investigations.

This morning, after listening to the debate we had here on this floor yesterday, and after this bill was filed last night, the National Association of Assistant United States Attorneys sent a letter to every Member of the House, opposing the bill. Their letter states:

> Section 301 of H.R. 2879 will undermine Federal civil enforcement activities and criminal prosecutions during the investigative, pretrial, trial, and enforcement phases of litigation involving the interests of the United States.

The fact is that we have held no hearings on this legislation before we marked it up in committee last week. We had no testimony from law enforcement officials about their concerns with the bill. Instead, the House Republicans rushed it to the floor without adequate consideration. In fact, in their rush to bring this bill to the floor, committee Republicans apparently did not even contact key law enforcement agencies to make sure this bill would not harm ongoing investigations.

This morning, I directed my staff to contact the Department of Justice, the FBI, and the Department of Homeland Security, including its operational components, the Secret Service and Immigration and Customs Enforcement. Officials from all of these entities have now reported that they have significant operational concerns with the bill.

Does that matter to the supporters of this bill? Don't you think it makes sense to hear from key stakeholders before changing Federal law in this extreme way?

The bill also would interfere with existing State laws prescribing the conditions under which conversations can be recorded. Thirty-six years ago, my home State of Maryland enacted a law that made it a felony to record a private conversation unless every party to the conversation consents to the recording or another exception applies. Maryland statute requires actual consent, not forced or assumed consent. The bill negates these protections—and the protections of 11 other States—by deeming Federal employees, including all law enforcement personnel, to have consented to the recording of their official conversations just by coming to work.

The bill has several other troubling provisions. It would remove due process protections from members of our Senior Executive Service by giving politically appointed agency heads broad discretion to fire these employees without providing advance notice, without conducting a proper investigation, and without giving employees an opportunity to respond to accusations against them.

Under this bill, employees could be fired and then forced to prove their innocence to seek reinstatement. This turns on its head the most basic protection guaranteed to all Americans by our Constitution: the right to be presumed innocent until proven guilty.

I urge Members to reject this senseless, ill-considered legislation that will impede law enforcement activities and eliminate constitutional protections for civil servants. I urge Members to vote ''no'' on H.R. 2879, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. This is probably Groundhog Day, because these were the same statements made yesterday by the ranking member from Maryland, who implied that somehow what happens in 38 States would be draconian if it happened in 12 more.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentlelady from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS).

□ 1630

Ms. JENKINS. I thank the chairman for yielding.

We have seen too many examples of our Nation's bureaucracy making life harder for Americans and their families. Every weekend, when I return to Kansas, I hear story after story of Federal regulators abusing their power. But far too often, many of these people are afraid to tell their stories in public because they fear retribution. What country do we live in where Americans are afraid to tell the truth because they fear what their government might do to them?

The recent revelations that IRS officials targeted conservative organizations has shown light on the immense power Federal bureaucrats from hundreds of different agencies have over matters both large and small. When these officials abuse their power and waste taxpayer dollars, liberty is eroded, the economy is slowed, trust is lost, and the rule of law is betrayed.

The most troubling part is, when Americans are confronted by agency officials, they have few rights and insufficient resources to protect themselves. Not only do Federal agencies get to write rules, but they get to enforce them too. In fact, a citizen is 10 times more likely to be tried by a Federal agency than an actual court, and citizens have fewer rights during agency proceedings than in a courtroom.

I introduced the Stop Government Abuse Act to allow citizens to protect themselves or their small businesses when a government official comes calling. Among other things, this bill gives Americans a new tool to fight back by allowing them to record any conversation with most Federal agencies and finally have proof of what happens in these interactions.

Is it any wonder why Americans have lost faith and trust in our government when the Feds have allowed the IRS to target Americans based on their personal beliefs; allowed the Federal General Services Administration regional commissioner, Jeff Neely, to spend nearly $900,000 of taxpayer money on a conference in Las Vegas and then receive a bonus after being placed under investigation? And they have allowed high-ranking bureaucrats like Lois Lerner to still be on the government's payroll funded by taxpayers.

This stunning lack of accountability and transparency in our current system is unacceptable. And the Stop Government Abuse Act is a good first step to help level the playing field between the average American and Federal regulators.

The vast majority of Federal workers are good, patriotic people, but that doesn't mean that an additional check and balance can't help. This bill does not villainize Federal employees. And as long as they're doing their jobs properly, they have not a thing to worry about.

Unfortunately, with all the recent scandals, we have heard about far too many Federal employees who have had the luxury of playing by different rules than the rest of the hardworking men

and women in this country. This must end, and the Stop Government Abuse Act helps do just that.

Parts of this legislation already passed the House last year after news broke of the GSA scandal, but the Senate never acted on the legislation. It's time to do something about this, and today I demand action be taken.

While Americans are toiling across this country in factories, on farms, and elsewhere, to make ends meet, Lois Lerner is collecting her full paycheck. This bill would allow agencies to fire reckless employees on the spot and stop those under investigation from receiving salaries paid for by the very taxpayers they abused.

It's time to stand up against Big Government overreach and abuse. Americans deserve a government that expands their rights, not the rights of Big Government. Enacting the Stop Government Abuse Act will help restore trust in our government and get Big Government out of the way of our economy.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlelady from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for the wise words of his opening statement. I also thank him for retrieving the views of law enforcement officials—inasmuch as we had no hearing on this bill. They were very informative.

Madam Speaker, with most of the business of the Nation languishing with no action in this House, Republicans have rushed to the floor with these so-called ''messaging'' bills. Let's make sure we get the message:

Republicans—the party that champions states' rights—want to preempt the States, to require Federal employees acting for the government to record conversations with clients. Republicans—the party that wants the Federal Government to operate like the private sector and pay people on the basis of merit—wants to deny bonuses to Federal employees who deserve them, regardless of merit. Perhaps worst of all, Madam Speaker, Republicans—who spent most of this term accusing IRS employees of denying due process to Republican organizations—now propose to fire SES employees without due process.

And get this: the Republican version of due process is to give the employee the right to apply for reinstatement to the political appointee who fired him. Then, after the fact, having never had a hearing, the dismissed employee can now appeal to the MSPB. This last one, of course, reverses the age-old principle of innocent until proven guilty, but it's much worse. Not only is there no due process, there's no process at all. You're fired. That one is embarrassingly unconstitutional.

These are messaging bills all right, Madam Speaker, and we get the message. Republican principles apply—except when they don't.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

Mr. MEADOWS. Madam Speaker, today I want to speak a little bit from the heart.

We've heard a lot of debate going back and forth about how we haven't talked about this and how we haven't debated it, but there have been a number of amendments. As this bill comes to the floor today, what it's about is about fairness; it's about fairness to employees; it's about fairness to those who manage. And what we're seeing is that there is a trend where we're not being fair with bonuses.

You know, I've had my colleagues opposite here talk about the fact that we need to continue to incentivize. But when 75 percent of senior executive employees receive bonuses at an average of $11,000, it's out of control. This little chart shows that the Veterans Administration, 74 percent of those employees received bonuses of over $11,000 apiece. Now, why is this a problem? Because back in my district, the veterans are having to wait over 600 days, Madam Speaker, to get a determination on benefits, and yet we continue to give bonuses. I find that appalling.

The other part of that is we talk about being for small businesses, and small businesses are hurting. So what do we do with the Small Business Administration? Ninety-two percent of those employees are getting over $13,000 a year in bonuses. It's appalling, Madam Speaker. We need to make sure that we bring it back.

We've got Mr. Spock there that was part of the ''Star Trek'' parody that received a bonus of almost $31,000 the same year that he spent over $5 million on a conference. Where is the sanity?

When we really talk about Federal employees, the rank and file, the blue collar Federal employees, are going with pay freezes while we pay out ridiculous bonuses. Madam Speaker, I think it's time that we really turn back the tide.

You know, if the Democrats are going to vote against this particular bill, the headline tomorrow should read that the Democrats have embraced the 1 percenters, because that's what it is. It is 1 percent getting all the bonuses while the rest of the Federal workers are not receiving the benefits that they deserve.

It is time that we bring some sanity to this situation. I strongly urge support of this bill.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH), a member of our committee.

Mr. LYNCH. I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding.

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2879, the so-called ''Stop Government Abuse Act.'' This legislation is simply a rehash of the three attacks on Federal workers that were incorporated in the bills that the Republican leadership abruptly pulled from the suspension calendar yesterday due to a lack of support from the required two-thirds majority of this House.

The fact that these anti-Federal worker suspension bills have now been reconstituted into a single anti-Federal worker bill does not make this legislation any less misguided or any less harmful to our Federal workers than it was yesterday. After all, H.R. 2879 is based on the same message that has been continually reflected in a series of Republican legislative attacks on our Federal workers throughout this Congress. That message from the Republican leadership has been that our hardworking Federal employees cannot be trusted, and they are the primary source of our deficit burden.

On the heels of repeated attempts to freeze Federal employee pay beyond the current 3 years, efforts to increase Federal pension contributions and slash our Federal workforce across the board, we are now considering legislation that would only add insult to injure by depriving Federal employees of their constitutional rights to due process of law.

In particular, I'm deeply concerned about the expedited termination provisions in H.R. 2879. These provisions would give agency heads broad discretion, without limitation, to immediately fire senior executives accused of misconduct without notifying the employees of the charges against them and without giving them a reasonable opportunity to defend themselves. Instead, it places the burden on the employee, after they fire them, to prove that their reinstatement is required. This ''ready, fire, aim'' approach by my Republican colleagues, where they fire the employee first and ask questions later, flies in the face of the rights guaranteed to all Americans under our Constitution.

The ''guilty until proven innocent'' framework violates the due process protections envisioned by James Madison and guaranteed under the Constitution. In 1985, in *Loudermill* v. *Cleveland Board of Education*, the United States Supreme Court held that public employees, Federal employees, who are facing discipline are entitled to certain due process rights. The U.S. Supreme Court held that public servants had a property right in the jobs that they held and in continued employment, and that such employment could not be denied to employees unless they were given a meaningful opportunity to have notice of the allegations against them, to have a fair hearing and an opportunity to respond against the charges against them. Notably, that must occur prior to being deprived of their right to employment. The court stated:

> An essential principle of due process is that a deprivation of life, liberty, or property be preceded by notice and opportunity for hearing appropriate to the nature of the case.

The court goes on further and it says:

> This principle requires some kind of a hearing prior to discharge of an employee

who has a constitutionally protected property interest in his employment.

Now, this is unconstitutional. This provision is flatly unconstitutional, and there's a long line of Federal cases under the Supreme Court that declares it so. The one saving grace, in my opinion, in this bill is that there's no severability clause, and that after this provision is struck down by the Supreme Court, these employees will all be reinstated with back pay. And the whole bill that they're offering will be struck down because of the lack of a severability clause in the bill.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LYNCH. I thank the gentleman.

Look, this Nation was founded on the principle that every person, every man and woman is entitled to due process before he or she is deprived of life, liberty, or property. Our Supreme Court in the *Loudermill* case understood the injustice of depriving a person of their livelihood, and I hope that my colleagues understand that H.R. 2879 unfortunately would do just that.

Due process demands that we oppose H.R. 2879. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting ''no'' on this legislation.

I thank the ranking member for his advocacy and his courtesy.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, the gentleman is entitled to his opinion, but not his facts.

In the bill itself, which I read yesterday, it says:

> An employee removed under this section shall be notified of the reasons for such removal within 30 days.

□ 1645

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to explain a little bit about what's going on.

The other day we talked a little bit about the dizzying effects of being on this floor, and somehow things get twisted around, so when you see people bumping off the walls you know it's because of the spin.

Let me tell you what I'm talking about here today. When I walked on the floor today—and some of my friends did also—we passed the Capitol Police, passed all these people on the dais, we passed so many people on the way, and you would think that we are talking about every single person that works for the government.

Now, the truth of the matter is that there are over 2.1 million people working for the government. That doesn't include the Army. It doesn't include the post office. That includes people who are out there. So the people that we are talking about that we want to hold accountable—and, my goodness, what an unusual effort for Congress to try and hold people accountable. Why in the world would you do that? Half of us wouldn't be back here.

So we are talking about four-tenths of 1 percent. And as the President is fond of saying: ''Just do the arithmetic. Just do the arithmetic.'' It isn't everybody that you talked about. It's not all these folks that are sitting here tonight. It's not the Capitol Police that we walk by. It's not the people that clean our offices every night. It's none of those folks. It's the senior executives.

Now, these poor people are going to be under such great duress by this that they're probably going to get their resumes together and that loud ''whoosh'' you hear is them running away from $199,000 a year jobs. Are you kidding me? You can't say that with a straight face about how are we ever going to keep qualified people here.

I got to tell you something. I've got a lot of unemployed people back in northwest Pennsylvania that will line up for these jobs. Now, the $199,000, of course, is the top of it. But the real kicker is they can't go over $230,000 with their bonuses. These are people that are going to walk away from these jobs because we have the unmitigated gall to hold them accountable to the people who pay those wages, and that's the American taxpayers. That's who we are talking about. My goodness, have we fallen that far away from what this country was supposed to be?

Now, here's all we are saying to them—and we came about this because in a hearing on the GSA we asked about why is Mr. Neely on leave with pay. The people at the GSA say: ''Well, you see, you don't understand, Congress. We don't have any mechanism to put them on leave without pay.'' I said: ''I have never heard anything like that.'' Of course I haven't heard it because I come from the private sector. We don't do that in the private sector. But what I did find out was they would love to have that.

The people we put in charge of these agencies would actually love to be able to hold those that work for them accountable and responsible. So what did we give them? We gave them the ability to do that. They can fire somebody on the spot. But we didn't do anything about their due process. That person is still entitled to come back and any protections under the law he or she still gets.

We can create an investigation on a leave without pay, but we also require that the agencies report to Congress every 45 days to let us know where the investigation is. My goodness, there's nothing harder in this body than trying to get information when there's an investigation under way. I just think that we've seen that the last couple of months, of: ''You want to get the information? Well, we can't talk about it now because there's an investigation going on.'' It doesn't make sense to me. It doesn't make sense to the people I represent.

Now, you know when we talk about protecting American workers and we talk about what our duty is here, we were elected by a group of people from districts all over this country to come and represent them. According to the IRS, there are 145 million Americans who pay taxes. They file their taxes every year. There's 300 million out there, but 145 million pay taxes.

That's who it is that we are trying to protect. They're the ones that pay for every single thing that happens here. Or they cosign the note on the loan to keep this place floating.

So I want you to look at this now. There are ''total Federal employees''—2.1 million. Now, this little red sliver—and it's really hard to see—remember, this represents four-tenths of 1 percent. As the President would say: ''It's all about the arithmetic. It's all about the arithmetic.'' I would say to my colleagues on both sides, it's all about the people we represent.

I appreciate the spin. I appreciate the fact that you like to make every Capitol policeman think that he's unappreciated or she's unappreciated, or that everyone that works in our office is unappreciated, or that everybody from the private sector that works for this great Nation is unappreciated, but you know it's not true and you know what you are saying is not true.

What I would love to see is for you to stand up on this floor and look at people and say, this is what's going on, and you know it's not true. You absolutely know it's not true, but you say it anyway. And why? Because it wears well.

Thank you for bringing this legislation up, and thank you for protecting the American taxpayer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded that they are to address their remarks to the Chair and not to other Members in the second person.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time both sides have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 15½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 10½ minutes remaining.

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

The Supreme Court Loudermill case, which Mr. LYNCH cited, says that the employee must be given notice before they are fired and an opportunity to respond. This bill, basically you're fired and then you appeal trying to get your job back, so you don't really truly have notice.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my friend from Maryland.

Madam Speaker, the distinguished manager on the other side of this bill says you are entitled to your own opinion, but not your own facts, in taking to task my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) in his reading of this bill. And I've got the bill in front of me. It says that ''at least 30 days' advance written notice stating specific reasons for the proposed action''—that is to

say, the removal or suspension of an employee—''unless there's a reasonable cause to believe the employee has committed a crime or the agency determines, as prescribed in regulation, that the employee's conduct with respect to an action covered by the subchapters proposed is flagrant and such employee intends to engage in such contact,'' and then you can be removed without that notice.

So Mr. LYNCH was right: facts are stubborn things.

If we really wanted to understand the motivation behind the legislation in front of us, it is a cynical political ploy before this Congress goes out on recess to allow one whole party and its Members to go home and avoid discussing the tough issues of the day and make the Federal employee the bogeyman. That Federal employee, whoever he or she is, vaguely abuses you, and you need to be protected against them.

So we are going to pass a bunch of bills that had no hearings, that are flawed in their drafting, that had to be removed from the floor yesterday and redrafted in order to come back today to qualify for a vote, because they otherwise wouldn't have passed on a suspension rule, and it is all part of this consistent and flagrant and, in my opinion, reckless campaign to demonize the public servants who serve us. And the loser ultimately in this game, this political game, will be the constituents they serve and we are supposed to serve.

It is not right to demonize Federal employees, and we've done that. We've cut their pay. We've frozen their pay for 3 years. We've raided their pensions to try to finance things that have no relationship whatsoever to Federal employment per se, and we've characterized them in disparaging and negative ways that are not worthy of this body.

So it's all right. Go home, campaign against the Federal employee, and maybe you will make some headway. Maybe, in fact, it's a brilliant move short term, in terms of short-term political gain. But it's at long-term expense—expense at the truth and expense of the men and women who serve this country ably every day and who deserve better from their elected representatives.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman from Virginia would have kept this person on for how long—weeks, months, more than a year? This individual received a bonus after more than a year.

When this bill came through our committee, the amendment to say ''in all cases 30 days'' could have been offered; it wasn't. This came through in regular order of the committee. The language was published. There was every opportunity.

When the gentleman from Virginia said ''redrafted,'' with all due respect, not a word was changed in any of these three bills from the time it left our committee until today when it's being considered.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENTIVOLIO).

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. I thank the gentleman from California.

Madam Speaker, Federal agencies not only get to write rules, they get to enforce them. It was recently noted that a citizen is ten times more likely to be tried by an agency than by an actual court. In any given year, Federal judges conduct roughly 95,000 adjudicatory proceedings, including trials, while Federal agencies complete more than 939,000—939,000.

In these agency proceedings, citizens have fewer rights than in a courtroom. And unfortunately, there are some bad actors who intimidate, coerce, or even lie, violating public trust and potentially breaking laws. Far too often, the public is left without evidence to help prove Federal employees mistreated them.

For example, the SEC bowing to political pressure to scrutinize donations to tax-exempt groups; IRS employees targeting Tea Party groups applying for tax-exempt status; and other agencies that are writing and enforcing rules and regulations written in legalese to confuse and frustrate the public.

Title III of this bill ensures that individuals have the right to record their meetings and telephone exchanges with Federal regulatory officials engaged in enforcement activities.

The manager's amendment adopted in committee ensures that law enforcement would not be impacted adversely. Undercover investigations and wiretap surveillance would not be interfered with.

This legislation does not supersede any State laws, and it has no impact on citizen interactions with non-Federal officials such as State and local police officers.

Madam Speaker, it is the duty of Congress to protect rights, not take them away. This legislation is just another step in protecting the rights of our citizens.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my friend.

Madam Speaker, the distinguished chairman of this committee throws a picture up on the floor and, of course, doesn't allow me to respond when he demands ''is this what the gentleman from Virginia is talking about.''

It is wrong for the chairman of the distinguished committee to suggest or allow the inference to be drawn that somehow that picture represents all Federal employees. And the gentleman who just spoke, talking about rights, what about the rights of the employees who serve our country, what about their rights that are being trampled on in this legislation?

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I was not going to speak. I was constrained to speak, to come to the floor, when we had this chart about 2 million employees.

But only adversely affecting just a small sliver. The premise seems to be you can undermine—as long as they're a small minority—the rights of people.

And those Capitol policemen of which the gentleman spoke, and the people at the desk of whom the gentleman spoke, people who serve in our committees of whom the gentleman spoke, people who serve as nurses—not necessarily in VA hospitals because they're exempt—zero COLA 4 years in a row. All 2 million have been affected.

□ 1700

Every new employee has been affected—everyone—not just that small, little sliver that apparently the SES is. They don't get rights. If it were 1.98 million, well, then, that's a different story, but as long as it's only a small sliver, undermine their rights.

I came to the floor to say that, if we undermine the rights of one, frankly, the rights of all are soon at risk. We have learned that throughout history. So I would hope that we would reject this bill, which was seven or eight bills to start out with, which were put up here in a way that you could not amend them—suspension—in this transparent, open, ''let the House work its will'' process, and we now come back with a closed rule, putting all the bills in one—a rule covering all seven bills—and the chairman shakes his head and shows pictures and believes those are facts.

My friends, we ought to reject these bills because they are about all employees. They may affect only a small few at this juncture, but they are about all employees; and it's about undermining their rights and the respect we ought to accord to them for the service they give to the people of the United States of America.

Mr. ISSA. At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the gentleman from Maryland as he talks about its being about all employees. Indeed, it is, because, if we allow this continued behavior to go on, it will tarnish the good reputation of Federal workers who day in and day out serve this country and the citizens so well.

What we are talking about is giving a tool, a management tool, to let managers manage. We are talking about not giving bonuses to those who are of the very highest—the 1 percent—while the rank and file goes so many times without being recognized or compensated for what it deserves. We are talking about employees who make an average salary of $168,000 a year, and yet we are talking about a privileged few whom we need to make sure we address. So, Mr. Speaker, it is about all

of the employees, and it is about being fair.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, there is so much I would like to say, particularly as to the extraordinary discrepancy between those folks who make far less than their counterparts in the private sector and those who work in the private sector, who, perhaps, have less responsibility on their shoulders. Look it up. See the statistics. That's the case.

The other thing I want to say to my friend is that the law now provides for procedures to remove bad actors. Do we have some bad actors in the Federal service? We do. That's human life. That's the human experience.

Mr. MEADOWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I don't have anymore time, but if the gentleman from California will yield you some time, I will be glad to yield you some time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished minority whip presumes to tell me about the private sector and how much people make. The problem is that I came from the private sector. I know the difference between management and labor, and I know the difference between people who elect to be the top-paid management of entities and who typically serve at will in the private sector. Those of the Senior Executive Service are, in fact, people who choose to get additional pay for these special responsibilities, and they know what they're doing when they get into it. We are proud of most of them, the vast majority of them.

The fact is that Mr. HOYER has people who serve at will. He fires them without notice if he chooses to. Yet he cannot understand the fact by that picture I held up—I won't hold it up again; it's reprehensible even though it has been well seen—that that man continued to work and get a bonus during the 10 months in which the GSA Administrator knew wrongdoing had occurred on his watch. It wasn't until he decided to retire—to be honest, my understanding is with criminal allegations—that he even left and stopped getting his pay, and, today, he enjoys a very comfortable retirement.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time we have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 9 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is truly astonishing. We have serious issues before us. We should be focused on job creation, on comprehensive immigration reform, on providing nutrition assistance to children and seniors, on postal reform or on funding the government; but we are again debating partisan bills that stand no chance of becoming law, including the 40th vote to defund or to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

Now, as kids, we are told that people in glass houses shouldn't throw stones, so I sure hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have not given one bonus to one of their senior staff members.

I hope that that is the case, that you have not given one bonus to a senior staff member. I hope, furthermore, that each of you is recording all of your staff members when they answer the phones because you want to know how they are treating your constituents.

This particular bill is the height of hypocrisy. It is a blatant attack on Federal employees that reinforces the fact that current leadership is only interested in political messaging, including through repeated attacks on hard-working Federal employees. It is simply shameful to say that we will belittle public service like that. I am a public servant, and I am proud to be a public servant. Every Federal employee who works in this building and virtually every Federal employee who is out there in our communities is doing so because he believes in public service. I think that a Federal employee today is pretty crazy to be doing this job. He basically is being told, You're not worth very much. His integrity is constantly being questioned. He has had 3 years of pay freezes and furloughs, and he is supposed to continue to do public service.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentleman.

I want to address one section of this bill that would now allow individuals to record telephone and in-person conversations with Federal employees. This would preempt the law in my State of California and in the chairman's State of California and in 11 other States that require the consent of all parties to a conversation. It contains no exceptions for law enforcement, sensitive communications, the military or anything else.

The FBI has already indicated to us that it strongly opposes this bill because, in its words, ''this proposal risks undermining criminal investigations by reducing the willingness of individuals to cooperate with law enforcement and would result in the creation of recordings of law enforcement conversations that could jeopardize sensitive and important criminal and counterterrorism investigations.''

I think this is ill-founded.

Even the ACLU, which strongly supports the principle of allowing citizens to record law enforcement interactions, does not support the provision in this bill because it ''threatens to impermissibly interfere with government workers' constitutional liberties.''

So this is a bill in search of a problem that actually makes it harder to go after real criminals, and this bill does not apply to this body, to Members of Congress. Maybe it's time for this bill's authors to look a little closer to home.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY DAVIS), a member of the committee.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this legislation, the Stop Government Abuse Act. I would feel much better about it if it were labeled the Promotion of Government Abuse Act, because it encourages government to roll back the clock and take away rights that workers have earned from working hard.

Can you imagine being fired after you've worked up to the ranks of the SES, which is very difficult to get to, and being told that you've been let go on the basis of an IG report? Where is the equal protection under the law there? There is none. I think that it's unfortunate that we would treat our Federal workforce this way. They work hard, deserve better; and I oppose this legislation.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, this is one more bill designed to punish the Federal workforce and to discourage the very people whom we need to join the Federal workforce. It's singling it out for harsher treatment than we would apply to ourselves or to our workforces, frankly. You need to be able to reward your best workers. If this were a private sector corporation, our revenue would have dried up; our stock value would have imploded; and our employees would have left.

Federal employees stick with it because they believe in this government. They hope that, one day, the legislative branch will appreciate what they do. I worked for the Federal Government 40 years ago; and while I worked 10 or 12 hours a day, there were people working longer than that. They did that for about 40 years, and they worked very hard and in a dedicated way.

This legislation isn't even properly thought through. No congressional hearing has been held on this measure that, in fact, jeopardizes law enforcement. It would intrude upon and disrupt sensitive phases of many Federal civil and criminal investigations and law enforcement efforts, as well as litigation involving the government. We

hear that from the National Association of Assistant United States Attorneys. We hear from the FBI employees that this proposal risks undermining criminal investigations by reducing the willingness of individuals to cooperate with law enforcement. It would result in the creation of recordings of law enforcement conversations that could jeopardize sensitive and important criminal counterterrorism investigations. We hear from Federal law enforcement officers that it puts law enforcement activities at risk and does a disservice to the brave men and women who are asked to put their lives on the line to protect us from terrorists and criminals.

This is bad legislation. We know why it is being offered. We also trust that it's not going to become law. So you have to ask, Why are we doing it? We are doing it to send a message.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. MORAN. The message it's sending is that our Federal employees are not to be valued, that our managers are not to reward people for good work, that, in fact, we want the government to shrink, that we don't want it to be able to carry out its necessary activities. When we do that, we do a disservice to our constituents and to this country. This stuff has got to stop.

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, July 29, 2013.

Hon. DARRELL ISSA,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight & Government Reform, Washington, DC.

Hon. ELIJAH CUMMINGS,
Ranking Member, Committee on Oversight & Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ISSA AND RANKING MEMBER CUMMINGS: On behalf of the membership of the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association (FLEOA), I am writing to oppose H.R. 2711—the ''Citizen Empowerment Act,'' as amended by the Committee and urge you to further amend the bill to ensure that law enforcement and other public safety activities are not covered by its provisions.

As originally written, the legislation contained general exceptions for situations where classified information, public safety or an on-going law enforcement investigation would be at risk. This language was necessary to ensure that federal law enforcement officers and the critical work they perform are not adversely impacted by this bill. In fact, the original language should have gone even farther to make clear that law enforcement activities would not be jeopardized in any way.

For incomprehensible reasons the committee approved an amended bill that removed even basic exceptions.

When a federal law enforcement officer is conducting a criminal investigation via telephone, i.e. on a suspect of terrorism, the officer should not have to notify the suspect of the right to record the conversation and whether the officer is recording the conversation. Obviously, conventional wisdom tells us that any thought of conducting a successful investigation after disclosure of this type is impossible. There is no logical reason why criminal investigations shouldn't be exempted from the proposal.

This legislation puts law enforcement activities at risk and does a disservice to the brave men and women who are asked to put their lives on the line to protect us from terrorists and criminals. FLEOA opposes any actions by Congress that lessens the ability of our Citizenship to remain safe and secure and jeopardizes the ability of federal law enforcement officers to continue to perform their sworn duties to protect them.

As the Chair and Ranking Member with jurisdiction over H.R. 2711, we urge you to ensure that the bill is not considered on the Floor unless it is amended to exempt law enforcement from its provisions. Until that time, FLEOA will continue to strongly oppose this legislation.

Respectfully,

FRANK TERRERI,
National Vice President for Legislative Affairs.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS,
Lake Ridge, VA.

VOTE ''NO'' ON H.R. 2879, ''THE STOP GOVERNMENT ABUSE ACT''

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS OPPOSES H.R. 2879, ''THE STOP GOVERNMENT ABUSE ACT,'' AND URGES HOUSE MEMBERS TO VOTE NO ON THIS LEGISLATION

Section 301 of H.R. 2879 will undermine federal civil enforcement activities and criminal prosecutions during the investigative, pretrial trial and enforcement phases of litigation involving the interests of the United States.

Section 301 is the former ''Citizen Empowerment Act'' (H.R. 2711), as amended by the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee on July 24. The provision contains no exemption for litigation involving the United States or the activities of federal law enforcement personnel. No Congressional hearing has been held on the measure.

Section 301 requires the Government broadly to inform an individual of the right to record in-person and telephonic interactions with Government employees—including law enforcement officers, investigative agents and Assistant United States Attorneys and other federal prosecutors—whenever an Executive Agency provides ''any written material . . . to the individual concerning an audit, investigation, inspection, or enforcement action that could result in the imposition of a fine, forfeiture of property, civil monetary penalty, or criminal penalty against, or the collection of an unpaid tax, fine, or penalty from, such individual or a business owned or operated by such individual.''

This notice requirement would reach to a myriad of legal and law enforcement-related documents regularly issued by the federal government, including subpoenas, search warrants, arrest complaints and forfeiture notices. This mandate is far more expansive than requiring the government to post notice of the right to record on agency websites, as also included in section 301.

The notice mandate of H.R. 2879 would intrude upon and disrupt sensitive phases of many federal civil and criminal investigations and law enforcement efforts, as well as litigation involving the government. The breadth of the ''written material'' trigger could undermine undercover investigations, given its potential to ''tip off'' witnesses, suspects and targets of investigations. The bill also would permit defense counsel to insist upon recording all interactions with federal prosecutors and law enforcement personnel in all phases of litigation with the government, including sensitive settlement and plea-bargain discussions. Even federal court proceedings, whose rules prohibit recording by individuals, could be impacted by this bill.

Citizens already may record their interactions with federal government officers and employees in most states within a carefully balanced set of legal and practical concerns. There is no compelling need for a measure like H.R. 2879, especially considering its incalculable damage on law enforcement efforts. At the very least, an exception should be included in the measure that exempts law enforcement-related activity involving government agents, investigators and Assistant United States Attorneys.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION AGENTS ASSOCIATION,
Alexandria, VA, July 31, 2013.

Hon. DARRELL ISSA,
Chairman, Comm. on Oversight & Government Reform, Washington, DC.

Hon. ELIJAH CUMMINGS,
Ranking Member, Comm. on Oversight & Government Reform, Washington, DC.

Re: H.R. 2711, the Citizen Empowerment Act

DEAR CHAIRMAN ISSA AND RANKING MEMBER CUMMINGS: On behalf of the FBI Agents Association (''FBIAA''), a voluntary professional association currently representing approximately 13,000 active duty and retired FBI Special Agents, I write to express the FBIAA's concerns about H.R. 2711, the Citizen Empowerment Act.

H.R. 2711 creates a broad right to record conversations with federal employees, and requires that notices of the right to record conversations be provided to individuals engaged in discussions with federal employees—without any exceptions related to criminal investigations. This proposal risks undermining criminal investigations by reducing the willingness of individuals to cooperate with law enforcement, and would result in the creation of recordings of law enforcement conversations that could jeopardize sensitive and important criminal and counterterrorism investigations.

Also, by requiring written notices under the threat of disciplinary action, H.R. 2711 would create new administrative and bureaucratic requirements for Agents conducting investigations. The time and resources available to Agents are already stretched too thin, and new administrative burdens make it more difficult for Agents to protect the public.

For these reasons, the FBIAA opposes H.R. 2711 as currently written, and hopes that the House will make significant changes to H.R. 2711 before considering the legislation.

Sincerely,

REV TARICHE,
President.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I've heard so much about pay being frozen that I've got to tell you: the people that I represent in the Third Congressional District of western Pennsylvania wish their pay had been frozen. It has gone down steadily since 2010.

We talk about the inability to get the economy going. I feel the same way—it's embarrassing—but at the end of the day, we are not benevolent monarchs. We are stewards of the taxpayers' moneys. All we are doing is talking about accountability. Only in Washington is ''accountability'' a bad word. In the private sector, ''accountability'' reigns. The market determines my accountability. That's what holds me accountable in coming from the private sector.

Why is that so foreign here to, all of a sudden, have bills—to have things in front of us—that will help us to say to people in charge to hold people responsible and to hold people accountable?

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, as I've listened to all of these arguments, I cannot help but think about the many employees whom we see every day—the hardworking employees who give their blood, sweat, and tears to keep our country together.

When we talk about our senior executives, I will remind this body of something that Mr. HOYER talked about and, that is, under current law, senior executives may be disciplined for misconduct, neglect of duty, malfeasance, or of the failure to accept reassignment or transfer. There is a current statutory list of reasons for which actions may be taken against senior executives that covers a broad variety of situations, and they are adequate to deal with the problems that we are addressing today.

□ 1715

Senior executives suspected of criminal activity may already be removed or placed on indefinite suspension without pay. We need to focus on improving agency implementation rather than passing legislation that would deprive employees of their due process.

I know Mr. MORAN is right. There has been a relentless attack on Federal employees. The fact is that they're in their third year of pay freezes. They've been asked to pay more for their pensions and get less. We constantly hear negative comments about them, still folks say, We love them; we appreciate them. They are often the ones that aren't seen, unnoticed, unappreciated, and unapplauded.

We have a bill here that takes away something very fundamental, and that is their due process rights. A lot of people may think about due process and say, Oh, it's no big deal. Later, we'll take a little bit of due process here and take a little bit there. It is that due process that is the basic foundation of our Constitution and of our democracy. What we're talking about here is making sure that employees are afforded that due process.

So you get somebody who says, Okay. Fine. Fire them, and then let them appeal to get their job back. That's not how it's supposed to work. They're to be given some type of notice and given an opportunity to simply address whatever the accusations are. A lot of times we may look at folks and say we don't like what they allegedly did, but the fact is that we still have that little document—which, to me, is a big document—that we must adhere to.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge all Members of the Congress to vote against this bill and give us a chance to come back, perhaps, and make the appropriate amendments so that it will be one that is suitable for the Congress to vote on.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I want to clarify one thing.

When we talk about a freeze, when is a freeze not a freeze? Only in Washington, D.C.

Over the last 3 years, 99.4 percent of Federal employees got increases. Out of every 1,000 employees, only six were denied an increase. I think the record needed to be clarified.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 4¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. ISSA. Then I will close at this time and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, controversy comes in all forms. Sometimes it's legitimate; sometimes there are differences that are unresolved; sometimes, though, you find yourself befuddled.

These three bills passed on a voice vote. It didn't mean that they would have been authored by any of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle or that they loved them. It meant that they were given a full opportunity to evaluate these, to offer amendments, to have up-or-down votes on them. Many of the suggestions they made were taken into account on many of the bills marked up during that long day. Many of the things being brought up here today simply were not brought up, and it's not because they didn't know about this.

When you have a version of this bill that's almost identical to that passed on December 19 of last year by a vote of 402–2, that means that you have people that today are vehemently opposed to provisions that they already voted for. I repeat, they're vehemently opposed to provisions they already voted for. I don't have the names of the two people that voted ''no.'' They certainly have a right to express why they voted ''no'' last December.

I can tell you that when you have to only terminate 4/100 of 1 percent of the workforce, if you do it at all, the head of the agency has to determine that the employee has done something seriously wrong in regards to negligence of duty or misappropriation of funds or malfeasance. They have to determine that the employee did it knowingly, and they have to consider it necessary and advisable to protect this enterprise.

On top of that, the employee does have to be told why they're being terminated. I think that's important, because the ranking member and I heard from a woman in a hearing who left me feeling absolutely shocked. She's been on leave without pay, and to this day, an investigation that is ongoing, months into it, she's never been told why she's on leave without pay. To be honest, she's a member of the Senior Executive Service.

Maybe she would fall under this bill. But in order to fall under this bill, some things would have to happen. First of all, the head of the agency would have to make a decision of wrongdoing, and it would be held by that decision being reasonable after the fact. They'd have to have told her why she's being removed, and she would already have had an opportunity in front of the Merit Systems Protection Board and the U.S. Court of Appeals, known as the Fed circuit. She already would have had all this due process, except months go by and she doesn't know and she's on administrative leave.

The fact is this is a tool. They don't have to use it. If they use it, they have to make sure that it's only for serious violations: neglect of duty, misappropriation of funds, or malfeasance. These are very serious. An extremely small part, highly compensated, respected people, and a few bad actors for neglect of duty, misappropriation of funds, or malfeasance can be removed. They still have their rights. We knew this was constitutional. To be honest, the complaint we seemed to have in committee for hours was something that I want to share with you, Mr. Speaker.

Members of my committee, when talking about the idea that only one-third without special exception of employees in any agency could receive bonuses rather than the 75 or 80 percent you heard about here today, they said, But this is their right. They've negotiated that. You're interfering with their contracts.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Government does not allow negotiation in collective bargaining or otherwise for wages. We have a standard scale. Bonuses were created for only one purpose, and that was, in fact, to reward good behavior as an incentive.

These bills are well thought out and are only controversial today because the minority wants to make them controversial to create a controversy.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 176, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 436]

YEAS—239

Aderholt	Gosar	Pearce
Alexander	Gowdy	Perry
Amash	Granger	Peters (CA)
Amodei	Graves (GA)	Peterson
Bachmann	Graves (MO)	Petri
Bachus	Griffin (AR)	Pittenger
Barber	Griffith (VA)	Pitts
Barletta	Grimm	Poe (TX)
Barr	Guthrie	Pompeo
Barrow (GA)	Hall	Posey
Barton	Hanna	Price (GA)
Benishek	Harper	Reed
Bentivolio	Harris	Reichert
Bera (CA)	Hartzler	Renacci
Bilirakis	Hastings (WA)	Ribble
Bishop (UT)	Heck (NV)	Rice (SC)
Black	Hensarling	Rigell
Blackburn	Holding	Roby
Bonner	Hudson	Roe (TN)
Boustany	Huelskamp	Rogers (AL)
Brady (TX)	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (KY)
Bridenstine	Hultgren	Rogers (MI)
Brooks (AL)	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Brooks (IN)	Hurt	Rokita
Broun (GA)	Issa	Rooney
Buchanan	Jenkins	Ros-Lehtinen
Bucshon	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Ross
Calvert	Jordan	Rothfus
Camp	Joyce	Royce
Cantor	Kelly (PA)	Ruiz
Capito	King (NY)	Runyan
Carter	Kingston	Ryan (WI)
Cassidy	Kinzinger (IL)	Salmon
Chabot	Kline	Sanford
Chaffetz	Labrador	Scalise
Coble	LaMalfa	Schock
Coffman	Lamborn	Schweikert
Cole	Lance	Scott, Austin
Collins (NY)	Lankford	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	Latham	Sessions
Cook	Latta	Shimkus
Cotton	LoBiondo	Shuster
Cramer	Long	Simpson
Crawford	Lucas	Sinema
Crenshaw	Luetkemeyer	Smith (MO)
Cuellar	Lummis	Smith (NE)
Culberson	Maffei	Smith (NJ)
Daines	Marchant	Smith (TX)
Davis, Rodney	Marino	Southerland
Denham	Massie	Stewart
Dent	Matheson	Stivers
DeSantis	McCarthy (CA)	Stockman
DesJarlais	McCaul	Stutzman
Diaz-Balart	McClintock	Terry
Duffy	McHenry	Thompson (PA)
Duncan (SC)	McIntyre	Thornberry
Duncan (TN)	McKeon	Tiberi
Ellmers	McKinley	Tipton
Farenthold	McMorris Rodgers	Turner
Fincher	McNerney	Upton
Fitzpatrick	Meadows	Valadao
Fleischmann	Meehan	Wagner
Fleming	Messer	Walberg
Flores	Mica	Walden
Forbes	Miller (MI)	Walorski
Fortenberry	Miller, Gary	Weber (TX)
Foxx	Mullin	Webster (FL)
Franks (AZ)	Mulvaney	Wenstrup
Frelinghuysen	Murphy (FL)	Westmoreland
Gallego	Murphy (PA)	Whitfield
Garcia	Neugebauer	Williams
Gardner	Noem	Wilson (SC)
Garrett	Nugent	Wittman
Gerlach	Nunes	Womack
Gibbs	Nunnelee	Woodall
Gibson	Olson	Yoder
Gingrey (GA)	Palazzo	Yoho
Gohmert	Paulsen	Young (AK)
Goodlatte		Young (IN)

NAYS—176

Andrews	Braley (IA)	Carson (IN)
Bass	Brown (FL)	Cartwright
Beatty	Brownley (CA)	Castor (FL)
Becerra	Bustos	Castro (TX)
Bishop (GA)	Butterfield	Chu
Bishop (NY)	Capps	Cicilline
Blumenauer	Capuano	Clarke
Bonamici	Cárdenas	Clay
Brady (PA)	Carney	Clyburn
Cohen	Kaptur	Quigley
Connolly	Keating	Rahall
Cooper	Kelly (IL)	Rangel
Costa	Kennedy	Roybal-Allard
Courtney	Kildee	Ruppersberger
Cummings	Kilmer	Rush
Davis (CA)	Kind	Ryan (OH)
Davis, Danny	Kirkpatrick	Sánchez, Linda T.
DeFazio	Kuster	Sanchez, Loretta
DeGette	Langevin	Sarbanes
Delaney	Larsen (WA)	Schakowsky
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Schiff
DelBene	Lee (CA)	Schneider
Deutch	Levin	Schrader
Dingell	Lipinski	Schwartz
Doggett	Loebsack	Scott (VA)
Doyle	Lofgren	Scott, David
Duckworth	Lowenthal	Serrano
Edwards	Lowey	Sewell (AL)
Ellison	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Shea-Porter
Engel	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Sherman
Enyart	Lynch	Sires
Eshoo	Maloney, Carolyn	Slaughter
Esty	Maloney, Sean	Smith (WA)
Farr	Matsui	Speier
Fattah	McCollum	Swalwell (CA)
Foster	McDermott	Takano
Frankel (FL)	McGovern	Thompson (CA)
Fudge	Meeks	Thompson (MS)
Gabbard	Meng	Tierney
Garamendi	Michaud	Titus
Grayson	Moore	Tonko
Green, Al	Moran	Tsongas
Green, Gene	Nadler	Van Hollen
Grijalva	Napolitano	Vargas
Gutiérrez	Neal	Veasey
Hahn	Negrete McLeod	Vela
Hanabusa	Nolan	Velázquez
Hastings (FL)	O'Rourke	Visclosky
Heck (WA)	Owens	Walz
Higgins	Pascrell	Wasserman Schultz
Himes	Pastor (AZ)	Waters
Hinojosa	Payne	Watt
Honda	Perlmutter	Waxman
Hoyer	Peters (MI)	Welch
Huffman	Pingree (ME)	Wilson (FL)
Israel	Pocan	Wolf
Jackson Lee	Polis	Yarmuth
Jeffries	Price (NC)	
Johnson (GA)		
Johnson, E. B.		
Jones		

NOT VOTING—18

Campbell	Holt	Miller, George
Cleaver	Horsford	Pallone
Collins (GA)	King (IA)	Pelosi
Conyers	Lewis	Radel
Crowley	McCarthy (NY)	Richmond
Herrera Beutler	Miller (FL)	Young (FL)

□ 1749

Ms. BROWN of Florida and Mr. PAYNE changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. CHAFFETZ changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, I attended a meeting at the White House with the President of the United States. As such, I was unfortunately not able to be present for the following vote:

On final passage of H.R. 2879, had I been present, I would have voted ''nay.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I regret that a meeting at the Whtie House caused me to miss the first vote series on August 1, 2013. Had I been present, my intention was to vote as follows on the amendments to H.R. 1582, the Energy Consumers Relief Act: ''no'' on the Waxman Amendment, ''no'' on the Connolly Amendment, and ''yes'' on the Murphy (PA) Amendment. I would have voted ''no'' on the Motion to Recommit H.R. 1582 and ''yes'' on Passage on H.R. 1582. Further I would have voted ''yes'' on the previous question, ''yes'' on the combined rule for the REINS Act, Keep IRS Off Health Care Act, and the Stop Government Abuse Act. Finally, I would have voted ''yes'' on the passage of H.R. 1897, the Vietnam Human Rights Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 9 of House Resolution 322, H.R. 1541, H.R. 2579, and H.R. 2711 are laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. RES. 319

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H. Res. 319. It was put on that resolution inadvertently.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2783

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove the name of the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) as a cosponsor from H.R. 2783.

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

There was no objection.

REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT OF 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 367.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 322 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. 367.

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

□ 1757

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. 367) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law, with Mr. HULTGREN 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 Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Earlier this month, President Obama announced that he would, once again, pivot to the economy. The bottom line of his speech, after 4½ years of the Obama administration: ''We're not there yet.''

The President is right: we're not there yet. Economic growth is the key to job creation and recovery, but America's growth rate is historically anemic. From 2010 through 2012, it averaged barely 2 percent. In the fourth quarter of 2012, growth was just four-tenths of one percent.

In the first two quarters of this year, growth averaged only 1.4 percent according to the most recent estimates. These dismal figures translate into deep economic pain for America's workers and families.

The June 2013 jobs report showed an increase of 240,000 in the number of discouraged workers, those who have simply quit looking for a job out of frustration or despair.

The number of people working part-time, but who really want full-time work, passed 8.2 million. That represents a jump of 322,000 in just 1 month.

Worst of all, the truest measure of unemployment, the rate that includes both discouraged workers and those who cannot find a full-time job, continues to exceed 20 million Americans. That rate rose from 13.8 percent back to 14.3 in June.

America's labor force participation rate has fallen to levels not seen since the Carter administration. Median real household income, meanwhile, is 5 percent lower than in June of 2009, when the recession officially ended.

□ 1800

Median incomes are supposed to rise during economic recoveries, not fall. The Obama administration, however, has managed to buck the historical trend. Worse, median incomes remain 9 percent below the peak they reached in January 2008, before the financial crisis. The President is indeed right: we're not there yet. But what the President missed in his speech is that it is his administration's policies that are responsible for America still remaining so deep in this economic hole. To see how true that is one only has to look at the historical record.

The current recovery is the weakest on record in the post-World War II era. The contrast with the recovery Ronald Reagan achieved is particularly stark. Four-and-a-half years after the recession began in 1981, the Reagan administration, through policies opposite to the Obama administration, had achieved a recovery that created 7.9 million more jobs than when the recession began. Real per capita gross domestic product rose by $3,091. Real median household income rose by 7.7 percent.

Surely, the administration knows this. But instead of fixing the problem by changing its policies, the Obama administration knows only one response: double down, increase taxes, increase spending, and increase regulation.

The number of new major regulations the Obama administration has issued and plans to issue—generally, regulations with more than $100 million in impacts—is without modern precedent. Testimony before the Judiciary Committee this term and during the 112th Congress has plainly shown the connection between skyrocketing levels of regulation and declining levels of jobs and growth.

To make matters worse, it is increasingly the case that, when Congress refuses to enable the administration's flawed policies through legislation, the administration unilaterally issues new regulations to achieve an end run around Congress.

The REINS Act is one of the most powerful measures we can adopt to put an end to regulation that wrongheadedly imposes the administration's flawed policies on the American people. It achieves that result in the simplest and clearest ways—by requiring an up-or-down vote by the people's representatives in Congress before any new major regulation can be imposed on our economy.

Some say the REINS Act will mean an end to new major regulation, even when regulation is needed. But the REINS Act does not prohibit new major regulation. It simply establishes the principle: no major regulation without representation.

By restoring to Members of Congress, who are accountable to the American people, the responsibility for America's costliest regulatory decisions, the REINS Act provides Congress and, ultimately, the people with a much-needed tool to check the one-way cost ratchet turned by the Obama administration and Washington's regulatory bureaucrats.

I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) for introducing this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote for the REINS Act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 367, the REINS Act of 2013.

As I noted during our extensive debate in the Judiciary Committee on this bill, it reminds me of the movie ''Groundhog Day.'' I feel like Bill Murray. It's that day over and over again. We come back to the same bill.

We extensively debated this bill in the last Congress; we debated bills very similar to it in this Congress; and, again, we're here debating this bill, which, by any sensible measure and probably a civics student in the 10th grade or less would know that this is a seriously flawed bill that will impede legislation and hurt the American public. It's based on a premise that regulations by themselves stifle job creation, a rather unique concept that we have come to debate in our committee and now on the floor.

H.R. 367 threatens to undermine vital protections that ensure the safety and soundness of the entire range of societal needs, from food safety to clean air and clean water, to workplace safety, to consumer product safety, to financial stability. It does this by bringing most important Federal rulemakings—including those that protect the public like the Affordable Care Act and the implementation thereof, as well as the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform Act aimed at keeping us back from the catastrophic days back in 2008 or 2009 when the world was coming to an end because of derivatives—it takes the implementation of these bills to a screeching halt, a result that will put at risk the well-being of millions of Americans, both from fiscal health and physical health.

The REINS Act would require that both Houses of Congress pass and the President sign a joint resolution of approval within 70 legislative days before a major rule can take effect. In the House, a committee of jurisdiction would have but 17 legislative days to consider a joint resolution of approval, after which it would automatically be discharged from the committee and sent to the full House—certainly not enough time to do a good job of reviewing the regulations. The House must consider such a resolution either on the second or fourth Thursday of every month, assuming that the House is even in session on that Thursday.

The bill also defines a ''major rule'' as one having at least a $100 million economic impact or having one of a number of other economic impacts. In all, Federal agencies issue about 50 to 100 major rules every year. That means that if the REINS Act had become law this year, there would only be 5 days left in 2013 for the House to consider 50 to 100 major rules. And while the other side loves gas, as we've seen with the farm bill and THUD, they can't pass it.

Given those traps set forth in the bill, no major rule would ever go into effect. This, in turn, threatens agencies' ability to protect Americans' health, safety, and well-being. It's a way of stifling the opportunity to protect Americans.

Another concern with the REINS Act is the influence of industry lobbyists over rulemaking would tremendously increase. K Street would love it. Given the complexity of the rules at issue and the expedited timeframe for congressional consideration, Members would instead be bombarded with visits, phone calls, and talking points from industry lobbyists, who would no doubt

take advantage of the REINS Act's short-circuited process to shape Members' views about a particular rule, probably within days of a major fundraiser.

On top of all the problems with this bill, it is simply unnecessary. First, to the extent that its proponents are concerned with Congress's accountability for agency rules, there are already numerous tools at our disposal to shape agency rulemaking. For example, Congress can rescind or limit its delegation authority to an agency if an agency acts beyond what we intended. Congress can also disapprove a rule under the Congressional Review Act process, defund enforcement of a rule or an agency through its appropriations and authorization power, overturn specific rules through legislation, and conduct regular oversight activity.

Second, to the extent that the REINS Act's proponents claim that the bill is necessary because the Obama administration has inundated the country with costly regulations, the facts simply do not bear this out. Just because you say ''Obama'' doesn't mean it's bad. Most Americans like Obama. He's been elected President twice.

In an op-ed that appeared in the Memphis Commercial Appeal, Doyle McManus cited Cass Sunstein, former director of OIRA, known as the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, who noted that in President Obama's ''first 4 years in office, he has issued fewer new Federal regulations than any of the four Presidents who came before him, including Ronald Reagan.''

Moreover, the op-ed noted that this President has revoked ''hundreds of outmoded rules that produced savings for government, business, and consumers that will add up to billions.''

Congress has already considered and rejected congressional approval schemes in the past. For instance, Chief Justice John Roberts—not exactly a flaming liberal—criticized legislation that was similar to the REINS Act back in 1983 when he was an associate White House counsel. In a memorandum, he objected that such legislation would ''hobble agency rulemaking by requiring affirmative congressional assent to all major rules'' and would ''seem to impose excessive burdens on the regulatory agencies.''

So before Chief Justice Roberts saved the ACA, he spoke out on this legislation as well in giving us wise counsel.

Finally, the broader premise underlying the REINS Act—that regulation stifles economic growth and job creation—is simply false.

It's pretty incredible that the proponents of antiregulatory bills like the REINS Act continue to make this claim in light of the fact there's absolutely no credible evidence establishing the fact that regulations have any substantive impact on job creation. But do not just take my word for it. Listen to some respected Republicans and conservatives.

Bruce Bartlett, a senior policy analyst in the Reagan and George H.W. Bush administrations, said:

> Republicans have a problem. People are increasingly concerned about unemployment, but Republicans have nothing to offer them. The GOP opposes additional government spending for jobs programs and, in fact, favors big cuts in spending that would likely lead to further layoffs at all levels of government. These constraints have led Republicans to embrace the idea that government regulation is the principal factor holding back employment. They assert that Barack Obama unleashed a tidal wave of new regulations, which has created uncertainty among businesses and prevents them from investing and hiring.

He concludes:

> No hard evidence is offered for this claim. It is simply asserted as self-evident and repeated throughout the conservative echo chamber.

It's as if you say it enough, people will believe it.

On the related argument that regulations create business uncertainty, Mr. Bartlett has said:

> Regulatory uncertainty is a canard invented by Republicans that allows them to use current economic problems to pursue an agenda supported by the business community year in and year out. In other words, it is a simple case of political opportunism, not a serious effort to deal with high unemployment.

That was Bruce Bartlett from the Reagan and George H.W. Bush days.

Susan Dudley, who headed the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs during the administration of George W. Bush, has been quoted as saying that it is ''hard to know what the real impacts of regulation are.'' She also stated that she was unaware of any ''empirically sound way to assess the impact that proposed rules have on jobs.''

During one of the many hearings held on this issue in the last Congress, the majority's own witness clearly debunked the myth that regulations stymie job creation. Christopher DeMuth, with the conservative American Enterprise Institute, stated in his prepared testimony that ''the focus on jobs . . . can lead to confusion and regulatory debates'' and that ''the employment effects of regulation, while important, are indeterminate.''

The REINS Act is seriously flawed in its very conception and based on false premises that regulation kills jobs. Ultimately, it will only serve to needlessly heighten risks to the health and safety—financial and physical—of the American people. I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in opposition to H.R. 367, which I feel confident will pass this House and meet a timely death before it gets to see the light of day in the Senate.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, at this time it is my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 367, the REINS Act.

Some of my Democrat friends want to characterize this bill as an antiregulation bill. But a vote for the REINS Act isn't a vote against regulations. It's a vote for better regulations. It's a vote in favor of a smarter regulatory system. It's a vote to balance broad economic interests against the narrow jurisdiction of individual Federal agencies. It's a vote to give the people most affected by regulations a louder voice in the democratic process.

Yesterday, the White House threatened to veto this bill if it passes. In their veto threat, they wrote:

> Maintaining an appropriate allocation of responsibility between the two branches is essential to ensuring that the Nation's regulatory system effectively protects public health, welfare, safety, and our environment, while also promoting economic growth, innovation, competitiveness, and job creation.

I couldn't agree more. That's exactly why I introduced this bill in January. For those, like me, who are truly concerned about maintaining an appropriate allocation of responsibility between the two branches, regardless of who occupies the White House, it's worth noting the executive branch only derives its power and only invokes its responsibility to issue a given legislation when the legislative branches authorize it to do so, and only in accordance with legislation passed by Congress.

However, this ''allocation of responsibility'' has been thrown out of whack because Congress has taken to the habit of passing sweeping, ambiguous laws that leave it to Federal agencies to sort out the details. This is typically done for the purpose of rushing bills through Congress in order to meet a political timetable or because certain Members would prefer to avoid working through the controversial details. It's much easier to leave such decisions to unaccountable rulemakers, after all.

ObamaCare is a great example of this phenomenon. As the minority leader said when she served as Speaker:

> We have to pass the bill so you can find out what is in it.

It turns out that's exactly the case. They had to pass the bill so HHS, the IRS, and our veritable alphabet soup of Federal agencies could tell us how the law would actually work. In fact, we still don't know exactly what's in the bill because we're still waiting on more regulations.

□ 1815

If the REINS Act were in place, none of the major regulations that are issued for ObamaCare or other sweeping laws would take effect until Congress approved them. This would make our regulatory process smarter for a number of reasons—chiefly, because we currently regulate in silos.

Now, when HHS employees are drafting a regulation about health insurance, for instance, they narrowly focus only on insurance. They aren't too worried about economic growth. If the IRS is drafting a regulation on tax collection, they are likely to focus narrowly on taxes. They don't take much

into account job losses and income effects.

We need a Congress that can comprehensively look at these things, a body that can, in the words of the White House, ''protect public health, welfare, safety, and our environment, while also promoting economic growth, innovation, competitiveness, and job creation,'' all at the same time.

So as we learn what's actually in ObamaCare and other laws, why is it such a bad idea to ensure that individual, rank-and-file Americans get to weigh in, through their elected representatives, on the important details that impact their pocketbooks, consume their time, and govern countless aspects of their daily lives?

The truth is it's not a bad idea. In fact, I predict Congress would take the time to more thoroughly and publicly deliberate about these large ambiguous bills if the regulators didn't get the final say. In the end, we would end up with better, clearer legislation in a diminished role for unelected rulemakers. More Americans could stay engaged in the entire lawmaking process and could voice their concerns in a meaningful way. And politicians would be unable to hide behind so-called ''unelected bureaucrats'' because the American people could ultimately hold Congress accountable for the rules coming out of Washington.

I implore my colleagues to join me in restoring a measure of accountability to the democratic process. Support this bill.

The CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROTHFUS) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 22. Concurrent Resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and an adjournment of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT OF 2013

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to set the frame for where we are.

What we're asking is for all major rules and regulations to have to be approved by both the House and the Senate and signed by the President before they would ever go into effect. That message is one of the few things we can agree on—the Senate agreed on the time we can adjourn. That's about what we agree on. Seventeen bills have made it through here in 7 months, and we're talking about 50 to 100 major rules. Not gonna happen.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my friend from Tennessee, and I thank him for his able leadership on this bill.

Listening to our friends on the other side of the aisle, I urge them all to reread Upton Sinclair's ''The Jungle,'' because that's where you would take us. You would take us to a world in which there was no Federal oversight of the food supply in America, there was no oversight of child labor in America, there was no oversight of workplace safety in America. And tragedies ensued.

America's water, America's air is cleaner, more breathable, and healthier today precisely because of regulation. The narrative that all regulation is burdensome—it only entails a cost, it never entails a benefit—is absolutely false and needs to be rejected by this body.

Sadly, Mr. Chairman, it is once again shaping up to be a lost summer for Congress as a number of issues ripe for debate—not this one—will be left to wither on the vine as Members leave town for the next 5 weeks. That's frustrating, after this year began with so much promise.

I was pleased to be part of a bipartisan coalition that voted for the New Year's Day deal to avert the fiscal cliff. A few weeks later, that same bipartisan coalition banded together to provide emergency aid to communities ravaged by Superstorm Sandy. Thankfully, our success didn't stop even there. We came together again on a bipartisan basis to reaffirm the strong support for the Violence Against Women Act after it had languished in this body because leadership refused to compromise.

At that point, people were actually beginning to wonder if the 113th Congress had finally gotten the message—that the American people want us to work together to get things done, not to just make cheap political points. But sadly, that progress was not sustained.

The first fissure appeared after the Senate's adoption of its first budget in nearly 4 years. I guess my friends on the other side of the aisle, the House Republicans, who had repeatedly beat up on the other Chamber for not doing its job with respect to the budget, are still dumbfounded that they in fact did pass one because it's been 4 months and they still have yet to appoint Members to the conference committee they claim they wanted.

Then the Senate managed to pass bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform. Our Republican colleagues may talk a good game on immigration, but that's all they've done so far here in the House. Not one of the bills in their piecemeal approach has come to this floor for consideration.

And just recently, House leaders allowed extreme partisanship to not only derail what was originally a bipartisan farm bill, but to also cast aside a critical safety net that was founded on a bipartisan basis in both the Senate and the House decades ago to protect families who need help putting food on the table.

The list of unfinished business continues to grow as we enter the final days of summer, but where is the urgency to resolve them? I was puzzled to see House Republicans bring up a so-called ''jobs'' bill that once again provided less infrastructure funding than we did the previous year in what was called the T-HUD appropriation bill. Of course it wasn't a surprise they had to pull it from the floor in the face of bipartisan opposition. Their parting shot of this week will be the 40th attempt to repeal part or all of ObamaCare. That's 40.

When we return from this ill-timed recess, Congress will have just 9 legislative days to reach a deal on keeping the government open for business beyond the end of the fiscal year, and by that time we're going to be bumping up against the debt ceiling. We actually managed a bipartisan accord to suspend that debt ceiling earlier this year, but we haven't been able to rekindle that spirit of cooperation.

Mr. Chairman, the American people aren't taking 5 weeks off like we are, and neither should this Congress. We can't afford another lost summer.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, at this time it's my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law.

Mr. BACHUS. The gentleman from Fairfax, Virginia, has just told us that we have avoided the fiscal cliff. I wonder if our children and grandchildren can take any comfort in that. I had no idea that the deficit and the debt had gone away. I had been told they were increasing by billions of dollars every day.

We have another difference of opinion across the aisle. Our colleagues are saying we need more Federal regulations—those that are covered by this bill that cost $100 million or more. We on this side of the aisle think that we could do well with a few less more regulations. Yes, every President has added regulations, every administration—and we're supposed to say that that is a good thing?

Regulations today cost $11,000 per American worker. Now, that's not taxes; that's not your Social Security; that's not their expense. That is just the Federal regulations. Fourteen percent of our national income, according to Dr. Douglas Holtz-Eakin, our former Congressional Budget Office director, 14 percent of our national income is being absorbed by Federal regulations.

Now, the gentleman from Tennessee says there were all these regulations before, and the Obama administration, they passed very few regulations. Well, not according to Dr. Holtz-Eakin. He

actually says that in the last 4 years, the Obama administration has added over a half-trillion dollars worth of new regulations. Boy, so it may be Groundhog Day, but we're another half-trillion dollars deeper in Federal regulations.

But let's talk about one family. Let's talk about one family and what regulations mean to them. One regulation caused American families to pay $20 more for a bronchial dilator. That was despite the fact that in 1987, in Montreal, there was an accord. And the reason is, the FDA said we're not going to allow an ozone-depleting substance to come out of these bronchial dilators, so they banned it. And immediately, in 2008, the cost of these bronchial dilators went from $6 and $8 up to as much as $30. Well, you know what the effect of that was? Let me tell you what The New York Times said. The New York Times described this as a rough transition to new asthma inhalers because several million Americans suddenly were paying $20 more and some couldn't afford it.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BACHUS. Some couldn't afford it, I'll say to the gentleman from Virginia, the gentleman from Georgia, and the gentleman from Tennessee. Several million Americans were suddenly being forced—some elderly, some children—to pay $20 more for what had been a $7 or $10 item. And you know what happened? A lot of them couldn't afford it, and there were more asthma attacks and there was more bronchitis, and emphysema increased. That was despite the fact that in Montreal, in 1987, there was an accord that said, number one, that substance in a medical inhaler was essential and was excepted from the accord because the ozone was improving, number one. But number two, even if you banned all non-industrial discharges of ozone-depleting substances—all of them—it wouldn't do any good; it would have an insignificant effect. And of the non-industrial discharges, the amount from medical inhalers was infinitesimal. We denied millions of Americans an essential health item.

Mr. COHEN. Before I yield to Mr. JOHNSON, I would say that I could respond to some of the statements that the gentleman from Alabama made, but I won't do it because I have the highest respect for him. He's one of the finest Members of this House.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 367, the REINS Act.

I have profound concerns with the REINS Act. This bill would undermine the ability of agencies to protect the public interest. It is a continuation of the majority's obstructionist approach that led to sequestration.

This deregulatory train wreck threatens to send us back to the days before the Wall Street collapse, a financial catastrophe that could have been avoided by responsible policies. This bill comes from the same brain trust that pulled the bill for transportation funding yesterday. Apparently, $4.4 billion in budget cuts is not good enough for these Republicans.

And now we consider the REINS Act, a bill that would require Congress to have the final say on regulations. Stop and think about that. The same House Republicans that could not vote to fund transportation now want to have the final say on all major rules. Never mind that Congress already has that power under the Congressional Review Act. Never mind that House Republican leadership tried this same maneuver in 2011.

□ 1830

If Republican leadership truly believed in growing the economy and creating jobs, we would have come together with a grand bargain long ago. We could even vote on job-creating legislation to strengthen the middle class. But instead, this Republican Congress insists on voting on a messaging bill that will go absolutely nowhere. Few Americans are surprised by yet another Republican leadership failure that has become par for the course.

Mr. Chairman, millions of Americans are still out of work. As we go back to our districts over the recess, I hope my Republican colleagues can look into the eyes of the poor and the unemployed in their communities and say: ''Don't worry, I voted for a messaging bill to deregulate America.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, at this time, it's my pleasure to yield 2 minutes on this job-creating legislation to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH), a great new member of the House Judiciary Committee,

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 367, the REINS Act of 2013.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform and a cosponsor, I am pleased to see a good reform bill like REINS come to the floor. Regulations impose hundreds of billions of dollars—in fact, trillions of dollars—on family farmers and small businesses, which significantly affect our economy and job creation in southeast Missouri.

Businesses and individuals face an uncertain regulatory future, and this gives them pause as they seek to start or grow their businesses to encourage economic growth and create jobs. The REINS bill adds just a little more certainty to the process. It allows these individuals to hear about regulations and give input to Congress before they vote up or down on an agency rule.

As I travel across Missouri, I always run into business owners, family farmers, and individuals who have felt the sting of government and their overreach, with the over 170,000 pages of rules and regulations affecting their lives. The ''pie in the sky'' regulations here in D.C. have real effects back home. The voice of the American people through their elected representatives should be the determining factor in government regulation, not that of a beltway bureaucrat.

I urge adoption of the REINS Act.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes and 53 seconds to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to oppose this misguided piece of legislation, which would erect new obstacles and red tape to protecting American lives.

At the outset, let me just reiterate what Mr. COHEN said earlier in his opening remarks, which is that Congress already has the power to disapprove any rule through the Congressional Review Act, through the appropriations process, and through other authorizing legislation.

H.R. 367, let's face it, is essentially an attempt to impose a procedural chokehold on protecting American citizens. I want to talk about one of those proposed rules, which is now pending at OSHA, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, which is a rule to prevent the continuing litany of workplace fire and explosions from combustible dust.

Unfortunately, the Rules Committee didn't see fit to allow an amendment offered by Representative GEORGE MILLER to exclude that rule from the underlying bill. It has been abundantly clear for a decade that Federal regulatory action is needed to prevent combustible dust explosions and fires.

In 2003, the Chemical Safety Board found that protections to stop these explosions were grossly inadequate. The Board identified hundreds of other combustible dust fires and explosions, causing at least 119 fatalities and 715 injuries over the last 15 years.

The investigators themselves are not alone in demanding action. Tammy Miser of Kentucky testified before Congress recently about how her brother Shawn was killed in a metal dust fire at an aluminum wheel plant in Huntington, Indiana, in 2003. She told us how he was left lying on a smoldering floor after the explosion while aluminum dust burned through his flesh and muscle tissue. And each breath caused his internal organs to be burned even more.

Shawn wasn't the first to die at work this way, and he hasn't been the last. It has been more than 5 years since the Imperial Sugar explosion in Georgia, an explosion that killed 14 workers. It caused hundreds of millions of dollars in damage because an unchecked accumulation of sugar dust ignited and caused a chain of explosions, leveling the plant.

These workplace explosions have not stopped. There have been 49 major combustible dust fires or explosions that have killed 18 and injured 131 workers since Imperial Sugar.

More recently, five workers were killed in three separate events at a factory north of Nashville because an iron powder processing plant failed to abate repeated dust hazards. Each of the five left behind a wife and child; one had four children under 11, another became a grandfather the day before he was killed.

Widows have called on their government to protect them, and that's where OSHA comes in. In 2009, OSHA finally started work on a rule to reduce the risk of these explosions. There will be small business panels, risk assessments, public hearings, and plenty of opportunities for comments.

Despite the clear need to move forward, this bill would give special interests a new way to block needed protections, and they are already lining up to kill a rule they dislike.

The sad truth is that the underlying bill is nothing more than an effort to put the powerful above the lives and limbs of working families and their widows.

I urge my colleagues to vote down this bill.

If I have another few seconds, I just want to say we are now hours away from a 5-week recess. 640,000 DOD civilian employees are looking at Congress, asking why they should be furloughed for the next 8 weeks, losing 20 percent of their pay, some of whom are doing critical work for our national security, and yet not once in the over 200 days since this Congress was sworn in, has the governing majority brought a bill to this floor to turn off sequester and make sure that these people who are doing critical work for our national security can do their job. That's what we should be focused on. We should cancel the recess, turn off sequester, and end the endless debate about bills that are headed nowhere.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the REINS Act.

The REINS Act is needed, frankly, because for decades now Congress has abdicated its responsibility for lawmaking to unelected Federal elites in the executive branch. They often create overbearing regulations that stifle innovation, reduce productivity, prevent businesses from growing and adding jobs, and increase prices on everything from gasoline to groceries. Don't get me wrong; some regulations are good and necessary, but they come with substantial cost, and there is not enough accountability for them.

I would look forward to voting for good regulations, and I would think my colleagues across the aisle would also look forward to voting for good regulations and taking credit for them. At this moment, however, the Obama administration has regulations in the pipeline that could cost the American people more than $50 billion. The Competitive Enterprise Institute estimates the regulatory burden to be almost $15,000 a year per family. Another study estimates that just six EPA regulations will cause the loss of almost 10 million jobs.

These rules are written by unelected elites with very little accountability to individual citizens across my district in western Pennsylvania, from Ellwood City to Lower Burrell to Somerset.

The REINS Act requires your elected representatives to be more accountable for regulations. Very simply, if the regulations will cost Americans more than $100 million, then Congress has to vote on it. Good regulations will be approved, and others will not. But your representative will have to declare a position, and you can hold them accountable for their votes.

Mr. Chairman, the REINS Act makes sense to me, it makes sense to my constituents in western Pennsylvania, and I encourage my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time is remaining on each side?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 11½ minutes. The gentleman from Tennessee has 10½ minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA).

Mr. ROKITA. I thank the chair for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the REINS Act, and I rise in support of the man who introduced it, my friend and colleague from Indiana, Mr. YOUNG.

I want to start out by addressing something the gentleman from Tennessee debated and talked about just a little bit earlier. He said that ''we don't get anything done here.'' I would like to take some opposition to that.

Just this week, we solved in a permanent fashion, Mr. Chairman, the student loan situation. We didn't do it with Democratic-inspired price fixing; we tied it to the market. Now, it's true it was very much a Republican bill when it left this House, then it was wisely adopted by the Senate in agreement last week, and it came back over here for a final vote 99 percent the same as it left. That's getting something done. That is real.

But let's take the gentleman's point a little bit further. Let's say sometimes we don't get something done; let's say sometimes we don't agree. The gentleman's solution is to let the unelected, unaccountable, nameless, faceless bureaucrats handle it, who aren't directly elected by anybody.

That is an abdication of the constitutional duty of this House, of this branch of government. It is our duty to make the laws; it is our duty to make the rules. And not only is it our duty to debate and pass legislation—hopefully not every time with our names on it—but it's also our constitutional duty to oversight the executive branch. That's exactly what the REINS Act acts to do.

How dare we decide we don't want to address, we don't want to tackle the big issues, Mr. Chairman, because they're too controversial; let the bureaucrats do it. That's not the way to run a government, that's not a way to run this branch of government, and that's not the way to run this House.

It's time this body starts doing its second and equally important constitutional duty, and that is oversight of the executive branch. The REINS Act, again, helps us do that in large measure. For that reason, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. COHEN. I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Houston, Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), home of Archie Bell and the Drells.

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for his distinguished leadership and friendship, and the chairman of the full committee, because I believe that it is fair to have a difference of opinion. It is also fair to say that there are times when we have a great opportunity to work together.

I believe the gentleman mentioned my tenure on the Judiciary Committee, so let me document for my colleagues: the REINS Act goes around and around and around and around. It is constantly repeated and reintroduced, and it constantly fails.

For the new Members, my friends on the other side of the aisle who are standing up and talking about what a great impact this would have, they are using old data and misinterpretation, for there is no real documentation that the REINS Act is going to stop $1.5 trillion in excess cost. In fact, the authors of the study that my friends are using—the study was assessed by the Congressional Research Service.

I know when I speak to the American people and my colleagues they want to debunk all of this procedure and say ''enough is enough.'' But the CRS showed that the study was flawed, but more importantly, the author said: ''We never intended for this to determine benefits to regulation. Our studies have nothing to do with it.''

We cannot document the $1.5 trillion or the billions of dollars that our friends say that they're going to lose. They know full well that there is a procedure of disapproval that Congress can respond to the needs and the questions of the American public.

□ 1845

What they do not tell you is that this procedure—oh, I hate to talk about it. Please let me apologize. If you hear it, your eyes will roll back in your head, for what has to happen now is that the agency is doing its work. The DOD, Health and Human Services, the Department of Education are doing their work under existing law. They are trying to work on clean air and clean

water, safe toys, safe cars, and safe workplaces.

By the way, I offered an amendment to exempt children's regulations for babies who are 2 and under, and I was denied by the majority, by the Republican Rules Committee, so that babies who need safe cribs and toys now have to have this happen. Unless both Houses of Congress pass a joint resolution—let me tell you how long that might take—2 years, 3 years, five sessions, who knows—and then such rule within a fixed 70-legislative-day period, it kicks over into the next Congress. In the meantime, babies' heads are driven through cribs.

Those of us who are mothers know that era. It hasn't stopped. Each time, you have to look at the technology of cribs—or of toys that they choke on—and be able to discern how newborns are impacted. The Consumer Product Safety Commission can't effectively put a regulation in. Mothers understand that. Can you imagine a resolution of two Houses of Congress? Right now, we can't even get a budget resolution going forward.

I will tell you what the American people want us to do. It's not the REINS Act, which goes around and around. I think it was in the 112th Congress and in the 111th Congress. We are now in the 113th, and we will do it in the 114th. It does not save money. The American people want a solution-based budgeting process. They want us to go back to the budget reconciliation. They want us to stop laying off, as my good friend from Connecticut said, hardworking Defense workers, hardworking Homeland Security workers, hardworking Department of Education workers, who are trying to help this country be better. They want us to reduce the deficit. I will raise my hand for that. That is a good thing. They want us to create jobs, and they want us to be fair to the middle class.

I come from Texas. One of the worst disasters ever to occur was in West, Texas—the tragedy and the devastation of the loss of our fellow Americans in an explosion that should not have happened. What was the cry? What was the Federal Government doing? What was the regulatory scheme in order to prevent whatever ignited that terrible tragedy to see the loss of first responders?

The Federal Government is an umbrella on a rainy day. Fix the problems of regulation one by one. If there is one that is undermining small businesses, we are happy to do the disapproval process, and you can be assured that the voices of the American people will cry out. I can tell you that there is no proof—no legitimacy, no documentation—but anecdotal stories of, I hate the Federal Government. I don't hate the Federal Government. I pledge allegiance to this great flag and to this great Nation. I love my country. Therefore, I understand that it is the umbrella on a rainy day.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. COHEN. I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlelady in order to explain the fallacies of this bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the distinguished gentleman for his kindness.

Mr. Chairman, the reason we had to reassess the Army Corps of Engineers and have a regulatory scheme is that we lost almost 1,000-plus individuals in Hurricane Katrina. It wasn't the hurricane that had come through; it was the dam that broke. I know it well because I walked those streets of the Ninth Ward, and I saw the babies' shoes and the clothing hanging on closets and the whole area that was literally destroyed and that killed 1,000 people.

It's the regulatory structure of what kind of oversight was given, what regulatory structure the Army Corps was working under, what oversight they gave, what the regulation period was in which they had to review these kinds of structures around America. Then people wanted us to get in and get something accomplished. So I am just perplexed that there is no evidence whatsoever that this will create jobs, and it does not answer, by any means, how this government can work better.

I started to say to the gentleman from Tennessee that we all love this country—we pledge allegiance to the flag in our schools and in this body—and I wish my friends on the other side of the aisle would find some other way that we could work together. They talk about Obama administration regulations. My friends, they have been submitting this over and over again. These regulations have been carried forward from the Bush administration. This is not from the Obama administration.

Let me close by saying that I want clean air, that I want clean water, that I want our babies to be safe in their cribs and playpens. I am appalled that they put this legislation on the floor as something new when this is as old as Methuselah and, I might say, has limited value. As we would say in Texas, it's something that would be very doubtful. I'll leave it at that because we usually talk Texan in Texas, and I'm not there now.

What I will tell you is that we have ways of explaining how things are not relevant. This is not relevant, and it does not equate to a State legislature at all. This is for the United States of America. You cannot put the REINS Act in place and talk about jobs. I simply ask that we defeat this bill and pass these amendments that have been offered by Democrats, who want to make sure that we address the question of the American people.

I leave this podium by saying to the gentleman from Tennessee: Is it ludicrous to place as a responsibility of the Congress a 70-day window for two Houses to pass a resolution when we did not and were not able to pass a student loan effort for months and months, which, by the way, was made better by Senate Democrats? Is it reasonable?

Mr. COHEN. It is not reasonable.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, since 1996, the disapproval process described by the gentlewoman from Texas has succeeded just one time. During that time, tens of thousands of regulations have been passed; and if people think that all but one of them were just fine, I would suggest it's just the opposite. It's the process right now—the inability of the Congress to rein in regulations that are out of control—which is lacking, and that's why we need the REINS Act, so that regulations that cost more than $100 million come back to the Congress for approval.

It is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD), a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee and the vice chairman of the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chairman, I want to address, too, what my colleague from Houston, Texas, just said.

I love clean air, clean water, safe working places as much as she does; but we've got a government now that, instead of working with the people and with industry, is working against them. The trust in our government is at an all-time low. Scandal after scandal is plaguing the government. We have got to get people who are accountable in charge of those regulations, not unelected bureaucrats who are writing regulations that only in the history of the Review Act have been overturned one time. Ergonomic furniture was the only time that was able to work.

What I want to talk about is the Constitution.

The Constitution granted this body—the House of Representatives—and our colleagues across the Capitol, the Senate, the legislative power in this country to write laws and make rules that the American people must abide by. Now, for a variety of reasons, past Congresses have delegated this part. I mean, it makes sense. I don't know how many parts per billion of whatever substance in water is safe and what isn't. I don't know how many feet high a barrier needs to be to keep our workers safe. We've given this authority to our regulatory agencies. Yet, under this President in particular—and even under past Presidents—these agencies have seized that power and have written more and more burdensome regulations that go beyond the intent of this body.

Before we burden the American people with expensive, burdensome and intrusive regulations, the American people have a right to have their elected officials vote on it. This is how we are starting to reclaim some of the power that past Congresses have given away and are bringing it back to where our Founding Fathers rightfully intended—

into the Halls of Congress. This is a rational way to do it.

Washington works best under pressure. We give ourselves a deadline. If there is a bad rule that comes up under the REINS Act, we will get to it. We will approve it if it's good, and we will disapprove it if it's bad. That's our job. That's what we were sent here to do and, with our salaries, what we are paid to do.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CONAWAY). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. It is my pleasure to yield an additional minute to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to wrap up by saying that this really is a problem. Elected officials are not making the rules. There is no accountability, and it's going to be hard for us to do it. This is the first step in bringing the power back to the people and to their elected Representatives. The REINS Act is a commonsense way to hold government accountable and to start to rebuild that trust that the American people have lost in Washington, D.C. That is what is good for America, and I urge my colleagues to support the REINS Act.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I would reserve what few precious minutes and seconds I may have left, and I would like to be informed of how many precious minutes and seconds I have.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding and for bringing this bill forward.

Mr. Chairman, I am a strong supporter of the REINS Act. If you look at why we are bringing this bill forward, it is because of the onslaught of radical regulations that have been coming from this Obama administration for the last 4½ years.

Every time I go back home and talk to small business owners in my district, the biggest impediment that they tell me they have to creating more jobs—the biggest impediment—is the rules and regulations coming down from the Federal Government. If you look at what the REINS Act does, it doesn't stop those rules and regulations. It just says, if these rules and regulations are so important and have a $100 million impact on our economy, shouldn't they come before Congress and have to state their cases? I mean, what are you so afraid of in coming before the public body and having transparency?

President Obama said he was going to be the most transparent President ever. Yet he has got these bureaucrats who want to go behind closed doors and come up with rules and regulations. We have had hearings on some of this stuff, by the way, and they talk about things that are going to save kids' lives and things that are going to improve the quality of our air. We have had hearing after hearing in which the rules that they come up with have absolutely nothing to do with improving the quality of people's health.

What it has to do with is ramming through a radical agenda that they can't pass through Congress, and if Congress can't pass it—the publicly elected body of the United States Government—then you shouldn't go through the back door and have some unelected bureaucrat try to ram that through on this country and cause a devastating impact on jobs.

There have been over 130 different major rules under the Obama administration having a $70 billion impact on families in this country. With that $70 billion of impact that's going to cost families more money for food, for energy—for everything they do—shouldn't they have to come before the public bodies here in Congress and state the case? If it's such a good rule, what are they afraid of? Why don't they want that transparency?

It's because they don't want the transparency. They want to ram through the radical agenda, and the REINS Act just puts a stop to the unelected bureaucrats from doing it.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I believe all of the speakers on our side have spoken. I reserve the right to close, and at this time, I await the gentleman's actions. Then I will be happy to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, we have had a good discussion on this bill. Indeed, it is ''Groundhog Day'' as we have had it so many times. We've just gone around and around.

It is amazing that this body, which I am so proud to serve in, has popularity ratings amongst the American public of less than 10 percent because of the ineffectiveness of the House to work with the Senate and get anything done. Yet here we are, trying to give this body more power over the safety and health—fiscal and physical—of the American public.

One of the gentlemen spoke and said, I don't know how tall something has to be—a dam. I don't know.

Of course he doesn't know. You leave it to the experts. We pass laws. We instruct the agencies to come up with reasonable rules and regulations because they know how to build dams and know how to have airplanes that you can get off of in case of a crash and save people's lives and how to have fire-retardant seats and deal with other safety issues. There are abundant safety issues for the American public.

This is a bad idea. It is an idea that will not create jobs. It will hurt the American public. It will hurt safety and possibly our financial safety as well because it could impede Dodd-Frank from going in to protect the American public from future financial doom like we almost saw in 2008 with derivatives here in this Congress.

So I would ask that we vote ''no,'' that we protect the American public, and that we respect the system that we have had for so many years for safety and health.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1900

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

A year and a half ago, the President of the United States came to give his State of the Union address here in the House Chamber and stood at the podium just below where you're standing right now. He had a long list of legislative items he wanted the Congress to pass. At the conclusion of it he said, If you don't do it, I will. I'm paraphrasing, of course. The question that many of us had was: By what authority in the United States Constitution does the President of the United States have the ability to do something that he has come to the Congress to ask to be passed legislatively and to tell us, if we don't do it, he's going to do it himself in the executive branch?

Well, the way he does it, when he's not stopped by lawsuits and other means, is he simply has regulations passed to accomplish those objectives. You know what? Thousands of regulations are passed every Congress compared to a few hundred laws that are passed. All we're asking here today is that for those regulations that cost the American people $100 million or more, that they have to come back here and be approved by the Congress rather than have executive fiat control that.

This is the representative democracy here in the House of Representatives and in the United States Senate. This is the people's House. We have the authority to pass laws, and we definitely are concerned about the welfare and well-being of our American people. But when we add trillions of dollars in costs to the expenses of American families, $11,000 per family, that's a stunning thing to think about what money could have been spent on other things. Yes, of course, some of those regulations are necessary, but many of them are not. Many of them needlessly add cost and create an ever-growing bureaucracy in the executive branch. We need to have ways to rein that in.

The most effective way to do that is to start with the largest regulation. Many people would say, well, we should do it for all regulations. That ought to be our objective, to make it very clear that we do not want to see regulations passed that are ineffective, that are needless, that add costs. Starting with those that cost more than $100 million, it is absolutely appropriate for the elected representatives of the people to have the final say on whether those

regulations are, indeed, what the Congress intended when they passed the underlying laws upon which those regulations are based. That's all we ask in this legislation. It is reasonable. The American people want it. This Congress should pass it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chair, I strongly support of the REINS Act.

The American people today face an onslaught of unnecessary Federal regulations. From the President's health care law to the never-ending list of EPA rules, government regulation has become a barrier to economic growth and job creation.

Congress hears from employers daily about the threat of Federal regulations to their businesses. These employers are rightly concerned about the cost of compliance that regulations impose on their businesses. Overly burdensome regulation diverts limited money and resources away from business investment and expansion to meet the government's demands. This harms the ability of business owners to create more jobs and boost local economies. That should motivate us to take action today.

Rather than halt its efforts to expand government, the administration seeks to use the regulatory agencies to accomplish what it cannot get approved by Congress. The REINS Act ensures that Congress has the final say over whether Washington will impose major new regulations on the American economy. Specifically, the bill establishes a procedure for Congress to approve all new major regulations proposed by the administration.

The President himself has expressed the risks that excessive regulations pose to our economy. He has called for reviews of existing regulations to provide relief. He has also made a commitment to make the regulatory process more transparent. However, the President has failed to deliver on these promises. Instead, the Obama administration has proposed four times the number of major regulations than the previous administration over the same time period.

It is time for Congress to reverse this harmful trend in overregulation. The REINS Act holds the administration accountable for its unjustified regulatory assault on job creators. It guarantees that Congress, not unelected bureaucrats, will be the final arbiter of all new major regulatory costs.

The American people want job creation and economic growth, not more regulation. The REINS Act reins in out-of-control Federal regulations that burden the economy.

I thank Mr. YOUNG of Indiana for introducing this important legislation and I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for taking up the REINS Act.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, as an administrator and policymaker at the local, state, and federal levels, I have often seen the value of common-sense regulations that save lives. I have also seen the challenges associated with cumbersome regulations that are difficult to navigate. However, in my experience, regulations tend to be less stringent than necessary rather than overly strict. There are ways to make regulation more efficient and easier to navigate, but we must do so in a way that protects public health, maintains our environmental protections, and ensures fair market interactions.

For the second time in less than two years, today Congress is considering H.R. 367, the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act. I oppose this legislation, as I did in 2011, and urge my colleagues to vote against it. This bill is an attack on our government's basic ability to enforce laws that protect public health and the environment. Every major law requires enforcement by the executive branch of government, and enforcement requires agencies to write regulations that explain and make public how that agency is going to enforce the law. This is how legislation is implemented. This bill would require both the House and the Senate to vote on every major regulation before that regulation can be enforced, providing only seventy days to do so. This allows Congress to effectively veto any legislation we have already passed, simply by taking no action and keeping agencies from moving forward with implementation. Agencies will not be able to enforce new laws or complete updates to regulations as required by existing laws, such as the Clean Air Act.

We do not need to extend Congress's dysfunction to the rest of the federal government. I strongly oppose H.R. 367 and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I rise today as a proud original cosponsor of H.R. 367, the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny—or REINS—Act.

Far too much authority has been delegated to federal agencies, leading to a lack of accountability and massive Executive overreach through regulation. According to current procedure, major rules promulgated by agencies take effect unless Congress passes and the President signs a joint resolution disapproving them under the Congressional Review Act. The Obama Administration has abused this process time and time again to bypass the legislative branch to regulate what it cannot legislate, with $50 billion in new rules proposed this year alone and the overall cost of the current regulatory burden coming in at $1.8 trillion.

At a time when nearly 12 million Americans are searching for work, the Obama Administration continues to burden the economy with cumbersome, bureaucratic regulations that harm small businesses and hamper economic growth. To make matters worse, this Administration has made a habit out of ignoring the legal obligation to transparency in the regulatory process. The constant flow of regulations has led to uncertainty and a lack of oversight, and Americans deserve a government that is truly accountable to the people.

Mr. Chair, H.R. 367 would restore Congressional accountability by requiring Congress and the President to approve major rules—those with an impact on the economy of more than $100 million—before they can be enforced, thereby allowing a means to stem the flow of unnecessary, complex, and ineffective regulations. Congress has the right and responsibility to exercise rigorous oversight over the rulemaking process to ensure that we reduce needless and excessive regulatory burdens, protect current jobs, and promote future growth. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 367.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 367, the ''Regulations from the Executive in Need of Need of Scrutiny Act.''

Without question, this bill will have dangerous consequences for all Americans by creating an unworkable approval process that will make it nearly impossible for many new regulations to go into effect.

It does this by imposing impossibly unrealistic deadlines by which Congress must consider and pass exceedingly complex and technical regulations in order for such regulations to take effect.

Under H.R. 367, Congress would have only 70 legislative days within which to act after it receives a major rule.

Now, let us put this in some perspective. Over the past few years, the average number of major rules promulgated each year is about 85.

In 2010, for instance, 94 major rules were issued. But keep in mind the following fact: there were just 116 legislative days in the House during 2010.

Worse yet, the bill restricts the days on which these major rules may be considered in the House, which—for last year—would have been just 10 days.

Assuming there is just an average number of major rules, the House would have to consider an average of 8 separate major rules on each of those days.

And, if the REINS Act were to become law today, there would be only 5 days left in 2013 on which the House could consider the merits of major rules.

Under H.R. 367, there is just no way Congress could possibly have the time to consider all the major rules issued during the year.

And, if Congress fails to act within this mandatory time frame, the regulation cannot be considered until the next Congress.

Even Chief Justice John Roberts criticized a prior iteration of the REINS Act back in 1983. He said that such legislation would ''hobbl[e] agency rulemaking by requiring affirmative Congressional assent to all major rules'' and would ''seem to impose excessive burdens on the regulatory agencies.''

The bottom line is that the bill would at least significantly delay rulemaking and at worst bring it to a halt.

Avoiding undue delay in rulemaking is important because strong regulation is vital to protecting Americans in nearly every aspect of their lives.

According to the Government Accountability Office, if the REINS Act were in effect now it would delay or possibly derail at least 32 major proposed regulations issued this year and 68 such rules issued last year.

Among other things, these proposed regulations pertain to:

reimbursement rates for end-stage renal disease Medicare providers;

payments to primary care physicians under the Vaccines for Children Program;

various Federal student loan programs;

the Justice Department's National Standards to prevent, detect, and respond to prison rape;

meal requirements for the National School Lunch Program under the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010;

the Transportation Department's Certified Medical Examiners National Registry;

Labor Department Standards for H–2B Aliens in the United States;

the subsistence allowance for veterans under the Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment Program; and the Patent and Trademark Office's proposal setting and adjusting patent fees.

And, this is just a small sample of the many kinds of protections that the REINS Act would jeopardize. I could go on and on.

This explains why nearly 70 consumer groups, environmental organizations, labor unions, and other entities, strenuously oppose this bill.

Likewise, the Administration issued a strongly worded veto threat against this bill. It warns that H.R. 367 ''would delay and, in many cases, thwart implementation of statutory mandates and execution of duly-enacted laws, create business uncertainty, undermine much-needed protections of the American public, and cause unnecessary confusion.''

Finally, H.R. 367 will give anti-regulatory interests yet another opportunity to derail rulemaking.

Major rules are the product of an intensive, multi-year process, based on extensive input received from the public and affected entities through a notice and comment period.

Agencies often spend many months, if not years, to perfect theses rules based on feedback from these sources and their own expertise.

Under the bill's short-circuited process, however, Congress will not realistically be able to second-guess the merits of these rules.

Instead, we in Congress will be bombarded with visits, phone calls, and talking points from industry lobbyists and well-funded special interests that can use every resource available to persuade us of the validity of their views.

Superficially, it may seem like a good idea to make Congress the final arbiter of all significant regulatory decisions. After all, Members of Congress are elected and regulators are not.

But realistically, we simply lack the expertise and resources to make the requisite prudential decisions about the bona fides of these rules, particularly given the limited time frame we have to act under the bill.

An example of how this legislation would work:

I recently introduced H.R. 2480, the Nurse and Health Care Worker Protection Act of 2013, which would require the Occupational Safety and Health Administration to promulgate a regulation that protects our caretakers from debilitating injuries. Nursing professionals and health care aids have among the highest rates of back, neck, and shoulder injuries of any profession, due to the trauma of lifting, supporting, and repositioning patients. Through a straightforward regulation that promotes safe patient handling practices, including the use of mechanical devices, this regulation could save, millions of dollars each year, and countless years of experience.

Now even if the House and Senate pass H.R. 2480 and the experts with OSHA develop the proper standards to prevent these debilitating injuries, under the REINS Act, any resulting regulations would have to be assessed by Congress and voted on in a short time frame. Let's be honest, who in this body know about ergonomics and the technical aspects of a nurse's day to day job?

Accordingly, I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this seriously flawed bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Congress adopted the current system over a hundred years ago because it recognized the necessity of assigning the job of crafting appropriate regulations to the scientific, economic, legal, and other experts in agencies. The REINS Act is an extreme departure from current procedures designed only to stymie the development of regulations with which the industry does not want to comply.

The current system of administrative agencies of the federal government began more than 100 years ago, and developed through the 20th century. It was codified in its present form in the Administrative Procedures Act. The REINS Act guts this precedent, and replaces it with insurmountable hurdles.

Congress already has the power to stop regulations if extreme circumstances dictate under the Congressional Review Act. The REINS Act requires agencies to submit new final rules to Congress for review, delaying the effective date of those rules to permit Congress to block them, and establishes a fast-track process for legislation proposed to overrule a regulation.

The bill would make it virtually impossible for an approval resolution to pass because it does not entirely prohibit a filibuster. Since the bill does not clearly prohibit a filibuster in the Senate, more specifically it does not prohibit a filibuster on a motion to take up a matter, it would empower a few, or even one Senator, to block regulations.

The legislation gives Congress a short 70-day window to approve a regulation, and if either chamber fails to do so during that time period, the regulation is deemed to have been rejected, and Congress is barred from subsequently voting to approve the regulation or one ''substantially similar'' to it for the remainder of that Congress. The 70-day requirement will make it next to impossible for any regulations to be approved.

Resolutions approving regulations would first have to be cleared by committees. The vast majority of bills introduced in Congress die in committee, and there is no reason to believe that new regulations wouldn't suffer the same fate.

Claims about so-called ''job-killing'' regulations are a fabrication, a reiteration of the same doomsday rhetoric that has been used to oppose virtually every major step forward for health and safety. In actuality, the REINS Act is about giving representatives of industry more opportunities to kill regulations they find inconvenient, posing a great detriment to public safety and health.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill, as modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 113–187, shall be considered read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 367

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 ''Regulations From the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to increase accountability for and transparency in the Federal regulatory process. Section 1 of article I of the United States Constitution grants all legislative powers to Congress. Over time, Congress has excessively delegated its constitutional charge while failing to conduct appropriate oversight and retain accountability for the content of the laws it passes. By requiring a vote in Congress, the REINS Act will result in more carefully drafted and detailed legislation, an improved regulatory process, and a legislative branch that is truly accountable to the American people for the laws imposed upon them.

SEC. 3. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING.

Chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''CHAPTER 8—CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING

''§ 801. Congressional review

''(a)(1)(A) Before a rule may take effect, the Federal agency promulgating such rule shall submit to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General a report containing—

''(i) a copy of the rule;

''(ii) a concise general statement relating to the rule;

''(iii) a classification of the rule as a major or nonmajor rule, including an explanation of the classification specifically addressing each criteria for a major rule contained within sections 804(2)(A), 804(2)(B), and 804(2)(C);

''(iv) a list of any other related regulatory actions intended to implement the same statutory provision or regulatory objective as well as the individual and aggregate economic effects of those actions; and

''(v) the proposed effective date of the rule.

''(B) On the date of the submission of the report under subparagraph (A), the Federal agency promulgating the rule shall submit to the Comptroller General and make available to each House of Congress—

''(i) a complete copy of the cost-benefit analysis of the rule, if any;

''(ii) the agency's actions pursuant to sections 603, 604, 605, 607, and 609 of this title;

''(iii) the agency's actions pursuant to sections 202, 203, 204, and 205 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995; and

''(iv) any other relevant information or requirements under any other Act and any relevant Executive orders.

''(C) Upon receipt of a report submitted under subparagraph (A), each House shall provide copies of the report to the chairman and ranking member of each standing committee with jurisdiction under the rules of the House of Representatives or the Senate to report a bill to amend the provision of law under which the rule is issued.

''(2)(A) The Comptroller General shall provide a report on each major rule to the committees of jurisdiction by the end of 15 calendar days after the submission or publication date. The report of the Comptroller General shall include an assessment of the agency's compliance with procedural steps required by paragraph (1)(B) and an assessment of whether the major rule imposes any new limits or mandates on private-sector activity.

''(B) Federal agencies shall cooperate with the Comptroller General by providing information relevant to the Comptroller General's report under subparagraph (A).

''(3) A major rule relating to a report submitted under paragraph (1) shall take effect upon enactment of a joint resolution of approval described in section 802 or as provided for in the rule following enactment of a joint resolution of approval described in section 802, whichever is later.

''(4) A nonmajor rule shall take effect as provided by section 803 after submission to Congress under paragraph (1).

''(5) If a joint resolution of approval relating to a major rule is not enacted within the period provided in subsection (b)(2), then a joint resolution of approval relating to the same rule may not be considered under this chapter in the same Congress by either the House of Representatives or the Senate.

''(b)(1) A major rule shall not take effect unless the Congress enacts a joint resolution of approval described under section 802.

''(2) If a joint resolution described in subsection (a) is not enacted into law by the end of 70 session days or legislative days, as applicable, beginning on the date on which the report referred to in section 801(a)(1)(A) is received by Congress (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), then the rule described in that resolution shall be deemed not to be approved and such rule shall not take effect.

''(c)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section (except subject to paragraph (3)), a major rule may take effect for one 90-calendar-day period if the President makes a determination under paragraph (2) and submits written notice of such determination to the Congress.

''(2) Paragraph (1) applies to a determination made by the President by Executive order that the major rule should take effect because such rule is—

''(A) necessary because of an imminent threat to health or safety or other emergency;

''(B) necessary for the enforcement of criminal laws;

''(C) necessary for national security; or

''(D) issued pursuant to any statute implementing an international trade agreement.

''(3) An exercise by the President of the authority under this subsection shall have no effect on the procedures under section 802.

''(d)(1) In addition to the opportunity for review otherwise provided under this chapter, in the case of any rule for which a report was submitted in accordance with subsection (a)(1)(A) during the period beginning on the date occurring—

''(A) in the case of the Senate, 60 session days, or

''(B) in the case of the House of Representatives, 60 legislative days,

before the date the Congress is scheduled to adjourn a session of Congress through the date on which the same or succeeding Congress first convenes its next session, sections 802 and 803 shall apply to such rule in the succeeding session of Congress.

''(2)(A) In applying sections 802 and 803 for purposes of such additional review, a rule described under paragraph (1) shall be treated as though—

''(i) such rule were published in the Federal Register on—

''(I) in the case of the Senate, the 15th session day, or

''(II) in the case of the House of Representatives, the 15th legislative day,

after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes; and

''(ii) a report on such rule were submitted to Congress under subsection (a)(1) on such date.

''(B) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to affect the requirement under subsection (a)(1) that a report shall be submitted to Congress before a rule can take effect.

''(3) A rule described under paragraph (1) shall take effect as otherwise provided by law (including other subsections of this section).

''§ 802. Congressional approval procedure for major rules

''(a)(1) For purposes of this section, the term 'joint resolution' means only a joint resolution addressing a report classifying a rule as major pursuant to section 801(a)(1)(A)(iii) that—

''(A) bears no preamble;

''(B) bears the following title (with blanks filled as appropriate): 'Approving the rule submitted by _____ relating to _____.';

''(C) includes after its resolving clause only the following (with blanks filled as appropriate): 'That Congress approves the rule submitted by _____ relating to _____.'; and

''(D) is introduced pursuant to paragraph (2).

''(2) After a House of Congress receives a report classifying a rule as major pursuant to section 801(a)(1)(A)(iii), the majority leader of that House (or his or her respective designee) shall introduce (by request, if appropriate) a joint resolution described in paragraph (1)—

''(A) in the case of the House of Representatives, within three legislative days; and

''(B) in the case of the Senate, within three session days.

''(3) A joint resolution described in paragraph (1) shall not be subject to amendment at any stage of proceeding.

''(b) A joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be referred in each House of Congress to the committees having jurisdiction over the provision of law under which the rule is issued.

''(c) In the Senate, if the committee or committees to which a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has been referred have not reported it at the end of 15 session days after its introduction, such committee or committees shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of the resolution and it shall be placed on the calendar. A vote on final passage of the resolution shall be taken on or before the close of the 15th session day after the resolution is reported by the committee or committees to which it was referred, or after such committee or committees have been discharged from further consideration of the resolution.

''(d)(1) In the Senate, when the committee or committees to which a joint resolution is referred have reported, or when a committee or committees are discharged (under subsection (c)) from further consideration of a joint resolution described in subsection (a), it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

''(2) In the Senate, debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 2 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

''(3) In the Senate, immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in subsection (a), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

''(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

''(e) In the House of Representatives, if any committee to which a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has been referred has not reported it to the House at the end of 15 legislative days after its introduction, such committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution, and it shall be placed on the appropriate calendar. On the second and fourth Thursdays of each month it shall be in order at any time for the Speaker to recognize a Member who favors passage of a joint resolution that has appeared on the calendar for at least 5 legislative days to call up that joint resolution for immediate consideration in the House without intervention of any point of order. When so called up a joint resolution shall be considered as read and shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered to its passage without intervening motion. It shall not be in order to reconsider the vote on passage. If a vote on final passage of the joint resolution has not been taken by the third Thursday on which the Speaker may recognize a Member under this subsection, such vote shall be taken on that day.

''(f)(1) If, before passing a joint resolution described in subsection (a), one House receives from the other a joint resolution having the same text, then—

''(A) the joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee; and

''(B) the procedure in the receiving House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House until the vote on passage, when the joint resolution received from the other House shall supplant the joint resolution of the receiving House.

''(2) This subsection shall not apply to the House of Representatives if the joint resolution received from the Senate is a revenue measure.

''(g) If either House has not taken a vote on final passage of the joint resolution by the last day of the period described in section 801(b)(2), then such vote shall be taken on that day.

''(h) This section and section 803 are enacted by Congress—

''(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such is deemed to be part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a joint resolution described in subsection (a) and superseding other rules only where explicitly so; and

''(2) with full recognition of the Constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as they relate to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

''§ 803. Congressional disapproval procedure for nonmajor rules

''(a) For purposes of this section, the term 'joint resolution' means only a joint resolution introduced in the period beginning on the date on which the report referred to in section 801(a)(1)(A) is received by Congress and ending 60 days thereafter (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: 'That Congress disapproves the nonmajor rule submitted by the _____ relating to _____, and such rule shall have no force or effect.' (The blank spaces being appropriately filled in).

''(b) A joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be referred to the committees in each House of Congress with jurisdiction.

''(c) In the Senate, if the committee to which is referred a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has not reported such joint resolution (or an identical joint resolution) at the end of 15 session days after the date of introduction of the joint resolution, such committee may be discharged from further consideration of such joint resolution upon a petition supported in writing by 30 Members of the Senate, and such joint resolution shall be placed on the calendar.

''(d)(1) In the Senate, when the committee to which a joint resolution is referred has reported,

or when a committee is discharged (under subsection (c)) from further consideration of a joint resolution described in subsection (a), it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

''(2) In the Senate, debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

''(3) In the Senate, immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in subsection (a), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

''(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

''(e) In the Senate the procedure specified in subsection (c) or (d) shall not apply to the consideration of a joint resolution respecting a nonmajor rule—

''(1) after the expiration of the 60 session days beginning with the applicable submission or publication date, or

''(2) if the report under section 801(a)(1)(A) was submitted during the period referred to in section 801(d)(1), after the expiration of the 60 session days beginning on the 15th session day after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes.

''(f) If, before the passage by one House of a joint resolution of that House described in subsection (a), that House receives from the other House a joint resolution described in subsection (a), then the following procedures shall apply:

''(1) The joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee.

''(2) With respect to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) of the House receiving the joint resolution—

''(A) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House; but

''(B) the vote on final passage shall be on the joint resolution of the other House.

''§ 804. Definitions

''For purposes of this chapter—

''(1) The term 'Federal agency' means any agency as that term is defined in section 551(1).

''(2) The term 'major rule' means any rule, including an interim final rule, that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget finds has resulted in or is likely to result in—

''(A) an annual effect on the economy of $100,000,000 or more;

''(B) a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, or local government agencies, or geographic regions; or

''(C) significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets.

''(3) The term 'nonmajor rule' means any rule that is not a major rule.

''(4) The term 'rule' has the meaning given such term in section 551, except that such term does not include—

''(A) any rule of particular applicability, including a rule that approves or prescribes for the future rates, wages, prices, services, or allowances therefore, corporate or financial structures, reorganizations, mergers, or acquisitions thereof, or accounting practices or disclosures bearing on any of the foregoing;

''(B) any rule relating to agency management or personnel; or

''(C) any rule of agency organization, procedure, or practice that does not substantially affect the rights or obligations of non-agency parties.

''(5) The term 'submission date or publication date', except as otherwise provided in this chapter, means—

''(A) in the case of a major rule, the date on which the Congress receives the report submitted under section 801(a)(1); and

''(B) in the case of a nonmajor rule, the later of—

''(i) the date on which the Congress receives the report submitted under section 801(a)(1); and

''(ii) the date on which the nonmajor rule is published in the Federal Register, if so published.

''§ 805. Judicial review

''(a) No determination, finding, action, or omission under this chapter shall be subject to judicial review.

''(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), a court may determine whether a Federal agency has completed the necessary requirements under this chapter for a rule to take effect.

''(c) The enactment of a joint resolution of approval under section 802 shall not be interpreted to serve as a grant or modification of statutory authority by Congress for the promulgation of a rule, shall not extinguish or affect any claim, whether substantive or procedural, against any alleged defect in a rule, and shall not form part of the record before the court in any judicial proceeding concerning a rule except for purposes of determining whether or not the rule is in effect.

''§ 806. Exemption for monetary policy

''Nothing in this chapter shall apply to rules that concern monetary policy proposed or implemented by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or the Federal Open Market Committee.

''§ 807. Effective date of certain rules

''Notwithstanding section 801—

''(1) any rule that establishes, modifies, opens, closes, or conducts a regulatory program for a commercial, recreational, or subsistence activity related to hunting, fishing, or camping; or

''(2) any rule other than a major rule which an agency for good cause finds (and incorporates the finding and a brief statement of reasons therefore in the rule issued) that notice and public procedure thereon are impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest, shall take effect at such time as the Federal agency promulgating the rule determines.''.

SEC. 4. BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF RULES SUBJECT TO SECTION 802 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.

Section 257(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF RULES SUBJECT TO SECTION 802 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.—Any rules subject to the congressional approval procedure set forth in section 802 of chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, affecting budget authority, outlays, or receipts shall be assumed to be effective unless it is not approved in accordance with such section.''.

SEC. 5. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE STUDY OF RULES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to determine, as of the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) how many rules (as such term is defined in section 804 of title 5, United States Code) were in effect;

(2) how many major rules (as such term is defined in section 804 of title 5, United States Code) were in effect; and

(3) the total estimated economic cost imposed by all such rules.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to Congress that contains the findings of the study conducted under subsection (a).

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. SCALISE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 113–187.

Mr. SCALISE. 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 5, line 17, insert after the period the following: ''Moreover, as a tax on carbon emissions increases energy costs on consumers, reduces economic growth and is therefore detrimental to individuals, families and businesses, the REINS Act includes in the definition of a major rule, any rule that implements or provides for the imposition or collection of a tax on carbon emissions.''.

Page 20, strike lines 10 through 14, and insert the following:

''(2) The term 'major rule' means any rule, including an interim final rule, that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget finds—

''(A) has resulted in or is likely to result

Page 20, line 15, redesignate subparagraph (A) as clause (i).

Page 20, line 17, redesignate subparagraph (B) as clause (ii).

Page 20, line 21, redesignate subparagraph (C) as clause (iii).

Page 20, line 25, strike the period and insert ''; or''. Page 20, insert after line 25 the following:

(B) is a rule that implements or provides for the imposition or collection of a carbon tax.

Page 22, insert after line 8 the following:

''(6) The term 'carbon tax' means a fee, levy, or price on—

''(A) emissions, including carbon dioxide emissions generated by the burning of coal, natural gas, or oil; or

''(B) coal, natural gas, or oil based on emissions, including carbon dioxide emissions that would be generated through the fuel's combustion.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I bring this amendment forward on the REINS Act to simply prohibit the Obama administration from imposing a carbon tax on the United States. If they wanted to impose that kind of tax, they could not do it through regulation. Of course, we've heard the Obama administration, from President Obama to his EPA Administrator and others, talking about various forms of taxes on energy that they want to impose. Whether it's a carbon tax, whether it's a cap-and-trade-type scheme, they've continued to throw out that opportunity to impose that kind of radical regulation by themselves without action from Congress.

Clearly, as we talk about the REINS Act and we talk about any kind of regulation having over a $100 million impact on our economy, we want to make it very clear that any attempt to impose a carbon tax would fall under that same definition of ''major rule'' where they could not do it by regulation.

If you look at what's been studied on this issue—again, this idea of a carbon tax has been floating around for a while by the Obama administration. In fact, the National Association of Manufacturers, Mr. Chairman, did a study, and it's titled ''The Economic Outcomes of a U.S. Carbon Tax.'' Let me tell you, it's not pretty some of the things that they talk about in this study.

If the Obama administration had their way and imposed a tax on carbon, manufacturing output in energy-intensive sectors, for example, could drop by as much as 15 percent. We're talking real job losses that would come to this country.

What would it do to families in terms of energy costs? How would it affect them? In the same study, they say, just in the first year of a carbon tax, we would see an increase in the cost of natural gas by more than 40 percent, and the price of gasoline at the pump would go up by 20 cents a gallon. That's just in the first year of a carbon tax. It would have devastating impacts on our economy.

Clearly, if you look at what President Obama and his administration officials are doing and saying, they want to keep the door open to impose a carbon tax through regulation. This amendment says absolutely not.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, this is a bad amendment to a bad bill, so it's doubly bad.

This would take almost anything that protects the air, the water, the public from carbon emissions away from the opportunity of the EPA to protect us. Many cities, such as Houston, Texas, and L.A. and other cities, have problems with smog. They have programs that they have to put a price on pollutants that cause urban smog, and these programs are part of the State-approved implementation plans through the EPA to protect the air. They are improving the air quality in Houston and Los Angeles, but under this amendment, if Texas or California ever needed to change these programs, they wouldn't be able to do so. Los Angeles has had enough smog, so has Houston and the rest of the country, and we have to be able to have laws that effectively protect our air.

Public health programs are important, and the amendment would risk the ability of EPA also to have its sanctions that they put into place. Right now, EPA, to ensure civil enforcement procedures, they change their penalties every 4 years to keep up with inflation so they're effective deterrents. This would stop this from happening, and eventually the deterrents would be less than necessary to stop bad actors from engaging in risky behavior that causes harm to the environment and harm to humans.

We just saw in January that Transocean agreed to pay $1 billion to resolve Federal Clean Water Act civil penalty claims for the 3-month-long oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico, the BP there. BP also has got the same risk. If we don't allow the penalties to be adjusted for inflation, they won't have an effect. The sanctions won't deter bad actors. We saw it in the BP Deepwater Horizon explosion, and we see it as it applies to the Clean Water Act, Safe Drinking Water Act, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, and all those others.

The bottom line is this could have unintended consequences, but its intended consequence is to protect the oil industry from regulations and imperil the American public. This is a bad amendment to a bad bill, and I ask my colleagues to defeat it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, if I could go back to that National Association of Manufacturers study on the impact of a carbon tax, the gentleman from Tennessee might be interested in knowing that in Tennessee alone, in the first year of a carbon tax, household utilities would go up by 14 percent, and, in fact, they could experience job losses of up to 40,000 lost jobs just in the State of Tennessee in year one, with a 40 percent increase in their natural gas prices.

I wanted to point that out, and then yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia, Chairman GOODLATTE.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This is a good amendment to a good bill, and I support it.

By requiring all new major regulations to be submitted to Congress for approval, the REINS Act provides a powerful check on overreaching executive action. This check could not come sooner. The Obama administration increasingly, and increasingly openly, is pursuing unilateral regulatory action to thwart Congress' decision not to pass legislation the administration desires. This includes legislation that would impose a carbon tax as part of the administration's climate agenda.

The amendment guarantees that no carbon tax can be imposed unless Congress consents to it, no matter how much the Obama administration would like to impose such a dramatic tax by executive fiat. This is the people's House. This is where new public policy should be established, and this amendment is a good one to assure that this is where policy related to carbon taxes is made, not in the administration.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I'll just reiterate that this is a bad amendment to a bad bill. It basically puts the interests of special industry—the gas and oil industry, particularly—above the American public's health, clean air, and the environment. If you want to have an Earth that we can give to the next generation that's in as good a shape so that their lungs can survive in it, you won't be for this type of regulation, this amendment, or for this bill.

I ask us to vote ''no,'' and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I just want to point out that clearly the Obama administration must be very interested in imposing a tax on carbon through regulation. The fact that the opposition has objected to this and stated all of the reasons that they think a carbon tax should be imposed tells you that they are holding out for that opportunity.

Of course, if you look at the devastating impacts of a carbon tax—there are a lot of good studies out there. Again, I go back to the National Association of Manufacturers. It's a very respected national organization, people that stand up for American jobs. The report they did, entitled, ''Economic Outcomes of a U.S. Carbon Tax,'' is devastating.

Clearly, the administration wants to do this. If it's such a good idea, bring the idea to Congress; bring it through the House; bring it through the Senate. They could get their floor leaders in the Senate to bring it up tomorrow, but they don't want this kind of scrutiny.

Just the other day, the President was in Tennessee bragging about all these new jobs plans that he has; and while he was doing it, ironically, in another State, his new EPA Administrator was talking about climate change. In fact, she called climate change the ''opportunity of a lifetime,'' and that the EPA would continue to impose regulations

despite what we think here in Congress.

That's not the way the legislative process works. That's not the system of government our great Founders created. They said, if an idea is so good, bring it to the people's House; bring it to the Senate, and pass it that way. Don't try to impose it through radical regulation and devastate our economy.

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

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. SCALISE. This amendment would prevent the President and the EPA from bypassing Congress and imposing a devastating national energy tax that would affect every American.

Struggling Americans who have been unable to find a job or have not seen their paychecks grow would pay this national energy tax every time they pay their utility bills or fill up their gas tanks or go to the grocery store. It would also be another tax on manufacturers and another increased cost of doing business under the Obama administration.

House Republicans have been fighting to fix our broken tax code to make it simpler, fairer and flatter for American families and businesses. We cannot let the Obama Administration make an end run around the Congress' Constitutional responsibility for tax policy and use the regulatory process to impose a national energy tax that will cost trillions of dollars in economic growth and lost opportunities for hard-working Americans.

I urge my colleagues to support the Scalise amendment—to ensure tax policy starts where the Constitution's Framers intended—here in the people's House.

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

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

Mr. SCALISE. 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 Louisiana will be postponed.

□ 1915

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. RODNEY DAVIS OF ILLINOIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 113–187.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. 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 6, beginning on line 12, strike ''sections 804(2)(A), 804(2)(B), and 804(2)(C)'' and insert ''clauses (i) through (iii) of section 804(2)(A) or within section 804(2)(B)''.

Page 20, beginning on line 11, strike ''the Administrator'', and insert ''—''

''(A) the Administrator''.

Page 20, line 15, by redesignating subparagraph (A) as clause (i).

Page 20, line 17, by redesignating subparagraph (B) as clause (ii).

Page 20, line 21, by redesignating subparagraph (C) as clause (iii).

Page 20, line 25, strike the period at the end and insert ''; or''.

Page 20, insert after line 25 the following:

''(B) is made by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and that would have a significant impact on a substantial number of agricultural entities, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture (who shall publish such determination in the Federal Register).''.

Page 22, insert after line 8 the following:

''(6) The term 'agricultural entity' means any entity involved in or related to agricultural enterprise, including enterprises that are engaged in the business of production of food and fiber, ranching and raising of livestock, aquaculture, and all other farming and agricultural related industries.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer the bipartisan Davis-Peterson amendment, which helps address the disconnect between the EPA and the agricultural community. Under our amendment, EPA rules that have a significant impact on a substantial number of agricultural entities—as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture—would be considered ''major rules.''

Under the REINS Act, major rules need congressional approval. We view this as another way to give agriculture a stronger voice when it comes to EPA regulations. As I travel throughout the 13th District of Illinois and listen to farmers and producers, one of their top concerns is regulatory actions by EPA. Ag has been a bright spot in our economy. For every $1 billion in agriculture exports, more than 8,000 jobs are supported here at home. With USDA projecting $139.5 billion in ag exports for fiscal year 2013, American agriculture will support more than 1 million jobs.

This is a good story, and my colleagues and I on the House Agriculture Committee do our best to tell it. However, our farmers remain concerned that the EPA does not understand production agriculture. These are concerns we take very seriously. We aren't the only ones that see this problem; EPA recognizes it as well. Acting Administrator For Water, Nancy Stoner, told me when I asked her if her agency was aware of the disconnect between EPA and the agricultural community:

We are actively working with those groups to improve communication on issues as to which we have had some difficulties. And I will acknowledge that we have had some, and we are doing the very best we can to improve that situation.

This amendment provides a solution to the problem by allowing the Secretary of Agriculture to examine EPA regs and identify those that have a significant impact on a significant number of agricultural entities. The USDA must be included in these decisions and equipped with the authority to identify these rules. This agency understands farmers and works best with them on a daily basis. We believe this amendment would improve communication between EPA and the USDA.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

It would improve communication between the EPA and USDA, give agriculture a place at the table during the process, and ultimately result in getting government out of the way to allow our family farmers to do what they do best. I urge support of this bipartisan amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, again, this is just another amendment in another area in what's totally a bad concept. The basic concept is that any rule or regulation would have to go through a passage in both the House and the Senate and Presidential approval to become effective. And it would have to happen in committees only on Tuesdays or Thursday, and within 15 days they would have to pass it. Basically, this is creating a Rube Goldberg type of legislative mechanism that would thwart the creation of regulations and rules that protect the American public. That's just plumb wrong.

What this does is tries to gut the EPA, and I'm shocked that my good friends on the other side of the aisle would try to gut the work of one of their great Presidents, Richard Nixon. He served in this House, served in the Senate, and 4 years as vice president. I think he almost eked out 5 years, he had some kind of ethically challenged problem when he was President, but he did create the EPA. He did some good environmental things. I think those things should be standards for the Republican Party. They should hold up the EPA and remember Richard Nixon as one of their party standard bearers, one of the men who served probably the longest time in a major capacity as President and Vice President and Senate leader. And his work on the House Un-American Activities Committee—we can't forget that in this House. To forget Richard Nixon and to minimize his work, I am just amazed, because that's one of the great heroes on the other side of the aisle, I believe.

But the EPA is important. It was good work that he gave us, and it shouldn't be gutted. And to make these rules have to go through passage in the House and Senate, we know the House and the Senate don't get along. They mentioned we got the loan bill through. That's the first thing we've kind of done since we did the Violence Against Women and kind of saved the storm victims of Superstorm Sandy. We really haven't got much done. Oh, I forget, a couple of post offices, we

agreed on them. And maybe some coins for the Hall of Fame or something. But to get these major rules done, it wouldn't happen. And so we're jeopardizing the American public. I urge us to defeat this as a bad amendment to a bad bill. It is deleting the legacy of Richard Nixon.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I respect and thank the gentleman from Tennessee for his comments on Richard Nixon. However, I was not yet in kindergarten when Mr. Nixon served, so, therefore, I do not remember him creating the EPA, but I thank him for reminding me of that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois for offering this amendment. It is another good amendment.

I also want to say to my good friend from Tennessee that I was a little older when Richard Nixon was in office. We are not minimizing what he did; we are going to maximize the amount of attention that Congress pays to the EPA when they get it wrong, particularly when the Secretary of Agriculture determines that any regulation issued by the EPA will have a significant impact on a substantial number of agricultural entities. We ought to take a look at that. As a result, it subjects such regulations to congressional approval before they can become effective.

This is an important step to rein in what is often regarded as the most overreaching of all Federal regulatory agencies. The EPA's actions and proposals have been particularly problematic for America's farmers, including small farmers. This includes, for example, the EPA actions aimed at farm dust.

The Secretary of Agriculture has a greater incentive than EPA to ensure that potential adverse impacts on agricultural entities have been adequately and accurately assessed. The amendment guarantees that regulation that should be characterized as major due to their impacts on agricultural entities will be so characterized and submitted to Congress for approval.

I urge my colleagues to support this very worthy amendment.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I, too, was alive when Richard Nixon was doing his service, and I remember him getting on that helicopter, waving good-bye. There were regulations that made sure that he was able to get away from Washington and get home to California, and we need to make sure those regulations that might be impeded by this REINS Act are still in effect so that Presidents like him can make their escape.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I wonder, even though I don't remember Richard Nixon getting up and flying away, I wonder if the EPA would let that helicopter leave Washington, D.C., today.

But I have to tell you, this is a commonsense, bipartisan amendment that gives our farmers a stronger voice and a better place at the table when EPA is considering these regulations that impact the ag community.

And I want to thank Ranking Member PETERSON for supporting this effort as well. I urge my colleagues' support. I want to say thank you, Mr. Chairman, to my colleague from Tennessee for making this actually a lively debate tonight. And hopefully a few more viewers on C–SPAN are smiling this evening because of it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MISSOURI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 113–187.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. 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 6, beginning on line 12, strike ''sections 804(2)(A), 804(2)(B), and 804(2)(C)'' and insert ''clauses (i) through (iii) of section 804(2)(A) or within section 804(2)(B)''.

Page 20, beginning on line 11, strike ''the Administrator'', and insert ''—''

''(A) the Administrator''.

Page 20, line 15, by redesignating subparagraph (A) as clause (i).

Page 20, line 17, by redesignating subparagraph (B) as clause (ii).

Page 20, line 21, by redesignating subparagraph (C) as clause (iii).

Page 20, line 25, strike the period at the end and insert ''; or''.

Page 20, insert after line 25 the following:

''(B) is made under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Pub. Law 11–148).''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as I have traveled across the Eighth Congressional District of Missouri from my hometown of Salem to the Ozark Hills in Wright County, Douglas, Howell County, to the banks of the Mississippi River, one of the largest concerns that my constituents have is the uncertainty surrounding the Affordable Care Act.

Individuals are concerned about the relationship with their doctor and what their costs are going to be. Businesses are left with a tremendous uncertainty. They are understaffed because they are afraid to hire additional employees, and they're also firing employees just to fall below the 50 individual threshold.

The effects of the Affordable Care Act are adversely affecting health care and the jobs of folks all across this great country. That is why I'm offering my amendment to revise the definition of major regulations to include any regulation under the Affordable Care Act. With over 3,000 pages of Federal regulations already issued, and many more to follow, Congress must prevent this widely unsupported law from causing further damage to our health care system.

Mr. Chairman, there is broad bipartisan opposition to the Affordable Care Act. The administration has demonstrated its own certainty through the delays to several key provisions of the bill. Congress must assert its role in oversight and give the American people their voice back in government, away from the bureaucrats. My amendment does just that. I urge adoption of the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, this is a microcosm of this 113th Congress; the macro has been the 40th attempt coming up to repeal ObamaCare. This is a microcosm to try to defeat ObamaCare through a little regulation. It seems like the preoccupation that the other side has with what is one of the most important social safety network provisions passed by this House in history, Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid, and then the Affordable Care Act, is amazing. We've had 40 bills, and now this rule and regulation, to try to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act means your child can stay on your insurance unless they are 26 years of age. It means you can't have lifetime caps on your health insurance. It means you can't be denied coverage because of a preexisting condition. It means that being a woman doesn't classify you as having a preexisting condition. It says that certain care comes to you, like colonoscopies or mammograms, without a copay, and it means yearly annual checkups, which can detect disease early and save people's lives. It is a way to provide health care for at least 40 million people in this country who don't have health care.

And it has already been shown to drive down the cost of health care. For those States that have worked with us and that have exchanges, we have seen reductions in what was expected to be the cost of insurance from 25 to 30 to even 50 percent in different States. Health care costs are not rising at the rates that they were otherwise because of the fact that we passed the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

It's important that individuals get more community health centers, which come with this provision. Lots of people, particularly in my district, they

don't live near hospitals and doctors. They need community health centers, and community health centers have been funded and created to give people access to health care otherwise denied.

We are the last industrialized country on the face of the Earth to provide health care for its people, the last industrialized country to do so. That is one of the shames that we have tried to cure with this bill.

And this provision, this amendment to this REINS Act, would deny people that health care coverage. It would say if you have a preexisting condition, too bad, you don't get insurance.

As President Obama said, the Affordable Care Act is insurance reform on steroids. Do you want to have the health insurance industry have total control without regulations, without controls, then you want to defeat it. But the American public doesn't want that. They want their health care costs to contained, and they don't want the insurance companies to have total control. They like the idea of their children having insurance up to the time they're 26, and to have preventive care come without copays, not have yearly caps on your insurance or lifetime caps on your insurance benefits that can be paid out.

So this is a sad state that we've spent so much time in this Congress trying to deny people health care and save their lives.

So this is a bad amendment. I would ask us to defeat it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1930

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the fine gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I commend him and support this important amendment.

The REINS Act restores to Congress the accountability for regulatory decisions that impose major burdens on our economy. This amendment strengthens congressional accountability for regulations under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. You know, ObamaCare? That legislation that has 400 new authorities, 400 new ways for the Secretary of Health and Human Services and other bureaucrats to regulate the American people, businesses, large and small, local governments, State governments, health care providers?

Yeah, that one. Imposed over the will of the American people, implementation of ObamaCare has demonstrated that the act imposes a detrimental and unworkable reform of the Nation's health care system. And one after another, promises made to the American people by the act's supporters when the law was passed have been broken.

Moreover, the Obama administration's own actions to waive or suspend ObamaCare requirements have made clear that regulatory actions to implement the act form a ''seamless web.''

Too often, actions to avoid one adverse effect of the act's implementation send ripple effects of unfairness or other harmful consequences throughout the ObamaCare web, requiring adjustments to other aspects of implementation.

This, too, justifies the amendment's requirement that Congress approve any new regulation promulgated under the act, and I urge my colleagues to support this excellent amendment.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, what this shows is exactly what the situation is. You've got a majority in the House that's against the Affordable Care Act, and you've got a majority in the Senate that's for it.

To have any rules and regulations under it go into effect, the House and the Senate would both have to approve it, which means you could have one House, not both Houses, the way we work, it's a bicameral legislature and the House and the Senate have to work together and pass the bill to become law.

But one House, by not passing it, could kill it—one House veto. This Republican Congress could veto every single regulation under the Affordable Care Act.

And then preexisting conditions, no insurance. Lifetime caps, back in effect. Yearly caps, back in effect. Child's 23, nope, can't stay on dad and mom's policy anymore.

Get hurt, go broke. Too bad. That's just wrong.

And that's what this would do for any regulations. One House could veto and kill legislation. That's antithetical to the bicameral legislature.

That's just one of the many reasons why we should defeat this amendment, defeat the bill, and go on and try to pass a jobs bill, and kill sequester, and see that the National Institutes of Health, which is cut $1.6 billion by sequester, isn't cut.

That's our Department of Defense. They protect us from Alzheimer's, AIDS, heart disease, cancer, diabetes, Parkinson's. Those are the enemies. The National Institutes of Health is the Department of Defense, and we shouldn't be cutting $1.6 billion from them because we're all going to be victims.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, this is truly a jobs bill. When you're looking at over 170,000 pages of Federal rules and regulations that affect jobs, this amendment will help alleviate that.

As I've traveled across the Eighth Congressional District, I've had businesses, one after the other, that said they had 56 employees. Well, they were going to reduce those employees because of one piece of legislation that was passed out of this Chamber that Congress never even took the time to read until after they passed it, and yet they've even passed it.

The problem with the Affordable Care Act is it affects more than one-sixth of our Nation's economy; and because of the burdensome regulations that are being promulgated from the Affordable Care Act, businesses are scared to death to hire additional employees, and they are firing additional employees.

I have had restaurant owners in our district that have sold restaurants because they want to fall below the 50-employee mark.

Folks, this is a jobs bill. Less government regulation that is breaking the backs of small businesses is what we need to do to turn this country around.

Mr. Chairman, I ask this body to adopt this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. 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 Missouri will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. LATHAM

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 113–187.

Mr. LATHAM. 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 6, line 15, insert before ''intended to implement'' the following: ''taken by or that will be taken by the Federal agency promulgating the rule that are''.

Page 6, line 17, strike ''and'' at the end.

Page 6, after line 17, insert the following (and redesignate provisions accordingly):

''(v) a list of any other related regulatory actions taken by or that will be taken by any other Federal agency with authority to implement the same statutory provision or regulatory objective that are intended to implement such provision or objective, of which the Federal agency promulgating the rule is aware, as well as the individual and aggregate economic effects of those actions; and''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, while my amendment is very simple, it's aimed at addressing a very complex problem, the problem of duplicative and conflicting Federal regulations.

In the underlying bill, Federal agencies are required to submit, along with the rule they want Congress to approve, a list of other regulatory actions to implement the same statute or regulatory objective, in other words, Mr. Chairman, to actually investigate whether the regulations may be redundant.

It's not clear whether the requirement to list other regulatory actions applies only to the promulgating agency or other agencies. The amendment clarifies that this list must include related regulatory actions by any other Federal agency.

Earlier this year, the GAO delivered to Congress its third annual report on duplication in government programs, identifying 17 specific areas of fragmentation, overlap, and duplication where multiple programs and activities are creating inefficiencies.

Unfortunately, these inefficiencies result in regulatory duplication, heaping needless costs and paperwork on businesses at a time when our economy continues to struggle enough already.

A group run by former CBO Director Douglas Holtz-Eakin recently compiled information on regulations in the specific problem areas identified by the GAO, using the government database contained by the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs. This report found 470 related paperwork requirements, 642 million hours of regulatory duplication involving 990 Federal forms, and at least $20 billion in compliance costs to employees.

Take these examples:

We have three agencies issuing regulations on catfish inspections, at a cost of 2 million work hours and $146 million in compliance costs.

Ten different agencies handle Medicare forms submitted by health care providers, generating 486 million hours of paperwork and 281 different forms.

Nine different agencies administer higher education assistance programs, involving 66 Federal forms and duplication, resulting in 47 million hours of paperwork at a compliance cost of $3 billion.

Congress must act to eliminate or consolidate duplicate and inefficient programs; but in the meantime, agencies must at least acknowledge requirements imposed by other agencies working on the same issues and work to minimize burdens on our small businesses.

According to the Small Business Administration, it already costs American businesses at least $8,000 and often more than $10,000 per employee to comply with Federal regulations.

It's no wonder that the massive Federal regulatory regime is consistently cited as a roadblock to job growth and economic recovery. I believe this amendment will help clarify areas of overlap and highlight opportunities for reducing the compliance burden faced by American employers.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment because it would add yet another onerous and unnecessary burden on agencies and will further stifle agency rulemaking.

Among other things, the REINS Act requires that an agency issuing a rule submit reports to Congress and the GAO containing a list of related regulatory actions intended to implement the same statutory provision or regulatory objective as the rule at issue, together with the individual and aggregate economic effects of those actions.

This amendment would add to that list actions taken, or that will be taken, by Federal agencies other than the agency issuing the rule to meet the same objectives. Such a requirement means that an agency issuing a rule would now be obliged to survey the vast panoply of Federal agencies to determine what other actions are being taken by other agencies before it could issue a rule.

Congress did not create agencies, Mr. Chairman, to keep tabs on other agencies. This amendment would only serve to divert already limited agency resources away from protecting the American people.

This amendment is just a further effort to derail rulemaking. It's placing another burden on already limited agency resources and is really just busy work.

So for those reasons I rise in opposition.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I want to thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding, and I support his amendment.

Mr. Chairman, interrelated Federal regulations are a common feature of the modern regulatory landscape. Numerous major regulations form part of a web of regulations agencies develop to implement one statutory division or one statutory goal.

In addition, numerous regulatory statutes entrust rulemaking authority over a given problem to more than one agency. This is the case, for example, with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' joint authority over wetlands. It is also the case with the EPA's and the Department of Transportation's joint authority over fuel economy standards.

The amendment requires that agencies, when they submit new major regulations to Congress for approval, provide a list of related regulatory actions that the submitting agency or other agencies have taken or will take to implement the same statutory provision or regulatory objective. Seems pretty reasonable to me to have to find out what other regulations are impacting the same objective.

This helpful amendment will provide Congress with more complete information on the extent of regulations agencies have taken or plan to take to implement an authorizing statute or achieve a regulatory goal. That information will better enable Congress to determine whether to approve or disapprove the submitted regulation.

This can only improve congressional accountability and the regulatory process, and I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, in response, I would point out that with respect to interrelated regulations, different regulatory authorities have different regulatory objectives. And so, to require that one agency survey the other to see whether or not there are any similar or the same objectives, with no power or authority to decide to do away with a particular regulation, based on an objective that is no longer suitable, I think, is not something that this amendment allows for; and it's also something that agencies themselves are not equipped to do.

I agree that we need to have some mechanism whereby regulatory regulations can be looked at, modified, strengthened or weakened or done away with at any particular time. But this anti-regulatory legislation and this amendment will not accomplish that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time there is.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa has 15 seconds remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 1½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I will just obviously be very brief. But the gentleman was talking earlier about opposing this amendment because it creates busy work for the agencies.

What about the busy work of the small businesses to comply with these mountains and mountains of regulations?

And the previous speakers have said the biggest reason that people are not hiring today is because of the cost of regulations.

I would ask for this amendment to be passed.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1945

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. 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 Iowa will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 113–187.

Mr. SESSIONS. 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 6, line 24, insert before the semicolon the following: '', including an analysis of any jobs added or lost, differentiating between public and private sector jobs''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, tonight we engage this House to talk about some commonsense legislation that would, in fact, allow the American people and this Congress to understand more about rules and regulations as they are presented that the American people have to live under.

My amendment requires that an agency submitting a report on any proposed Federal rule include an assessment of anticipated jobs gained or lost as a result of the implementation of any rules that fit within the REINS Act.

This is very important, Mr. Chairman, because many times rules and regulations are implemented without regard for what the impact would be on the people who have to live under them. We believe this is common sense. We believe this happens in businesses every day. We're asking for a cost-benefit analysis of the impact of the rules that are written, combined with the impact that they would have upon job losses, whether it be the government or the free enterprise system.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment presupposes that regulations depress job creation. To the contrary, there's no credible evidence that regulations depress job creation.

The majority's own witness at one of our hearings clearly debunked the myth that regulations stymie job creation. Christopher DeMuth of the American Enterprise Institute, a conservative think thank, stated in his prepared remarks that the ''focus on jobs . . . can lead to confusion in regulatory debates.'' Also, he stated that ''the employment effects of regulation, while important, are indeterminate.''

Nonetheless, I appreciate that this amendment recognizes that regulations could create jobs. I am, however, concerned about this amendment because it would add to the analytical burdens of agencies a speculative assessment of jobs added and lost and how many of those jobs would be added or lost to the public and private sectors.

To the extent that regulations have anything to do with jobs, H.R. 367 proponents should overwhelmingly support my amendment, which is upcoming, which simply exempts from H.R. 367's congressional approval mechanism all rules that OMB determines would result in net job creation. This way, job creating rules would not effectively be vetoed, which would be the precise result under H.R. 367.

Also, instead of trying to make Congress a superadministrative agency, what we should be doing is considering actual job creation legislation. We also should be talking about how to help middle class families who are struggling financially.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. I thank the gentleman from Texas for the opportunity to rise in support of this important amendment and to rise in support overall of the REINS Act, a critical tool in the battle against overregulation, which is destroying jobs.

The gentleman from Georgia talked about whether or not regulations actually destroy jobs. Well, from my home State of Kentucky, I can tell you we've lost 5,700 coal mining jobs in east Kentucky as a result of this administration's overzealous overregulation of our coal industry.

Small business owners from across Kentucky continually tell me that they want to create more jobs and grow their businesses. They want to help put food on the table, gas in the tank, and more money in the pockets of Kentucky families, who are hurting under this administration's war on coal. But costly and burdensome regulations coming out of unaccountable Federal agencies are raising their cost of doing business, leading to higher prices for consumers, fewer jobs for workers, and weakened American competitiveness.

While Federal regulations wreak havoc on families in Kentucky, small businesses, and our overall economy, the unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats writing them are hiding behind the fact that they are not always required to fully analyze the impact their proposal will have on jobs.

If you want to know about the impact of these regulations on jobs, come to eastern Kentucky and see those lost jobs.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. In response, Mr. Chairman, I would say that the old ways of creating or producing energy—those ways that foul up our environment and pollute our air and water and cause health concerns to the people of this great Nation—those types of jobs, fortunately, yield to a brighter day of new renewable and clean forms of energy. That's a growth industry that, if this legislature could only see the brightness of the future, I think we would have a whole lot more jobs created as the jobs of the past recede into history.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, we see 25 million people struggling in this country as a result of that same attitude that the Democrat Party and the President has about having jobs go off into the past and looking to the future.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I would like to thank my colleague from Texas.

Mr. Chairman, I'm a proud cosponsor of this amendment. This is a commonsense amendment that brings to mind the irony that, yesterday, the President of the United States came to the Capitol to brief certain Members of Congress on the other side of the aisle about another phony jobs plan that he's putting forth at the same time his signature legislation, ObamaCare, is killing jobs in America.

This amendment would make sure that we measured how many jobs his phony jobs plan is going to create versus how many jobs ObamaCare is going to kill in this country. It is essential.

And forgive me, Mr. Chairman, for not having compassion for the bureaucrats who are going to be burdened by analyzing this information, when we have millions of Americans—hard-working taxpayers of this country—worried about keeping their own jobs and getting a new job.

Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment wholeheartedly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, ObamaCare is resulting in 30 to 40 million people having access to the health care system, and that's not going to create any jobs? When you're bringing that many people into the health care system, that's going to kill jobs? How many more doctors will be needed? Maybe 20,000 will be needed to accommodate and treat those people. How many nurses and medical care practitioners will we need to train in order to accommodate the growth in the health industry that ObamaCare brings about?

We have to use our common sense. ObamaCare is not going to result in job loss.

Mr. COHEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COHEN. I find it interesting that today we're talking about the country is in such danger because of ObamaCare and regulations and rules and all these other things President Obama has done, and the Dow Jones Industrial average almost hit an all-time high of 15,600 and change.

So somewhere something must be working. Thank you, President Obama. Keep going.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman is expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP).

Mr. WENSTRUP. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor, I rise in support of this important amendment to protect and promote job creation in both southern Ohio, where I'm from, and for this entire country.

Business owners and entrepreneurs currently live and work under an executive branch hostile to the free enterprise system and a President whose governing philosophy has been: You didn't build that.

Agencies like the EPA, Health and Human Services, and the Department of Education hand down new regulations with little regard for the real-world impacts. These bureaucrats do not care if jobs are lost, as long as their rules are enforced.

This amendment requires an analysis of how many jobs would be added or lost due to new regulations brought forth under this or any future administrations. This amendment also requires the distinction as to whether the jobs affected are government or private sector jobs.

This amendment further protects real-world businesses from bureaucrats who are often punitive rather than constructive and are often far removed from everyday economic realities.

I stand in support of this amendment.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, tonight, we've had three new first-term Members of Congress who have come on the floor to talk about things that are important to them, and it's a balance. It's making a difference so that people back home have confidence in the rules and regulations that are promulgated by the Federal Government and that Congress knows how we can react and act upon those.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 113–187.

Mr. NADLER. 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 20, line 10, insert after ''means any rule'' the following: ''(other than a special rule)''.

Page 21, line 2, insert before the period at the end the following: '', and includes any special rule''.

Page 22, after line 8, insert the following:

''(6) The term 'special rule' means any rule pertaining to nuclear reactor safety standards.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would exempt the Nuclear Regulatory Commission from the bill so that the NRC can continue to protect Americans from nuclear disasters under current law, rather than the bill's proposed system.

Today's bill, H.R. 367, in the name of so-called reform, adds over 60 new procedural and analytical hoops agencies and departments must go through before a regulation can be issued. The result is simply to impede, obstruct, and delay the attempt of government to accomplish one of it's most basic functions: protecting the health and welfare of its citizens.

Not surprisingly, groups who care about protecting public health, safety, and the environment, such as the Natural Resources Defense Counsel, Public Citizens, Defenders of Wildlife, and U.S. Public Interest Research Group, oppose this bill. According, to the Coalition for Sensible Safeguards, which represents a coalition of many such groups, this bill ''will grind to a halt the rulemaking process'' and ''is nothing less than an attempt to roll back our critical public safeguards and promote industry interests instead of protecting American citizens.''

□ 2000

Americans should rightfully be scared that this bill will put their health and safety at risk. One example that highlights this fact is the subject of this amendment—nuclear power.

The risks and dangers of nuclear power were made all the more real by the nuclear disaster in Japan at Fukushima 2 years ago. We all watched in horror when that country was devastated by the earthquake and resulting tsunami. That disaster then caused its own disaster—the meltdown of three reactors at the Fukushima nuclear power plant. That led to the release of radioactive isotopes, the creation of a 20-kilometer exclusion zone around the power plant, and displacement of 156,000 people. Inside the evacuation zone all farming has been abandoned.

In 2011, Virginia itself was struck by a relatively rare but strong earthquake felt up and down the eastern seaboard. It caused a nuclear power plant near the epicenter to have to go offline. For me, this concern hits close to home. A nuclear power plant, Indian Point, about which many people, myself included, have had concerns for years, lies just less than 40 miles away from my New York City district on an earthquake fault. There are 20 million people living within a 50-mile radius around the plant, the same radius used by the NRC as the basis for the evacuation zone recommended after the Fukushima disaster. Indian Point also sits near two fault lines and, according to the NRC, is the most likely nuclear power plant in the country to experience core damage due to an earthquake.

To keep my constituents, and indeed all Americans, safe, I am offering this amendment today. Because of the catastrophes that can result in disasters—be they natural or manmade—at nuclear power plants, prevention of meltdowns is the key. Since Fukushima, the NRC has issued new rules designed to upgrade plants to withstand severe events like earthquakes and to have enough backup power so as to avoid a meltdown for a significant period of time.

The NRC must have the ability and flexibility to issue new regulations to safeguard the health and well-being of all Americans and to prevent nuclear disasters. However, this bill is intentionally designed so new and vital regulations will likely never be put into place. We cannot permit the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to never be able to create new regulations ever again should the need arise.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to exempt the Nuclear Regulatory Commission from the onerous new requirements for rulemaking imposed by this bill. In that way, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission would continue to have the ability to safeguard public health and safety, as it should.

We should not risk the lives of millions and millions of people. If a danger becomes evident and the experts in charge of protecting against that—the Nuclear Regulatory Commission—deem some new protection necessary, this bill would prevent those protections from going into effect. So my amendment would exempt the Nuclear Regulatory Commission with respect to safety regulations for nuclear power plants.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the amendment carves out of the REINS Act Congressional Approval Procedures all regulations that pertain to nuclear reactor safety standards. REINS Act supporters believe in nuclear safety. We want to guarantee that regulatory decisions that pertain to nuclear reactor safety are the best decisions that can be made. That is precisely why I oppose the amendment.

By its terms, the amendment shields from the REINS Act Congressional Approval Procedures not only major regulations that would raise nuclear reactor safety standards, but also regulations that would lower them. All major regulations pertaining to nuclear reactor safety standards, whether they raise or lower standards, should fall within the REINS Act. That way, agencies with authority over nuclear reactor safety will know that Congress must approve their major regulations

before they go into effect. That provides a powerful incentive for the agencies to write the best possible regulations, ones that Congress can easily approve. It is a solution that everyone should support because it makes Congress more accountable and assures agencies will write better rules. All Americans will be safer for it.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. NADLER. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, under current law, Congress can disapprove any proposed rule and regulation under the Congressional Review Act. Under this bill, no regulation could go into effect until Congress affirmatively approved the regulation. If the Nuclear Regulatory Commission were to approve some rule that reduces nuclear safety, Congress, under current law, could block that rule.

What this bill says, and what my amendment seeks to exempt the NRC from, is that no safety regulation can go into effect until Congress gets around to approving it. The Republican leadership took the appropriations bill for the Transportation and Housing and Urban Development Departments off the floor yesterday allegedly because they have no time to consider it. We've passed all of 12 bills this year for the President's signature, and we would have hundreds or thousands of regulations by all the different agencies that we would have to consider. Most would never be approved simply because we would not have time to consider them.

All this amendment says is, for regulations regarding nuclear disasters, to prevent nuclear disasters, let Congress veto them if necessary, but not kill them by not having the time to get to them.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that, when it comes to regulatory safety, the gentleman cites the Congressional Review Act. I'll remind the House that, as I noted earlier, since 1996, it's been used one time for ergonomic furniture. That is not a very good track record when tens of thousands of regulations have been passed during that time that should be reviewed by this Congress. This legislation only asks that those regulations that cost more than $100 million should be reviewed. But it's especially true of the most important regulations related to, for example, the nuclear power industry where safety is a very important standard, as is efficiency and making sure that the American people have the electric power generation that they need. So the Congress has great incentive to reach quick agreement on regulations like that, and it's very important that we have that jurisdiction.

But many regulations are not needed; they cost jobs in our economy. I know those on the other side of the aisle have been citing academics who claim that that's not the case. But I want to call attention to one more academic who wrote just on January 18, 2011. He said:

> Sometimes, those rules have gotten out of balance, placing unreasonable burdens on business—burdens that have stifled innovation and have had a chilling effect on growth and jobs.

That academic's name is Barack Obama, and he is currently the President of the United States.

I urge my colleagues to 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 New York (Mr. NADLER).

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

Mr. NADLER. 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 York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part B of House Report 113–187.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. 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 20, line 10, insert after ''means any rule'' the following: ''(other than a special rule)''.
>
> Page 21, line 2, insert before the period at the end the following: '', and includes any special rule''.
>
> Page 22, after line 8, insert the following:
>
> ''(6) The term 'special rule' means any rule that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget determines would result in net job growth.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment, which is very simple: it would exclude from this bill any rule that would result in net job growth.

I ask that my colleagues support this commonsense amendment to promote job growth and help to strengthen the middle class. After all, the stated purpose of the REINS Act is to grow the economy and create jobs, isn't that correct?

Although this bill purports to grow the economy and create jobs, nothing could be further from the truth. This bill's myopic focus on gumming up the regulatory process will not create a single job. It will, however, result in the loss of much-needed rules that protect the health, safety, and well-being of the men, women, and children of America.

I have profound concerns about the REINS Act. What would be its impact on air and water quality? This bill would undermine the ability of agencies to protect the public interest. It is a continuation of the majority's anti-middle class, pro-big business, anti-regulatory approach to governing.

The majority continues to rely on debunked partisan studies. Thee studies presuppose that regulations have harmful effects on job growth. Far from it. There is ample bipartisan evidence in support of the opposite conclusion.

Regulations ensure that the water we consume, the air that we breathe, the places where we work and where our kids go to school are safe. Regulations ensure fairness in the workplace and in the marketplace. Regulations are necessary to protect the have-nots from the haves; whereas the REINS Act protects the haves from the have-nots.

Nevertheless, the House Republican leadership continues like an out-of-control freight train to drive its reckless deregulatory agenda through Congress. This deregulatory train wreck threatens to send us back in time to the early 1900s, when there was no minimum wage, no workplace protections, and no limits on Wall Street.

If Republican leadership truly believed in growing the economy and creating jobs we would have come together with a grand bargain a long time ago. We could have agreed to a mix of spending cuts and tax reforms to address the government's long-term debt. We could have prevented the mindless austerity of sequestration which threatens our still-fragile economic recovery. Instead, this Tea Party Congress could not even muster the will to vote to fund the transportation bill yesterday. This is yet another example of a ''do-nothing'' Congress under the leadership of an anti-middle class Republican leadership.

Americans have a right to expect that their elected legislators will enact laws that help create jobs, like doing something about sequestration. My colleague, Mr. HAL ROGERS, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, hit the nail on the head yesterday when he said, and I quote:

''Sequestration—and its unrealistic and ill-conceived discretionary cuts—must be brought to an end.''

American workers continue to face hurdles to providing for their families, and I'm gravely concerned about the effects of sequestration on my home State of Georgia. Last month, furloughs began for most civilian Defense Department employees at Robins Air

Force Base and other military bases across Georgia. This won't just affect the hardworking people at the base, like firefighters; it will also have a substantial impact on the local economies.

As retired General Robert McMahon reports, the furloughs which began last week will take $50 million out of the economy around the Robins Air Force Base alone. Multiply that with the economic catastrophe across other military bases in Georgia and throughout the country, and you begin to understand the truly caustic effects of sequestration on small businesses and on the economy. But instead of working together to come to a bipartisan solution to the sequestration fiasco, this Congress is continuing an agenda to make life worse for American families.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment to promote job creation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment carves out of the REINS Act Congressional Approval Procedures regulations that the Office of Management and Budget determined will lead to net job creation.

The danger in the amendment is the strong incentive it gives OMB to manipulate its analysis of a major regulations job impact. Far too often, OMB may be tempted to shave the analysis to skirt the bill's congressional approval requirement. In addition, regulations alleged to create new jobs often do so by destroying real existing jobs and creating new hoped-for jobs associated with regulatory compliance.

For example, some Environmental Protection Agency Clean Air Act rules will shut down existing power plants. EPA and OMB may attempt to justify that with claims that more new green jobs will be created as a result. In the end, that is just another way in which government picks the jobs winners and the jobs losers. And there's no guarantee that all of the new green jobs will ever actually exist. And I would cite Solyndra as perhaps the best evidence of promised jobs that don't exist and cost the taxpayers half a billion dollars.

The REINS Act is not intended to force any particular outcome. It does not choose between clean air and dirty air. It does not choose between new jobs and old jobs. Instead, the REINS Act chooses between two ways of making laws. It chooses the way the Framers intended, in which accountability for laws with major economic impacts rests with Congress. It rejects the way Washington has operated for far too long, where there is no accountability because decisions are made by unelected agency officials.

□ 2015

The amendment would undermine that fundamental choice. Let me give you a few examples of this:

Regulatory agencies routinely estimate the benefits and costs of regulatory changes under the assumption that any individuals that become unemployed are instantly and constantly reemployed in nearly identical jobs. But the EPA's employment impact analysis is frequently flawed because it fails to account for the cascading employment effects of regulation across interconnected industries and markets.

Using the proper full economy model, NERA Economic Consulting found that the EPA's Utility MACT Rule would have a negative impact equivalent to 180,000 to 215,000 lost jobs in 2015, versus the EPA's claim of 8,000 net new jobs, and which, therefore, wouldn't come to the Congress, even though private consultants say it would lose over 200,000 jobs. EPA claims it would create 8,000 jobs.

The EPA's Cross-State Air Pollution Rule would have had an economic impact equivalent to the annual—annual—loss of 34,300 jobs from 2013 through 2037 versus the EPA's claimed 700 jobs gained annually.

Finally, the EPA's industrial Boiler Maximum Achievable Control Technology—or MACT—Rule would have a negative impact equivalent to 27,585 jobs per year on average from 2013 through 2037, compared with the EPA's claim of 2,200 per year claim.

All of this goes to show that this would be a shell game allowing the executive branch to claim job increases when actually there are massive job losses and, therefore, avoid the scrutiny of the people's House and the entire United States Congress where these massive regulations should come back for review and approval before they're implemented, and before they cost those kind of jobs to Americans.

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

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. 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 Georgia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part B of House Report 113–187.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Who has the right to close?

The Acting CHAIR. The right to close will not be established until the time in opposition is claimed.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Is it the proponent or the author of the amendment?

The Acting CHAIR. Under clause 3(c) of rule XVII, a manager in opposition would have the right to close.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Thank you.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 20, line 10, insert after ''means any rule'' the following: ''(other than a special rule)''.

Page 21, line 2, insert before the period at the end the following: '', and includes any special rule''.

Page 22, after line 8, insert the following:

''(6) The term 'special rule' means any rule that is promulgated by the Department of Homeland Security.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me thank my colleagues. Whenever they engage in debate, I know they have a serious commitment to the process of this House and this Nation.

But I rise today to offer an amendment, and I hope that it addresses the chairman's offer of legislative collegiality. If this is such an important effort, then I believe that the amendments that have been offered by my colleagues, and the one that I introduce as we speak, are ones that makes this bill reasonable.

My amendment would except from the bill's congressional approval requirement any rule promulgated by the Department of Homeland Security organized and established in the backdrop of the heinous and tragic terrorist act of 9/11. In fact, I can't imagine this legislation being effective in the midst of tragedy and devastation.

I don't think my friend understands that there's nothing in the REINS Act that prevents a filibuster. A filibuster means that we will never get a resolution voted on by the two Houses—never—because it does not negate a filibuster.

So in the midst of a crisis, where people are in need of relief by the Department of Homeland Security, such as the Department of Homeland Security having to act quickly to establish new or emergency regulations in the protection of critical infrastructure, here it comes, the dastardly REINS Act. I think we would be better off right now to be debating H.R. 900 to eliminate the sequestration to bring jobs back to America.

But I hope that this amendment will be considered, because I can't imagine the very Department that was established to put its foot in the gap now is going to be hindered by the REINS Act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentlewoman from Texas that the bill prohibits a filibuster in the Senate from being used to block consideration of regulations that come before the Congress.

We are making every effort to have that bipartisan collegiality that she suggests, but I don't think this amendment accomplishes that. The amendment seeks to shield the Department of Homeland Security from Congress' authority to approve regulations under the REINS Act. That shield should be denied.

For example, take the Department's rule to extend compliance deadlines for States to issue secure driver's licenses under the REAL ID Act. More than a decade after 9/11 hijackers used fraudulent licenses to board airplanes used to murder 3,000 innocent Americans, DHS continues to keep this extension in place.

This is the kind of decisionmaking that takes place at the Department of Homeland Security. Congress should use every tool it can to reassert its authority over the legislative rulemaking functions it has delegated to DHS, and the REINS Act is available to do that.

I would urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment and to support the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas has 3 minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Thank you.

To the contrary, to my good friend from Virginia, the bill does not entirely prohibit a filibuster. In fact, a filibuster can be used on the procedural motion to bring the bill up, and in the Senate they can never bring this up.

So let me remind my friends:

Galveston, 6,000 people dead and climbing, 1900; Hurricane Katrina, one of the 10 worst, killing 1,836 in 2005; 1980, a heat wave in the southern and central States killing 1,700; Chicago heat wave in 1995.

Disasters that need the relief that the American people deserve.

This tells us what we will be facing while a filibuster is going on in the Senate. This is a map only of this year. Already disasters in Washington State with mud slides, Oklahoma with tornados, Arizona with wildfires, Miami with mud slides.

Then they want to block Homeland Security from developing regulations for infrastructure, they want to stop what is going on with Hurricane Sandy and the repair that is needed and the infrastructure with something called the REINS Act, which, as I said earlier, goes around and around and around.

I hope my colleagues will support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to point out to the House that the assertion that this does not prevent a filibuster in the Senate is incorrect. If Members would examine pages 12 through 14 of the bill, they will see multiple ways in which procedural motions and substantive motions in the Senate are barred from undertaking a filibuster, and they must proceed through those points of order and other objections that might be raised to a final vote on this regulation under the REINS Act.

This is a good thing because it will allow for expeditious consideration by the Congress of regulations. Whether they are needed or not needed, they ought to be considered by the Congress, especially if they cost more than $100 million to the American economy.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman pointed us out to pages 12 to 14, because he indicated a number of procedural hula hoops that we have to jump through. Each of those procedural hula hoops will be subject to a filibuster.

But this is what the American people go through: Here is a tornado or an earthquake, here is Hurricane Sandy. There are a variety of issues that it results in. Here is a wildfire.

I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you. I appreciate you bringing this amendment. There are a whole lot of opportunities for the people of west Tennessee to benefit from it.

We are an area that has been known to have tornados; we have the potential for an earthquake from Reelfoot Lake. FEMA comes under this, and to stop FEMA from having proper regulations that could protect the public would be a serious mistake. It is important that we safeguard our citizens, particularly when they are victims of natural tragedies.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the gentleman.

I would like to ask my colleagues to be sensible and realize that you cannot control the other body.

This amendment is a sensible amendment that responds to the outcry of wildfires, tornados, hurricanes, earthquakes. The American people are looking for the Department of Homeland Security to be able to focus on the infrastructure repair, the regulatory scheme and structure to respond to an emergency.

This bill does not deal with emergencies. It deals with an elongated process that, unfortunately, will drown, if you will, the people with a regulatory structure that does not provide them with the relief that first responders need or the people need.

I ask my colleagues of this House to be sensible and vote for the Jackson Lee amendment.

My amendment would exempt from the bill's Congressional approval requirement any rule promulgated by the Department of Homeland Security. As a Senior Member of the Homeland Security and Ranking Member of the Border and Maritime Security Subcommittee, I am very concerned about any legislation that would hinder the Department of Homeland Security's ability to respond to an emergency.

The bill would add new review requirements to an already long and complicated process, allowing special interest lobbyists to second-guess the work of respected scientists and staff through legal challenges, sparking a wave of litigation that would add more costs and delays to the rulemaking process, potentially putting the lives, health and safety of millions of Americans at risk.

The Department of Homeland Security simply does not have the time to be hindered by frivolous and unnecessary litigation, especially when the safety and security of the American people are at risk.

According to a study conducted by the Economic Policy Institute, public protections and regulations ''do not tend to significantly impede job creation'', and furthermore, over the course of the last several decades, the benefits of federal regulations have significantly outweighed their costs.

There is no need for this legislation, aside from the need of some of my colleagues to protect corporate interests. This bill would make it more difficult for the government to protect its citizens, and in the case of the Department of Homeland Security, it endangers the lives of our citizens.

In our post 9/11 climate, homeland security continues to be a top priority for our nation. As we continue to face threats from enemies foreign and domestic, we must ensure that we are doing all we can to protect our country. DHS cannot react to the constantly changing threat landscape effectively if they are subject to this bill.

Since the creation of the Department of Homeland Security in 2002, we have overhauled the government in ways never done before. Steps have been taken to ensure that the communication failures that led to 9/11 do not happen again. The Department of Homeland Security has helped push the United States forward in how protect our nation. Continuing to make advance in Homeland security and intelligence is the best way to combat the threats we still face.

The Department of Homeland Security is tasked with a wide variety of duties under its mission. One example of an instance where DHS may have to act quickly to establish new or emergency regulations is the protection of our cyber security.

In the past few years, threats in cyberspace have risen dramatically. The policy of the United States is to protect against the debilitating disruption of the operation of information systems for critical infrastructures and, thereby, help to protect the people, economy, and national security of the United States.

We are all affected by threats to our cyber security. We must act to reduce our vulnerabilities to these threats before they can be exploited. A failure to protect our cyber systems would damage our Nation's critical infrastructure. So, we must continue to ensure that such disruptions of cyberspace are infrequent, of minimal duration, manageable, and cause the least possible damage.

Like other national security challenges in the post 9/11 era, the cyber threat is multifaceted

and without boundaries. Some cyber attackers are foreign nations' that utilize their military or intelligence-gathering operations, whereas others are either operating alone or are connected to terrorist groups. In addition, there are cyber threats that are international or domestic criminal enterprises.

According to the Government Accountability Office (GAO), the number of cyber incidents reported by Federal agencies to USCERT has increased dramatically over the past four years, from 5,503 cyber incidents reported in FY 2006 to about 30,000 cyber incidents in FY 2009 (over a 400 percent increase).

The four most prevalent types of cyber incidents and events reported to US–CERT during FY 2009 were malicious code; improper usage; unauthorized access and incidents warranting further investigations (unconfirmed malicious or anomalous activity).

Critical infrastructure in the nation is composed of public and private institutions in the sectors of agriculture, food, water, public health, emergency services, government, defense industrial base, information and telecommunications, energy, transportation, banking and finance, chemicals and hazardous materials, and postal and shipping.

With cyberspace as their central nervous system—it is the control system of our country. Cyberspace is composed of hundreds of thousands of interconnected computers, servers, routers, switches, and fiber optic cables that allow our critical infrastructures to work. Thus, the healthy, secure, and efficient functioning of cyberspace is essential to both our economy and our national security.

In light of an attack that threatens the United State's cyber protection, Homeland Security officials may need to issue emergency regulations quickly. Attacks can be sent instantly in cyber space, and the protection of our critical infrastructure cannot be mitigated by cumbersome bureaucracy.

The Department of Homeland Security is also tasked with combating terrorism, and protecting Americans from threats. With the current unrest in the Middle East, why would we want to limit DHS's ability to do its job?

The Department of Homeland Security is constantly responding to new intelligence and threats from the volatile Middle East and around the globe. We must not tie the hands of those trusted to protect us from these threats.

Hindering the ability of DHS to make changes to rules and regulations puts the entire country at risk. As the Representative for the 18th District of Texas, I know about vulnerabilities in security firsthand. Of the 350 major ports in America, the Port of Houston is the one of the busiest.

More than 220 million tons of cargo moved through the Port of Houston in 2011, and the port ranked first in foreign waterborne tonnage for the 15th consecutive year. The port links Houston with over 1,000 ports in 203 countries, and provides 785,000 jobs throughout the state of Texas. Maritime ports are centers of trade, commerce, and travel along our nation's coastline, protected by the Coast Guard, under the direction of DHS.

If Coast Guard intelligence has evidence of a potential attack on the port of Houston, I want the Department of Homeland Security to be able to protect my constituents, by issuing the regulations needed without being subject to the constraints of this bill.

The Department of Homeland Security deserves an exemption not only because they may need to quickly change regulations in response to new information or threats, but also because they are tasked with emergency preparedness and response.

There are many challenges our communities face when we are confronted with a catastrophic event or a domestic terrorist attack. It is important for people to understand that our capacity to deal with hurricanes directly reflects our ability to respond to a terrorist attack in Texas or New York, an earthquake in California, or a nationwide pandemic flu outbreak.

On any given day the City of Houston and cities across the United States face a widespread and ever-changing array of threats, such as: terrorism, organized crime, natural disasters and industrial accidents.

Cities and towns across the nation face these and other threats. Indeed, every day, ensuring the security of the homeland requires the interaction of multiple Federal departments and agencies, as well as operational collaboration across Federal, State, local, tribal, and territorial governments, nongovernmental organizations, and the private sector. We can hinder the Department of Homeland Security's ability to protect the safety and security of the American people.

I urge my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment in order to ensure that life saving regulations promulgated by the Department of Homeland Security are not unnecessarily delayed by this legislation.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time, and would just say in opposition to this amendment again, Members only need to look to the bill itself to see that the process in the Senate will not tolerate filibusters at any point in the process from start to finish.

Let me also point out that the American people care very much about how disasters are handled, and so do elected representatives of the American people. But we are talking about regulations written by the agency that cost more than $100 million.

Those regulations, if they are written wrong—and many people would suggest that the Department of Homeland Security has gotten it wrong many times with regulations from the TSA, for example—those regulations should come back to this Congress for review. The American people have the first and foremost place to look for leadership on these issues in the Congress of the United States, the people's House, and the United States Senate, and not to government regulatory agencies.

Yes, they need to write regulations, but they shouldn't have the final say, particularly on the most expensive regulations affecting our economy.

Money that is diverted—money that is diverted—to pay for unnecessary regulations is money that can't be spent to address other problems that we have in this country or to pay down our national debt. That's what is important, and that's why this amendment should be defeated.

We need to have common sense brought to our regulatory process. The REINS Act does it. The REINS Act reins in unnecessary burdensome regulations, it helps protect American jobs, and it ought to be protected, and that includes protected from unnecessary or burdensome regulations in the Department of Homeland Security.

I urge my colleagues to 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 Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. 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 Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in part B of House Report 113–187.

Mr. MCKINLEY. 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 20, line 16, strike ''$100,000,000'' and insert ''$50,000,000''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, this bill currently requires that all regulations that cost $100 million or more must first be approved by Congress.

□ 2030

Therefore, I rise today to offer an amendment to reduce that threshold from $100 million to $50 million. This would ensure greater transparency and more accountability in the process. Let's put this in perspective, Mr. Chairman.

For the past 2 years, according to the regulators, of all of the regulations individually that have exceeded $100 million, only 2 percent have been reviewed. That means 98 percent of all of the regulations that we have faced in America have not had the involvement of Congress. I mean, who would be satisfied if only 2 percent of our food that we eat has been inspected? Who would be satisfied if only 2 percent of the planes that we fly in are inspected—or of our homes? businesses? The Obama administration and its overly aggressive bureaucrats are playing with people's lives.

Last weekend, I was at a Serbian picnic in northern West Virginia, and I was approached by two adult males who were very concerned. Mr. Chairman, their eyes welled up with fear and concern because of all of these regulations that are being imposed on them.

They fear whether they're going to have jobs because of all of these regulations which no one is overseeing. These men love to work and they want to work, but they feel these new regulations threaten their American Dream and are taking away the possibility for them to raise their families. Each of us knows men like them. They live in our neighborhoods. Whenever we go home, we see these people. They want to work, but they're afraid of someone moving the goalpost with a new regulation that's not checked by Congress.

Every year, these regulations cost hundreds of billions of dollars annually, and 98 percent of them are implemented without congressional oversight. According to the Small Business Administration, the cumulative burden of regulations exceeds more than $1 trillion annually out of our economy. Let me say this again: nearly 98 percent of all new regulations have no economic analysis or oversight by the American public. According to the GAO, Federal regulators last year, Mr. Chairman, issued 2,500 new regulations—just in 1 year alone.

Doesn't this administration understand that excessive, unchecked regulations harm working families?

Just because the administration can issue a regulation doesn't mean that it should. By reducing the threshold from $100 million to $50 million, we provide Congress an opportunity to rein in these out-of-control agencies and allow more of our people to continue working and supporting their families.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment. I share in my colleague's desire to bring more congressional scrutiny to regulations with high economic impacts, and I know that recent major regulations have hit West Virginia and the gentleman's constituents particularly hard.

The Environmental Protection Agency's regulations that affect energy sources and power production are among the most troubling. The $100 million threshold for major regulations in the bill is consistent with definitions that have been used by Presidential administrations of both parties since at least the 1990s. However, regulations with a $50 million impact in today's economy will hit America's job creators and families too hard. This is particularly true of small businesses and the families that depend on them on Main Streets throughout the Nation. As a result, the amendment would make sure that Congress is accountable for regulatory decisions of this magnitude, which impose harm on an economy that can ill afford it.

Therefore, I support the gentleman's amendment, and I urge my colleagues to join me in doing so.

Mr. COHEN. I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is twice as bad as the bill because it decreases by $50 million the threshold, which means more and more regulations would have to go through this cumbersome process and really stifle regulations and rules, and that's what this is about.

The Speaker said that the job of this Congress is not to pass legislation but to repeal legislation. That's what these bills are about. They're not to improve the lives of Americans by having more safety and more protection but, rather, to defeat proposals that may come from the EPA, which are to protect the air and the water and our Earth, as well as to protect other areas of safety, whether it's automobiles or airplanes or trains or trucks or whatever.

The fact is that this would make it almost impossible to pass a rule or a regulation, and it would allow one House the ability to kill a regulation. This is a House that doesn't have the expertise within it, which has been said by some of the Members in their saying they didn't know how big to build a dam or whatever. That's why we have government people who study and do research and promulgate rules and regulations—to protect us—and it's done in a nonpolitical environment. If you bring it to this environment, you're going to have lobbyists coming up, trying to kill things that affect their industries.

This is a yo-yo bill: you are on your own. That's what they're saying basically, that we don't want protections for consumers or protections for citizens. We want to have something laissez-faire: no rules and regulations. You're out there on your own.

I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlelady from Houston, Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to differ with my good friend who has offered this amendment, which is even more extreme.

I proceeded to read the sections that my good chairman referred me to on how expeditious this process would be in the United States Senate. It's unworkable. How does anyone think that the Senate is going to pass this bill? They've never passed it because what it says is that you're going to kick the resolution out of committee, that you're going to discharge it, and then you're going to move it beyond all of their rules. You're literally abolishing the Senate's rules that they have not redone themselves. They never got an agreement on ending a filibuster, so I have no idea as to issues of security and safety as it relates to homeland security or of the issues dealing with fuel and greenhouse gases, which have decidedly impacted positively the American people as it relates to emissions.

Now we're going from $100 million to $50 million, which, I hate to say, in a country of this size means that we are going to multiply the number of resolutions on this body that has really been slow in the passing of any legislation. Then we are going to move to the Senate, and we are going to tell the Senate committees, If you don't act in 15 days, we're discharging this. Then we will expect the Senate to pass this bill, which is the only way that it's going to get to the President's desk.

I might also say to my good friend from Tennessee, over and over again, we keep talking about what President Obama's administration has done. If this is about President Obama, that's one thing. If this is about creating jobs, the President has offered the American Jobs Act, and we have introduced a bill that has been calculated to have helped create jobs and stop the bleeding of the economy.

I am glad my good friend talked about the success of the Dow. That translates into jobs if we get rid of the sequester. There is a bill that will get rid of it, H.R. 900, offered by Mr. CONYERS, which many of us have cosponsored. Where is the debate on the floor of the House of that?

I would simply say that we are now going from the extreme to the very extreme, and you're going to see a pounding of regulations. Moms and dads and children—families—municipalities,
places need clean air, clean water. They need better emissions to the extent that it helps with clean air. They need safety. They need security. Now we are going to pile it up with those that may cost $50 million.

How absurd is that in terms of the legislative schedule of this place and the legislative schedule of the United States Senate? Now, I'm not saying anyone is going to shuck off any work—we welcome that—but you have the regular order of legislation. Then every time an amendment comes up—now $50 million—then you're going to say that this must kick in.

I ask my colleagues to reject this amendment because it simply will not work.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in part B of House Report 113–187.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. WEBSTER OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in part B of House Report 113–187.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chair, 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 21, beginning on line 4, strike ''except that such term does not include—'' and all that follows through line 18, and insert the

following: ''except that such term does not include any rule of particular applicability, including a rule that approves or prescribes for the future rates, wages, prices, services, or allowances therefore, corporate or financial structures, reorganizations, mergers, or acquisitions thereof, or accounting practices or disclosures bearing on any of the foregoing.''

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chair, this amendment is straightforward. It closes a regulatory loophole that allows Federal agencies to make major policy changes without appropriate congressional review.

As currently written, the REINS Act covers agency rules developed through the formal notice and comment rulemaking process, but that's not enough. By removing two exceptions from the definition of ''rule,'' we ensure that agency actions that serve a regulatory purpose are subject to the $100 million threshold.

The current administration circumvents congressional oversight and public input by issuing general statements of policy known as ''guidance documents'' in order to achieve its intrusive regulatory agenda. This tactic shields major and costly policy changes from any congressional oversight laws put in place to protect citizens. Let me give you two examples.

The EPA used a guidance document to remove the word ''navigable'' from the definition of ''waters of the United States.'' This would expand its jurisdiction to potentially regulate traditional State waters and roadside ditches that hold water after rainfall. The EPA estimates that this guidance document could cost Americans $171 million annually. Last month, we all know the administration used a guidance document to delay the health care law's employer coverage mandate. The CBO estimates this guidance document will cost $12 billion.

Both of these guidance documents make substantive changes to policy without congressional review. Under the REINS Act as currently drafted, these costly guidance documents would escape the disapproval process even though they breach the $100 million threshold established by REINS.

Good policy does not have to be hidden within the cloak of bureaucratic power grabbing. My amendment seeks to shine light into the dark corner of regulatory infrastructure that is abused by those with an agenda that must be hidden from view. It simply allows elected Representatives the opportunity to review policy changes issued through internal guidance that exceed the $100 million threshold. Hardworking taxpayers are owed a choice and a voice through their elected Representatives in all major policy changes that impact their jobs and their pocketbooks. This amendment secures this fundamental measure of government, accountability, and respect for taxpayers.

By requiring a vote of Congress in all substantive agency rules, the REINS Act results in more clearly written legislation; it improves the regulatory process; and it holds government accountable to the American people for the laws imposed upon them.

I urge my colleagues to support the Webster amendment and strengthen the REINS Act by closing this guidance document loophole, which erodes the rule of law.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 2045

Mr. COHEN. In what I'm sure is no surprise to the Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. COHEN. Once again, this just takes it to another level. It's not just the rules, but then the rules of the rules.

Really what this bill is about is a messaging opportunity. We're supposed to be legislating. The reality is that we don't legislate in Congress; we message. One side says, We're for business. We're against regulations. We're against rules. We want to create enterprise by destroying rules and regulations. The other side, which is my side, says, We're for consumers. We're for safety. We're for protection. We're for health and clean water and clear air. We think that the government process works because it saves people; it saves their lives. We go back and forth.

This would effectively destroy the opportunity to have rules and regulations passed at all. It's not going to get through the Senate, so what it is is a messaging opportunity for us to fill up C–SPAN. It's unfortunate because we should be legislating about jobs and about the sequester. We ought to be talking about benefits that the government does provide, but right now sequestration is taking away important jobs in the Defense Department, moneys from the National Institutes of Health, which would protect people's lives in the long run with treatments and cures that we need, and the next generation will benefit greater than us; yet we're here talking about something that is not going to happen.

It is really unfortunate, because we should be legislating, and this bill just gets us into the weeds, gets us down into the regulations. It's like we're going to strangle the ''bureaucrats.'' But the bureaucrats are the experts who come up with the safety provisions that say your children's toys are going to be safe and your car is going to have brakes and work in the proper manner and your airplane is not going to fall out of the sky when it's not near the airport.

Those are important things to the American people, and if you don't have rules and regulations by experts that can be implemented, we're going to have a lot of accidents. That's why this is a very bad bill and a bad amendment and a bad use of the public's time.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. GOODLATTE.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding, and I'm going to support his amendment.

I share my colleagues's desire to curb the abuse of agency guidance documents and other agency directives, statements, and actions that too often have escaped adequate congressional scrutiny.

The amendment brings within the scope of the Congressional Review Act and the REINS Act rules of agency practice, procedure, and management that could be abused but otherwise would escape a congressional check and balance. It is a measured first step in reining in agency excess, and I look forward to working with the gentleman in the future to see if we can identify additional ways to rein in abusive agency practices and guidance.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time so we can get to the next program on C–SPAN quicker.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to remind everyone that we all remember what happened on July 3 when there was an announcement made that all of the sudden we were going to basically reverse our decision on the Affordable Care Act passed by this Congress. I would not have voted for it had I been here. With one stroke of the pen on a guidance document, they were able to thwart the law that we passed.

We talk about this body is for legislating? Yes, it is. When it does, we expect the executive branch to enforce that law, which it didn't; and it didn't because it was able to use that guidance document to change the law. It's not right. Vote for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in part B of House Report 113–187.

Ms. MOORE. 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 23, line 19, insert after ''determines.'' the following (and amend the table of sections accordingly):

''§ 808. Exemption for certain rules

''Sections 801 through 807 of this chapter, as amended by the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2013 shall

not apply in the case of any rule that relates to veterans or veterans affairs. This chapter, as in effect before the enactment of the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2013, shall continue to apply, after such enactment, to any such rule, as appropriate.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 367, the REINS Act, and I yield myself 3 minutes of my time.

Today's REINS Act would require a joint resolution approval of Congress every time the executive branch promulgates a major rule. My amendment would simply exempt our Nation's veterans from the burdensome layers and hurdles that H.R. 367 will add to the administration's rulemaking process.

I oppose the underlying bill because it will severely restrict agency or department action when many vulnerable veterans need help. It is just simply unacceptable every single time our Nation's veterans are held hostage by the gridlock we experience in Congress. This is yet another moment. This amendment offers an opportunity to exempt them from that.

Mr. Chairman, just a few little facts:

Today's veterans need help more than ever, and they really deserve it. Unfortunately, over 3,000 Active Duty troops have taken their lives since 2011. We have an estimated 22 veteran suicides per day. We've had over 2 million Active Duty soldiers deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan, many of whom are struggling to transition and trying to find employment. While the VA has made some progress in recent months, Mr. Chairman, the backlog of over 500,000 claims—those older than 125 days—is simply unacceptable.

Some veterans have had to wait up to 2 years for an administrative decision on a claim, and we're adding more administrative requirements for them. We're gravely concerned, all of us are here, on a bipartisan basis, about the growing backlog of appeals pending with the VA as resources are shifted. The amount of claims waiting to be heard by the Board of Veterans Affairs is currently over 45,000 and estimated to increase to approximately 102,000 by 2017. The average length of an appeal completed in fiscal year 2012 was 903 days, Mr. Chairman. Adding hurdles now will do nothing but curtail options available to the administration as it works toward solving these serious problems.

I appeal to the common sense and compassion for veterans of my colleagues. My amendment is simple. Veterans deserve to be left out of this political fight.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, the statistics about the delays in poor performance at the Department of Veterans Affairs with regard to veterans' claims are reasons to oppose the gentlewoman's amendment. The amendment carves out of the REINS act congressional approval procedures all regulations that affect veterans and Veterans Affairs.

We want to guarantee that the regulatory decisions that affect them are the best decisions. That's why major regulations that affect veterans and Veterans Affairs, like all other major regulations, should fall within the REINS Act. Under the legislation, agencies with authority over veterans' issues will know that Congress must approve their major regulations before they go into effect.

That provides a powerful incentive for the agencies to write the best possible regulations, ones that Congress can easily approve. Congress will have every incentive to approve good regulations and every incentive to disapprove regulations that have led to the kind of delays and uncertainty that veterans face today.

That's a solution that everyone should be able to support. Congress will be more accountable, agencies will write better rules, and veterans and all Americans will reap the benefit.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I'm sure my colleague agrees with me that we should not add hurdles. We've passed 11 bills since September on behalf of veterans, including the following kinds of initiatives: the 9/11 GI Bill, which we all agreed upon; copayments for medication; and resources for radiation poisoning. Had we had this bill in place, each and every one of these initiatives would have required a joint resolution from Congress each time the VA promulgated these rules.

If those sessions of Congress were anything like the majority's calendar for this year, we would not have had a lot of time to have completed work. This year we've only passed 15 bills into law. That's a record low compared to last year. As the Speaker just recently said—I suppose it would apply here—we should not be judged on how many laws we create; we should be judged on how many laws we repeal. Certainly, we would not have been able to do things like the GI Bill or reduce copayments for medications for veterans had we had this bill in place.

The other thing is you would think that my colleagues would have some pride in this institution. All this bill will do is put much more power within the hands of the executive. We can't appoint bureaucrats to conference committees on the budget.

I yield back the balance of my time.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS NATIONAL SERVICE & LEGISLATIVE HEADQUARTERS,
Washington, DC, July 31, 2013.

Hon. GWEN MOORE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MOORE: On behalf of DAV (Disabled American Veterans), an organization of 1.2 million wartime wounded, injured, and ill veterans, I am writing with respect to your proposed amendment to H.R. 367, the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2013, or the ''REIN'' Act.

Your proposed amendment, if accepted, would exempt veterans and veterans affairs from the requirements of the bill that all proposed federal rules that convey a cost of $100 million or more, or that are subject to other circumstances described in the bill, be submitted to Congress before promulgation by the Executive Branch. Under the bill, Congress would require itself to mandatorily act to approve or disapprove any such regulation through fixed rules of procedure and calendars.

Your effort to protect veterans to ensure their benefits and services are provided in an expeditious manner, as proposed by an Executive Branch agency, is deeply appreciated. Under the DAV Constitution and By-Laws, any federal legislation or policy that furthers the interests of wounded and injured veterans carries DAV's strong support.

While endorsing your specific amendment, DAV takes no position on the underlying bill itself, because our membership has not approved a resolution specific to the purpose of Congress generally limiting government regulation-making across the vast federal landscape.

Thank you for proposing your amendment, and please advise me how DAV can aid you in gaining its acceptance by the House as it concludes consideration of the REIN Act.

Sincerely,

BARRY A. JESINOSKI,
Executive Director, Washington Headquarters.

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

I say to the gentlewoman, my colleague from Wisconsin, that this House is very proud of the fact that we worked in a bipartisan fashion to pass all of those bills. I have absolutely no doubt that if, after we pass those bills, the Department of Veterans Affairs and other agencies affecting veterans didn't do the work properly and didn't get it done right that this Congress would again work in a very bipartisan fashion to say, No, you didn't get it right. Get it right.

That's what this is all about. That's why the REINS Act is important. It's not just for every other American, but also for veterans. This is something that will improve the regulatory process.

There is another study that talks about the creation of jobs, which are important to our veterans who have returned and are looking for employment in this country. This is a study by the Phoenix Center, and it's entitled, ''Regulatory Expenditures, Economic Growth and Jobs: An Empirical Study.'' It was performed by three Ph.D.'s and a lawyer. What could be better than that? I want to read from part of the abstract. It says:

Even a small 5 percent reduction in the regulatory budget, about $2.8 billion, is estimated to result in about $75 billion in expanded private sector GDP each year with an increase in employment by 1.2 million jobs annually. On average, eliminating the job of a single regulator grows the American economy by $6.2 million and nearly 100 private sector jobs annually. Conversely, each million-dollar increase in the regulatory budget costs the economy 420 private sector jobs.

This is a study that shows conclusively that we're right when we say that the REINS Act will help to create jobs in this country and the current regulatory morass that we're facing in this country is costing American jobs. I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment and to support the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

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

Ms. MOORE. 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 Wisconsin will be postponed.

□ 2100

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CRAMER) having assumed the chair, Mr. CONAWAY, 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. 367) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law, had come to no resolution thereon.

NATURAL GAS ECONOMIC IMPACT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I addressed the positive economic impact on jobs of shale gas production that was documented during a recent hearing in Pennsylvania by the bipartisan Natural Gas Caucus, which I cochair.

An additional area of economic impact of the natural gas production is the direct benefits to Pennsylvania. From 2008 to 2010, Pennsylvania established three leases for natural gas production on State forest lands. These leases have generated signing bonuses totaling $413 million and earned the State another $100 million in royalties.

Since 2007, a total of $1.7 billion in corporate taxes have also been paid. During 2012 and 2013, the natural gas industry contributed $406 million in impact fees that are benefiting counties and communities across Pennsylvania.

By 2035, shale gas will contribute $42.4 billion annually to Pennsylvania's economy, up from the $7.1 billion in 2010.

Mr. Speaker, the economic impact from natural gas development in Pennsylvania is exceeding all expectations. Governor Corbett and the Pennsylvania State legislature are to be congratulated for their leadership in shale gas production.

HEALTH CARE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. GRIFFIN) is recognized for the remainder of the time until 10 p.m. as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a little time tonight with my colleague, Representative YOUNG from Indiana, to talk a little bit about health care in America, talk a little bit about the Affordable Care Act that is currently being implemented, and talk about the need for real health care reform in this country.

I want to start out by just emphasizing that I firmly believe we need health care reform. I believe that the health care reform we got in the form of the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, is not the health care reform that we need. And I would say that we have lots of proposals here in the House. I think last Congress we had over 200 bills introduced that related to the health care system, reforming our health care system. And this Congress, we have dozens of health care reform related bills as well.

So the idea that it's either the Affordable Care Act as we're seeing it unfold, or nothing at all, it's a false choice. That's not the choice that we have. There are lots of ideas; lots of much better ideas, I must add. And while I am personally for repeal—I certainly want the Affordable Care Act repealed—I want to replace it with quality, patient-centered health care reform.

I am not against providing relief to Americans who are feeling the burden of the Affordable Care Act or ObamaCare right now. In fact, we had a hearing on the implementation of the ObamaCare law in the Ways and Means Committee today, a committee of which I am a member. And my colleague Representative YOUNG is also a member. And we heard a lot of people say hey, this is the law of the land, don't mess with it. This is the law of the land, let it go. This is the law of the land, any attempt to criticize it, to discuss its shortcomings, is a waste of time.

Well, I reject that outright. And, you know, I think the President, through his actions, has rejected that.

What am I talking about? Well, it's interesting because we've passed seven bills in this House, seven bills, that relate to ObamaCare, changing ObamaCare, repealing a part of ObamaCare, seven that not only passed this House, we sent them to the other side of the Capitol. They passed the Senate. And you know what? The President signed them into law. That may come as a surprise to some folks, but it's the truth. We passed seven bills to change, to modify, to repeal parts of, to make better ObamaCare, and the President has agreed with us on all seven. He signed them into law.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Are these some of the very same bills, my good colleague, that the President in recent speeches has characterized as partisan, misguided, meaningless? I do believe you may be referring to some of those bills.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Those are the same bills, and I would like to go through, if I can, the seven bills, and talk a little bit about what they do and how they were an improvement. I think they are evidence that yes, we'd like to replace this bill with something much better, this law, but in the short term, we will do whatever it takes to provide relief to American workers, relief to American families, relief to small businesses that are under the burden of ObamaCare.

So let me mention a few of these.

H.R. 4: H.R. 4 repealed the small business paperwork 1099 mandate. I remember when I first got to Congress, I heard from a bunch of folks about the 1099 filing obligation under the President's health care law. We repealed that. You know what the President did? He agreed. Bad part of the law.

Next, H.R. 1473. We cut $2.2 billion from what was characterized as a stealth public plan, a consumer-operated and -oriented plan, and froze the IRS budget. The President signed that into law.

Next, H.R. 674. We saved taxpayers $13 billion by adjusting the eligibility for ObamaCare programs. The President signed that into law.

H.R. 2055 made more reductions to the consumer-operated and -oriented plan that I mentioned earlier, also to the IPAB, the Independent Payment Advisory Board, an independent board that's going to cut Medicare, because it hasn't been reformed, when it runs out of money. So that was signed into law. And again in today's hearing in the Ways and Means Committee, folks on the other side of the aisle were saying this talk, this criticism about the President's law, ObamaCare, a waste of time, meaningless, all politics. Hogwash; the President signed a bunch of it into law.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Well, it is hogwash. And it's particularly hogwash because among those various reforms that you've itemized there, let's reflect on how much persuasion, how much public argument was required to even bring the President of the United States to go along with repealing this egregious, superfluous 1099 obligation.

We had to make the public argument. We had to win the argument because there was great reluctance, if recollection serves, and I think it does, to make any changes whatsoever to what most Americans now know as ObamaCare.

The thought was and the thinking still seems to be among a number of our colleagues that if they touch the act, then that is going to lead to further reform, perhaps dissolution or repeal of the act altogether and replacement with something that is more patient centered, with something, frankly, that is more bipartisan.

So to our colleagues who often level criticisms at those of us who are identifying ways to alleviate the pain on the American people with respect to this law, the so-called Affordable Care Act, I think it bears reminding the importance of continuing the argument, forcefully making the argument about all the pain that it is causing.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Precisely. And a lot of people ask, why all the focus, why all the energy, why all the speeches? Because it's important, number one. And, number two, it takes the energy, the focus, the time, the prioritization, the resources, to convince people, the President included, that this is not the way to go.

Now, I think if you were to throw these seven different bills out there a few years ago when ObamaCare passed and say, hey, what are the chances of the President signing this? People would have said no way. No way it's going to happen. So it's a process. It's a process of making the argument with facts; not through personal attack, with facts. Make the vigorous argument. That's what this body and democracy is about, make the argument, win the argument, and then repeal or change.

And I would mention, there are three more: H.R. 3630 slashed billions of dollars from some discretionary funds, some slush funds which they had some flexibility to use, and the President agreed with that. He signed that into law.

H.R. 4348 adjusted a drafting error. It saved $670 million.

And H.R. 8 repealed what was called the CLASS program—Community Living Assistance Services and Support program. The former Democratic chairman of the Senate Budget Committee called the CLASS program ''a Ponzi scheme of the first order, the kind of thing Bernie Madoff would be proud of.''

We saved billions of dollars through the repeal of H.R. 8. So to reiterate, there are seven bills we fought hard for, and every single one of them ultimately was signed into law by the President of the United States.

Now, I would be remiss if I didn't mention that the biggest change, the most consequential change to ObamaCare, the most open and full recognition that the President's health care law is unworkable and problematic and a burden is the fact that the President himself just a few weeks ago on July 2, through a blog post, a Department of Treasury blog post, said, you know what? I am going to suspend, postpone for a year the so-called employer mandate that is one of the key pillars of the ObamaCare law.

□ 2115

Now, what is that mandate?

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Well, the mandate is that every employer across the United States of America who employs 50 or more persons on a full-time basis must provide government-sanctioned, government-approved health insurance to their employees.

Now, look, superficially, that sounds just great. There's some problems here. First, this law redefines full-time in a way that Americans have never understood

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. If you were to ask me what does full-time mean to you, I'd say, growing up in south Arkansas, full-time means 40 hours in a week or more, right?

That's a commonsense, practical application of what full-time is.

Would that be right under ObamaCare?

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. That's what most Hoosiers think as well.

I think I've traveled quite a bit, gotten to know people around the country. And I don't believe I've encountered, I reckon, anyone who thought that full-time was 30 hours. So where did this come from? Out of thin air, presumably.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. So the bottom line is the President recognized—and I applaud him for this—I applaud him for recognizing the problem, the burden of his law, particularly the employer mandate. And he said, I'm going to postpone that part of the law. I'm basically going to repeal, in effect, repeal that for a year; just make that go away for a year as a practical matter.

Now, I applaud his recognition that the law has problems. The problem I had with that action is I don't think, still do not believe the President had the power to do that. If he wants the law changed, he should have called Congress. We would have been more than happy to deliver up a bill—send it over to the Senate—that postponed the employer mandate a year.

In fact, because of the President doing that, that's precisely what we did. So I introduced H.R. 2667, that does that in legislation, not through a regulatory change, a blog post. But I introduced the Authority for Mandate Delay Act, which we voted on. We passed on this floor.

Why?

It does the same basic thing, a little bit different, but the same basic thing that the President was doing, and we did it so that what he did would be legal. And you know what? Thirty-five Democrats supported this bill. Thirty-five Democrats supported this bill, and I applaud them for doing it.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Potentially, you, myself and so many other Members of this body agreed with the substance of the President's blog post, though one would question whether we were intended to be a Nation of laws or instead a Nation of blog posts. We could get into that separate conversation.

I think fair-minded people agreed that the delay was appropriate. ObamaCare is not ready for prime time. The computer systems don't seem to be ready. Employers are confused about exactly how this law's going to work, exactly how it's going to impact them. Employees are confused. And something had to be done.

But I think that recognition that something had to be done only occurred because there were people in Congress making arguments, as they continue to make arguments, with respect to the flaws in this legislation.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. And I would add to that there are many of us that believe the reason this law is not working is because it will never work. It is unworkable by design. It is top-down. It is the old way of doing things in a world that is becoming network bottom-up, innovative, new way of doing things. This is an old central control, top-down way of legislating.

And so the President recognized that. But, of course, for partisan politics reasons, even though my bill did basically what he did, he opposed it. He opposed the bill that would have made his actions legal.

And, of course, now it is sitting, napping, because we hope to awake it, it's napping in the Senate, in the United States Senate, with your companion bill, the Individual Mandate Delay.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Well, kudos to the one of, what is it, six colleagues on the other side of the aisle that joined us in voting for your bill.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Thirty-five Democrats.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Thirty-five in total?

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. That's right.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. I think one out of every six members of their conference were supportive of your bill.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. That's exactly right.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. I think that was the right thing to do, the right vote to cast. It certainly preserved the precedent that it is this body that passes the laws, that develops the legislation.

It's the job of the executive branch to sign those various acts into law, and then to execute them, not to recraft the laws as it might see convenient, for whatever motives.

And so you mentioned my bill, which is really, in the end, the American people's bill because it's designed to provide relief to American families, the Fairness for American Families Act.

You know, the thinking behind this is quite simple. If the President wants

to offer businesses a relief from the employer mandate tax, as our Supreme Court has styled it, then why won't you offer relief to working Americans and their families?

It's that simple. And I have yet to hear an acceptable response. No, we're playing politics.

Well, are those one of nine Democrats who voted for my legislation also playing politics?

No, candidly, I think they're being fair minded. Some would argue that they're looking for political cover or whatever. I'll let others assess that.

But, certainly, it's good legislation. It's fair and equitable legislation to accord the same sort of treatment to hardworking Americans that the President would give to the business community.

And though I agree, let me go on record that that business community needs relief too.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Well, and one in nine of the Democrats voted for your bill. I think it was 22 total. I think, just a year or two ago, that would have been unthinkable, that 35 would have joined voting for the Employer Mandate Delay and 22 or so for your bill. It would have been unthinkable.

It is because we have been relentless in pursuit of a better way, relentless in pursuit of real health care reform, relentless in identifying and letting folks in Washington know that the people back home, constituents, have made their voice very clear, where I live, in Arkansas, on the issue of the Affordable Care Act or ObamaCare.

And what's interesting is, today, in the Ways and Means Committee, we had the head of the IRS testifying. And he was explaining why the President decided to delay, for 1 year, one of the two key components of the Affordable Care Act—one being the employer mandate, and the other part of the law being the individual mandate.

We know that the President delayed that one, the employer mandate, and he was explaining why he did that. And this is a paraphrase of what he said.

It's the head of the IRS describing why the President gave 1 year relief to businesses impacted by the employer mandate. He said, to paraphrase, not a direct quote, but to paraphrase, he said, in effect, we heard from a lot of American small businesses that this was a burden on them, and so we acted to give them relief. That's a paraphrase, but that's effectively what he said.

I agree with the general sentiment. It is a burden on American workers and small businesses, et cetera, and they do need relief, and I'm glad they're getting it.

But it raises the question, why wouldn't you give that same relief, as a matter of fairness, to individuals, families, workers impacted by the individual mandate, the other key component of ObamaCare, of the Affordable Care Act?

Why would you give relief to small businesses and businesses and what have you, but not give relief to individuals?

It fundamentally doesn't make sense. It's not fair.

And when he said that, I thought to myself, well, is it possible that he doesn't know, that the head of the IRS and the administration don't know that individuals and families and workers are also impacted in a negative way, that they are burdened, many of them, by this law?

Yes, they want health care reform. Yes, people need insurance. Yes, people want to be covered. But this is not the way to go.

Does he not know the impact that this law is having?

So I thought, why don't we put all the opinions aside, the op eds, the editorialists, and why don't we just talk about some of the news headlines?

Without my commentary, I thought you and I could just read some of the headlines. These are news stories, not op eds, not editorial writers. These are news stories from a variety of publications from around the country. And I thought it would be instructive to run through some of those tonight.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. There seem to be a lot there. How would you like to proceed?

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I tell you what, I'll read through one of these, and I'll put one up. You could read through, and then I'll take one. These are headlines from around the country. And we're going to run through them because they are news stories that, regardless of what you hear from this administration, this is what's happening around the country.

The AP: Florida Insurance Officials: Rates Will Rise Under ObamaCare.

Georgia Insurance Rates Spike Under ObamaCare.

Now, I would point out, we don't have to guess what's going to happen anymore. We don't have to predict what's going to happen.

Why? Because we're already there. Implementation is under way. It's already happening. So we'll just let the facts speak.

Chattanooga Business Owner Says ObamaCare Costing Workers Pay Raises and Benefits.

Consumers Could See 25–Percent Premium Increases Under ObamaCare.

UNA Asks Student Employees to Work Fewer Hours.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. So the Contra Costa Times of Concord says that half of the Affordable Care Act call-center jobs will be part-time.

The Missourian says ObamaCare is going to impact Franklin County workers.

The Weekly Standard reports Wisconsin grocery store forced to cut hours due to ObamaCare.

The Huffington Post reports that White Castle indicates that ObamaCare is causing them to consider only hiring part-time workers.

KHN indicates Wellpoint sees small employers dropping their health coverage.

There's more.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I would point out that these are from all over the country. Growing worries about ObamaCare forcing insurers out of State markets.

Iowa Public Radio: Full-time vs part-time workers. Restaurants weigh ObamaCare.

ObamaCare forces work-hour limits for CMU students.

Brevard cuts some workers' part-time hours to avoid ObamaCare rules.

ObamaCare delay is a relief for a family business.

□ 2130

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. So we're already picking up on some trends here. From a number of the headlines, we're getting the sense that this health care law is not what we were told it would be, what the American people were told it would be. It's not sustainable. That's why there's all manner of taxes, from medical device taxes to what was once a tanning tax. They're looking for revenue under every rock to make this thing sustainable.

It doesn't control costs. By some estimates in my own State, the State of Indiana, premiums are expected to go up 70 percent-plus within the next year or so. There are problems about access that we're hearing about that are captured in articles around the country. Rural areas, in particular, can expect to have a shortage of doctors as a direct result of this law. And there are quality concerns.

I've just listed my thoughts on what health care reform ought to accomplish. All those various things ought to happen. Unfortunately, ObamaCare is failing on every front. And I don't say this with any celebration. I lament the fact. It's all the more reason that we need to continue to educate our colleagues and that minority of the American people that still believe this is going to work.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. As we see here:

Texas Business Owner Facing $1 Million in Annual ObamaCare Costs;

Maryland Employers Cutting Hours Due to ObamaCare;

Waitress Said She's Losing Full-Time Status Due to the ObamaCare Rule;

St. Pete College: HCC Cut Adjuncts' Hours Over Health Care;

Local Entrepreneur Sells Part of Business Due to ObamaCare.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. There are people behind every one of these headlines.

Forbes says: Labor Unions Are Indicating That ObamaCare Will Shatter Our Health Benefits and Cause Nightmare Scenarios.

My recollection was that labor was very much behind this bill, originally. I would love to work with them or any members of union or union leadership

to be part of the solution here to help alleviate some of the pain. Welcome home.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I share your feeling there. I found common ground with a lot of labor union folks on the Keystone pipeline because they want the jobs.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Absolutely.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Here, the labor unions are realizing this is a nightmare.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Well, they're hearing from their members.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. The members are speaking out.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. That's right.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Here you see:

Restaurant Shift: Sorry, Just Part-Time.

There's a theme here.

Workers' Hours Cut—'ObamaCare' Blamed.

Again, for those just tuning in, we're just reading news headlines, not op-eds. These are news headlines, stories from around the country, everything from the Weekly Standard to the Huffington Post, the AP.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Objective journalists.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. ObamaCare Strikes: Part-Time Jobs Surge to All-Time High; Full-Time Jobs Plunge by 240,000;

16,500 Working Fewer Hours Due to ObamaCare Mandate.

This is one of the mandates we've been talking about here tonight.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Let me press ''pause'' here before we read more of these headlines, which are incredibly illustrative and instructive.

So many of them deal with the cut in the number of hours for our wage earners during the worst economy since the Great Depression.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Sure.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Why is that happening? Why is that happening?

Well, you've got employers that are now mandated to provide health insurance to their employees, and many of them, in order to remain profitable, must change their way of doing business. So they change people from full-time into a part-time status. They hire people into part-time positions rather than full-time positions.

And then we have, perhaps most pathetically and tragically, what has been dubbed the ''29er effect,'' where people are working more than 30 hours a week, many of whom are barely getting by, barely able to put food on the table and meet their utility bills and so on, that are being dropped down to 29 or fewer hours.

How is that helpful to the American people?

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. And these are folks that the Obama administration says are full-time, but they're really not full-time. They may be working 35 hours a week. They don't even have a truly full-time, 40-hour-a-week job, what most folks across America know to be full-time. We talked about this before. Who said that 30 hours is full-time?

A lot of folks working 35 hours are trying to make ends meet. They would rather work 40 and get some other time. But what is happening is they're being cut back below 30, which is not just the number of hours they work. It's simultaneously reducing the money they take home.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. That's right. And we have legislation here, again, to address this problem, like the Saving American Workers Act. There's lots of cosponsors here in the House.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. That's your bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. I introduced the bill in response to some of the same things I'm hearing from my colleagues who are, in turn, hearing from their constituents and the sort of things I hear back home in Indiana, which is this is absolutely ridiculous. We're helping very few people at the expense of many.

Let's restore the definition of full-time as it's always been popularly understood and provide some relief. So we need to move forward on that. Let's continue to educate and assess what is being reported across the country on some of these.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Houston Doctors to Close Doors Because of ObamaCare;

Aetna Letter Warns Customers: 'Many People Will Pay More for Health Insurance' Under ObamaCare;

East Penn Cuts Cafeteria Workers' Hours to Avoid ObamaCare;

Affordable Care Act Insurance Mandates Leading Some Businesses to Cut Employees' Work Hours;

Limiting Part-Time Hours Unintended Result of Health Law.

Maybe the unintended consequences have something to do with the fact they didn't know half of what was in the law in the first place.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. That's right. I've seen some Indiana headlines—a number of them—related to some of these effects. One pops out there for me.

The Indianapolis News: School Part-Timers Fear Fewer Hours, Less Pay, as Impact of Health Care Law Kicks In.

Let's remember this is not just businesses that are being impacted. We've got municipalities, school workers, and businesses, especially in the hospitality industry or your retail sector, where we see a lot more people being hired on a part-time basis. Seemingly, every aspect of our economy and much of our society is being adversely impacted by this law.

Now, that's not to say that some people aren't helped. All things being equal, if we can insure a few more million people, that's a great thing; but with all the collateral damage created by this law and its unsustainability, that's the real problem here.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. And we can help those people. We can help those people through other means. As I said before, the idea that it's the ObamaCare model or nothing is a false choice. There are many other better patient-centered ways to do this to reach the same goal.

Health Care Law Causing SCC to Re-examine Adjunct Faculty Members;

Local Employers Struggle with Affordable Care Act.

When employers are struggling, the workers are struggling. The families are struggling.

ObamaCare Glitch Could Make Coverage Unaffordable for Low-Wage Workers;

ObamaCare's $96-an-Hour Cost Spike May End 30-Hour Workweek.

We're getting short on time, so I think we ought to run through these.

I want to talk a little bit about where our bills are now, sitting at the other end of the Capitol. I want to urge our Senate friends to think about the opportunity they have.

But let's take a quick look at these before we close out.

Rancho Cucamonga May Reduce Part-Time Hours to Avoid Health Care Costs;

Part-time Staff Hours in Flux Due to ObamaCare;

Fort Wayne Community Schools Cut Hours for Part-Time Positions;

Maricopa Community College Staffs Pinched by Obama Health Law;

Dallas Area Cities, School Districts Expect Budget Hits from Affordable Care Act.

And the good news just keeps on coming. There's a little sarcasm there. This is just awful.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Out in Colorado: Fort Collins Small Businesses Prepare for Affordable Care Act Changes;

The World-Herald: Districts to Cut Back Paraprofessionals' Hours as a Result of Health Care Law.

It's already even impacting paraprofessionals right now.

Beacon Journal: Limiting Part-Time Hours to Avoid Health Care Costs.

More of the same, impacting yet more Americans.

Requirements for Health Care Reform and Resulting Requirements for Chesterfield County Public Schools;

The Salt Lake Tribune: Ahead of Health Reform, Granite District Cuts Part-Time Workers' Hours.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. And there's so many more. One that I actually didn't get up here was reported just tonight. In Ohio, they announced that premiums statewide are going up 41 percent.

AAA Parks Full-Time Jobs, Cites Health Law;

Agencies Must Cut Some Part-Timers' Hours or Offer Health Insurance;

Part-Time Employee Hours Cut Over Health Care;

Fast-Food Worker Hours Cut, New Health Care Law Blamed.

I know we're short on time. We've got some other colleagues that want to talk tonight, but I just want to close

by first of all thanking my colleague, Representative YOUNG of Indiana, for being here with me.

But I'd just like to point out that the employer mandate bill that mimics what the President did, that postpones the employer mandate for 1 year, we passed it here with 35 Democrats, bipartisan. Your bill, the individual mandate postponement, 22 Democrats. We passed them out of here. We did our job.

The worst the White House could say about my bill is that it was redundant. Those bills are sitting down in the Senate, waiting for action.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Redundant to the Treasury Department's blog post, it bears reminding. They're sitting over there, gathering dust, as the American people demand relief. It is so important.

I want to thank you for your leadership on this issue. Those in Arkansas are well represented by you on this and other matters, working very hard to ensure that where relief can be provided, we provide it; where the prerogatives of the legislative branch can be defended, you will defend them.

That's where I stand as well. We just need the United States Senate to act.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. On the employer mandate delay, they should pass that immediately to make the President's actions legal, and they should pass the individual mandate delay to make the President's actions fair.

I appreciate you being here with me tonight. You are an outstanding member of the Ways and Means Committee, and I appreciate your leadership.

We're running out of time. I want to thank folks for joining us tonight, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2145

JERUSALEM AS THE CAPITAL OF ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) is recognized for the remainder of the time until 10 p.m. as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank Congressman GRIFFIN for the opportunity here. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the time.

Mr. Speaker, the tiny Nation of Israel began in earnest more than 3,000 years ago. Since that time the people of Israel have faced more heartaches, threats of annihilation, bigotry, torture, and genocide than any other people in the history of humanity. Yet even today, in 2013, against all odds and opposition, the noble people of Israel remain. And the peace of Israel continues to be the linchpin of peace for the entire world.

Today Israel faces another catastrophic challenge among the many in its long struggle throughout history that threatens to end its existence as a nation. The greatest challenge Israel faces today is the growing threat of a nuclear armed Iran. This is a menace that also threatens the peace and security of the entire family of mankind.

Mr. Speaker, Israel has been our truest friend and ally in the Middle East now for approximately 65 years, and during that entire time it has faced many unthinkable threats from enemies who desire to see its absolute annihilation. Now more than ever before the United States of America and the nation of Israel must stand together against the threat of a nuclear Iran and against those who would see our two nations and all those we love and all those who love human freedom eradicated from the face of the Earth.

One of the most important ways America can send a signal to the world that there is no space between us and Israel is to transfer our Embassy to an existing, newly constructed consulate in Jerusalem and once and for all make it clear that the United States officially and unequivocally recognizes Jerusalem as the undivided capital city of the state of Israel.

This is something we should have done a long time ago, Mr. Speaker. However, there has never been a more important time to do it because the world today, including some of our most dangerous enemies, doubt America's resolve to stand with Israel. And the actions of the Obama administration would create such doubt in any reasonable person's mind. For instance, when it was announced that the Israeli Government had completed one more step in the permit process for building houses in Jerusalem, the Obama administration openly rebuked Israel and demanded that they do several things by way of ''penance'' for building houses for its citizens.

Now Mr. Speaker, I cannot tell you how bewildering it is for me as an American Congressman to hear our own American President expressing more outrage toward Israel for building homes in its own capital city than he has expressed toward a madman like Mahmoud Ahmadinejad for building nuclear weapons with which to threaten the peace and security of the entire world.

Mr. Obama demanded that the permits be canceled, despite the fact that every Prime Minister of Israel has allowed them in their capital. Mr. Obama told Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu to make a ''substantial gesture'' towards the Palestinians and release Palestinian prisoners. Mr. Obama has made no such demands of the Palestinians, and the Palestinians have made no such concessions. In fact, Mr. Speaker, every concession that Israel has ever made for decades has been met and responded to by violence and terror.

Nevertheless, President Obama is continuing to insist that Israel publicly state its willingness to negotiate the division of Jerusalem and the right of return for millions of descendants of Palestinian refugees to Israel. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, no President in our history has been more bent upon isolating our friends and emboldening our enemies as this President.

And Mr. Speaker, it places Israel in a great conundrum. For if, on the one hand, they take military action to halt Iran's nuclear program, the world—including this administration—will openly condemn them and they will face intense isolation and hostility from the international community.

On the other hand, if they do not take action and they allow Iran to gain nuclear weapons, they face the real and imminent possibility that Iran will either directly or through its proxies unleash a nuclear hell on Earth that will annihilate their tiny homeland.

It is perilous beyond description for us all, Mr. Speaker, that the leader of the free world doesn't seem to understand the gravity of allowing the Iranian regime and the Government of Iran today to gain nuclear weapons capability. It is vital for those of us in Congress to make it clear that America's commitment to Israel remains steadfast and that Israel's enemy is America's enemy.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, America should make a major effort and make a major statement to that effect by transferring our Embassy to Israel's capital city, Jerusalem. This move would require nothing from American taxpayers. It could happen by selling the current Embassy in Tel Aviv, and that could even bring a substantial upside to America financially. This is something that we need to do for the sake of making it clear to the world that we will stand by Israel.

America has established bilateral relations with so many nations across the world, and in each case we have recognized their capital city. Yet when it has come to the State of Israel, our most critical and cherished ally on this Earth, Israel's capital city of Jerusalem is the only one in the world which we have yet to recognize.

Ironically, Mr. Speaker, it was America that was the first nation on Earth to recognize Israel as a nation, a mere 11 minutes after Israel's declaration. President Harry Truman said:

I had faith in Israel before it was established, I have faith in it now. I believe it has a glorious future before it—not just as another sovereign nation, but as an embodiment of the great ideals of human civilization.

Mr. Speaker, if America now ignores the opportunity to be the first to fully recognize Jerusalem as Israel's capital city, can we truly claim that we are Israel's nearest and dearest friend? And, can we honestly say that we are fully committed to our own principles?

The majority of Israel's citizens and leaders have yearned for their capital city's recognition by the people of the world and, moreover, by the people of the United States for so very long. Israel's capital city houses its government framework, including the Israeli Parliament, the Knesset, the Supreme

Court, the Bank of Israel, its diplomatic corps of the Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the Prime Minister's and President's offices. And very significantly, Jerusalem surrounds many of Israel's most sacred remembrances, including the tombs of the fallen soldiers on Mount Herzl, as well as the symbol of the most insidious injustice ever endured by the Jewish people, the Holocaust Museum—Yad Vashem.

Mr. Speaker, not so long ago one of the Members of this House said very eruditely and arrogantly: ''I don't take sides for or against Israel, and I don't take sides for or against Hezbollah.'' I believe, Mr. Speaker, that that is more dangerous, that kind of moral equivalence, that kind of moral neutrality, it's more dangerous to humanity than terrorism itself.

Ronald Reagan gave an address in 1983 when the world faced a similar threat in the growing strength and nuclear ambition of the Soviet Union. He stated:

I urge you to beware the temptation to ignore the facts of history and the aggressive impulses of an evil empire, to simply call the arms race a giant misunderstanding and thereby remove yourself from the struggle between right and wrong and good and evil.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot remove ourselves from that struggle.

Let us all be reminded that we have been here before. The free nations of the world once had opportunity to address the insidious rise of the Nazi ideology in its formative years, when it could have been dispatched without great cost. But they delayed, and the result was atomic bombs falling on cities, 50 million people dead worldwide, and the swastika's shadow nearly plunging the planet into Cimmerian darkness.

You know, it is said that those who survived the Holocaust achieved their revenge through simply living. Rather than allowing their faith and their hopes to be crushed by the atrocities of the past, they chose instead to dry their tears and to look up and to begin building again. And indeed they did build again. They built a future and a family and a community and a nation. And Mr. Speaker, the God of Jacob honored their courage. The threat of the Nazis is no more, and one day this threat of global jihad will be no more.

Mr. Speaker, recognizing Jerusalem as the rightful capital of Israel is not solely an act of foreign attributes and powers. It is the noble act of courage and justice that comports with everything that America is. We have assisted the Jewish people in restoring their ancient state. We must now act and recognize her restored ancient city, Jerusalem.

Together, we can ensure that Jerusalem continues to be a center for answered prayers and dreams come true. And I pray that the United States will be the first nation to officially and formally recognize Israel's capital city and to transfer our Embassy to Jerusalem. This will undeniably affirm our commitment and our resolve on behalf of Israel. And we will be standing steadfastly on our own Declaration of Independence, as well, Mr. Speaker, as on the right side of history.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would just pray that the light of God's peace will shine down upon the streets of Jerusalem forever.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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. LEWIS of Georgia (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of attending Lindy Boggs' funeral.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1911. An act to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish interest rates for new loans made on or after July 1, 2013, to direct the Secretary of Education to convene the Advisory Committee on Improving Postsecondary Education Data to conduct a study, on improvements to postsecondary education transparency at the Federal level, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2167. An act 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.

H.R. 2611. An act 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.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, August 2, 2013, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2450. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Handling of Animals; Contingency Plans; Stay of Regulations [Docket No.: APHIS-2006-0159] (RIN: 0579-AC69) received July 31, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2451. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Releasing Information; General Provisions; Accounting and Reporting Requirements; Reports of Accounts and Exposures (RIN: 3052-AC76) received July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2452. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on the amount of purchases from foreign entities in Fiscal Year 2012; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2453. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter 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.

2454. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on balances carried forward at the end of the Fiscal Year (FY) 2012; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2455. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting Annual Report to the Congress on the Presidential $1 Coin Program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2456. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket No.: FEMA-2013-0002] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2457. A letter from the Chief, Planning and Regulatory Affairs Office, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — National School Lunch Program and School Breakfast Program: Nutrition Standards for All Foods Sold in School as Required by the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010 [FNS-2011-0019] (RIN: 0584-AE09) received July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2458. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Animal Feeds Contaminated With Salmonella Microorganisms [Docket No.: FDA-2013-N-0253] received July 31, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2459. 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 (Centerville, Midway, Lovelady, and Oakwood, Texas); Applications of Stations KTWL(FM), Hempstead, Texas (Facility ID No. 21204), and KLTR(FM), Brenham, Texas (Facility ID No. 40775), to Change Communications of License [MB Docket No.: 12-92] (RM-11650; RM-11679) (File No. BPH-20120529ADK; BPH-20120529ADI) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2460. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Regulatory Guide 1.124, Revision 3, ''Service Limits and Loading Combinations for Class 1 Linear Type Supports'', pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2461. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Interim Enforcement Policy for Permanent Implant Brachytherapy Medical Event Reporting [NRC-2013-0114] received July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2462. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Developing Software Life-Cycle Processes for Digital Computer Software Used in Safety Systems of Nuclear Power Plants; Regulatory Guide 1.173, Revision 1, received July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2463. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Software Requirement Specifications for Digital computer Software and Complex Electronics Used in Safety Systems of Nuclear Power Plants; Regulatory Guide 1.172, Revision 1, received July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2464. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Software Unit Testing for Digital Computer Software Used in Safety Systems of Nuclear Power Plants; Regulatory Guide 1.171, Revision 1, received July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2465. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Test Documentation for Digital Computer Software Used in Safety Systems of Nuclear Power Plants Regulatory Guide 1.170, Revision 1, received July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2466. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Configuration Management Plants for Digital Computer Software Used in Safety Systems of Nuclear Power Plants; Regulatory Guide 1.169, Revision 1, received July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2467. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Verification, Validation, Reviews, and Audits for Digital Computer Software Used in Safety Systems of Nuclear Power Plants; Regulatory Guide 1.168, Revision 2, received July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2468. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Preparation of Environmental Reports for Nuclear Power Plant License Renewal Applications; Regulatory Guide 4.2, Revision 1, received July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2469. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Final Safety Evaluation by the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation Topical Report WCAP-12610-P-A & CENPD-404-P-A, Addendum 2/WCAP-14342-A & CENPD-404-NP-A, Addendum 2, ''Westinghouse Clad Corrosion Model for ZIRLO and Optimized ZIRLO'' Westinghouse Electric Company Project No. 700, received July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2470. A letter from the Assistant Secretary For Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — 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 [Docket No.: 110928603-3298-01] (RIN: 0694-AF39) received July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2471. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Additions to the List of Validated End-Users in the People's Republic of China: Samsung China Semiconductor Co. Ltd. and Advanced Micro-Fabrication Equipment, Inc., China [Docket No.: 130611539-3539-01] (RIN: 0694-AF93) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2472. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a letter regarding the section 620K(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2473. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process that was declared in Executive Order 12947 of January 23, 1995; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2474. A letter from the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, transmitting the twentieth quarterly report on the Afghanistan Reconstruction; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2475. A letter from the Director, Diversity and Inclusion Division, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's No FEAR Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2476. 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.

2477. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Annual Category Rating Report from November 1, 2011 to October 31, 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2478. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive and Political Personnel, Department of the Air Force, transmitting ten reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2479. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting ATF 2013 PACT Act Report, pursuant to Public Law 111-154, section 4(f)(2) (124 Stat. 1103); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2480. A letter from the Senior Attorney Advisor, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removing Unnecessary Office on Violence Against Women Regulations [OVW Docket No.: 110] (RIN: 1105-AB40) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2481. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a report regarding the International Marriage Broker Regulation Act (IMBRA); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2482. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0019; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-051-AD; Amendment 39-17485; AD 2013-12-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2483. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; B-N Group Ltd. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0314; Directorate Identifier 2013-CE-004-AD; Amendment 39-17490; AD 2013-13-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2484. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1052; Directorate Identifier 2012-CE-014-AD; Amendment 39-17471; AD 2013-11-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2485. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0205; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-226-AD; Amendment 39-17493; AD 2013-13-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2486. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1155; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-115-AD; Amendment 39-17445; AD 2013-09-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2487. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1214; Directorate Identifier 2011-SW-071-AD; Amendment 39-17482; AD 2013-12-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2488. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30907; Amdt. No. 3542] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2489. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30906; Amdt. No. 3541] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2490. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30905; Amdt. No. 3540] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2491. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Port Townsend, WA [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0926; Airspace Docket No. 12-ANM-24] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2492. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace; El Monte, CA [Docket FAA No.: FAA-2013-0505; Airspace Docket No. 13-AWP-4) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2493. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Area Navigation (RNAV) Routes; Washington, DC [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0081; Airspace Docket No.: 12-AEA-5] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2494. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of VOR Federal Airways V-55 and V-169 in Eastern North Dakota [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0484; Airspace Docket No. 13-AGL-16] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2495. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Live Oak, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0001; Airspace Docket No. 12-ASO-45] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2496. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Selmer, TN [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0074; Airspace Docket No.: 13-ASO-3] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2497. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Captiva, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1335; Airspace Docket No.: 12-ASO-19] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2498. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of VOR Federal Airway V-537, GA [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0971; Airspace Docket No. 12-ASO-31] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2499. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Tuskegee, AL [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0158; Airspace Docket No. 13-ASO-5] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2500. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0420; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-284-AD; Amendment 39-17315; AD 2013-01-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2501. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0302; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-019-AD; Amendment 39-17503; AD 2013-13-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2502. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; PILATUS Aircraft Ltd. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0598; Directorate Identifier 2013-CE-015-AD; Amendment 39-17506; AD 2013-14-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2503. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0864; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-023-AD; Amendment 39-17496; AD 2013-13-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2504. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1330; Directorate Identifier 2012-CE-006-AD; Amendment 39-17470; AD 2013-11-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2505. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Various Restricted Category Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0553; Directorate Identifier 2011-SW-041-AD; Amendment 39-17502; AD 2013-13-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2506. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; PILATUS Aircraft Ltd. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0223; Directorate Identifier 2012-CE-049-AD; Amendment 39-17468; AD 2013-11-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2507. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1327; Directorate Identifier 2012-NE-47-AD; Amendment 39-17478; AD 2013-12-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2508. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1034; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-051-AD; Amendment 39-17383; AD 2013-05-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2509. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Hawker Beechcraft Corporation (Type Certificate Previously Held by Raytheon Aircraft Company) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0462; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-092-AD; Amendment 39-17476; AD 2013-11-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2510. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1221; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-151-AD; Amendment 39-17474; AD 2013-11-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2511. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0522; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-018-AD; Amendment 39-17487; AD 2013-10-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2512. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0018; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-060-AD; Amendment 39-17483; AD 2013-12-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2513. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Presidio, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0770; Airspace Docket No. 12-ASW-6] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2514. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30908; Amdt. No. 3543] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2515. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Parkston, SD [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1282; Airspace Docket No. 12-AGL-16] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2516. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of VOR Federal Airway V-345 in the Vicinity of Ashland, WI [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0236; Airspace Docket No. 13-AGL-5] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2517. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Colt, AR [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1281; Airspace Docket No. 12-ASW-13] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2518. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Worthington, MN [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1139; Airspace Docket No. 12-AGL-12] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2519. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Elbow Lake, MN [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1121; Airspace Docket No. 12-AGL-8] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2520. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Ogallala, NE [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1138; Airspace Docket No. 12-ACE-6] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2521. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Sanibel, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1334; Airspace Docket No. 12-ASO-18] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2522. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Restricted Areas R-2504A and R-2504B; Camp Roberts, CA, and Restricted Area R-2530; Sierra Army Depot, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0515; Airspace Docket No. 13-AWP-8] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2523. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Restricted Areas R-2907A and R-2907B; Lake George, FL; and R-2910, Pine Castle, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1146; Airspace Docket No. 10-ASO-25] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2524. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Grand Canyon, AZ [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0163; Airspace Docket No. 13-AWP-2] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2525. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class D and E Airspace; Twin Falls, ID [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0258; Airspace Docket No. 13-ANM-12] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2526. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Embraer S.A. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1230; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-107-AD; Amendment 39-17477; AD 2013-11-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2527. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Learjet Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0214; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-152-AD; Amendment 39-17497; AD 2013-13-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2528. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2008-0620; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-357-AD; Amendment 39-17499; AD 2013-13-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2529. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland (Eurocopter) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0520; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-027-AD; Amendment 39-17484; AD 2013-12-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2530. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1035; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-235-AD; Amendment 39-17492; AD 2013-13-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2531. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1305; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-041-AD; Amendment 39-17475; AD 2013-11-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2532. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1039; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-275-AD; Amendment 39-17491; AD 2013-13-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2533. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; DASSAULT AVIATION Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1067; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-231-AD; Amendment 39-17444; AD 2013-09-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2534. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dowty Propellers Propellers [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0776; Directorate Identifier 2009-NE-32-AD; Amendment 39-17481; AD 2010-17-11R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2535. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; PILATUS Aircraft Ltd. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0383; Directorate Identifier 2013-CE-008-AD; Amendment 39-17498; AD 2013-13-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2536. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Piper Aircraft, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0535; Directorate Identifier 2013-CE-018-AD; Amendment 39-17489; AD 2013-13-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2537. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation (Sikorsky) Model Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1206; Directorate Identifier 2012-SW-021-AD; Amendment 39-17269; AD 2012-23-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2538. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0458; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-19-AD; Amendment 39-17480; AD 2013-21-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2539. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Piper Aircraft, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0983; Directorate Identifier 2012-CE-001-AD; Amendment 39-17457; AD 2013-10-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2540. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Engine Alliance Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1329; Directorate Identifier 2012-NE-46-AD; Amendment 39-17479; AD 2013-12-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2541. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0447; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-17-AD; Amendment 39-17488; AD 2013-10-52] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2542. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Various Helicopter Models [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0521; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-010-AD; Amendment 39-17486; AD 2013-06-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2543. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Hazardous Materials Safety, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Revision to Fireworks Regulations (RRR) [Docket No.: PHMSA-2010-0320 (HM-257)] (RIN: 2137-AE70) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2544. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Memorandum of Understanding Between the United States and the Government of Belize Concerning the Imposition of Import Restrictions on Archaeological Materials Representing the Cultural Heritage of Belize, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2602(g)(1); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2545. A letter from the Chief Counsel/Administrative Specialist, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Sale and Issue of Marketable Book-Entry Treasury Bills, Notes, and Bonds [Docket No.: Fiscal-BPD-2013-0001] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2546. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Appeals Settlement Guideline, New Qualified Plug-In Electric Drive Motor Vehicle Credit [UIL: 30D.00-00] received July 31, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2547. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Recognizing advance payments for gift cards that are redeemable for goods or services from an unrelated entity (Rev. Proc. 2013-39) received July 29, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2548. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Change in Terminology: ''Mental Retardation'' to ''Intellectual Disability'', pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2549. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Memorandum of justification for the President's waiver of the restrictions on the provision of funds to the Palestinian Authority; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

2550. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare Program; Inpatient Psychiatric Facilities Prospective Payment System — Update for Fiscal Year Beginning October 1, 2013 (FY 2014) [CMS-1447-N] (RIN: 0938-AR63) July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

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. BROUN of Georgia:

H.R. 2900. A bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the percentage floor on medical expense deductions, expand the use of tax-preferred health care accounts, and establish a charity care credit; to amend the Social Security Act to create a Medicare Premium Assistance Program, reform EMTALA requirements, and to replace the Medicaid program and the Children's Health Insurance program with a block grant to the States; to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for cooperative governing of individual and group health insurance coverage offered in interstate commerce; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, Natural Resources, the Judiciary, House Administration, Appropriations, and Rules, 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. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. COLE, Mr. JONES, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TERRY, Mr. HANNA, Mr. SCHOCK, and Ms. EDWARDS):

H.R. 2901. A bill to strengthen implementation of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 by improving the capacity of the United States Government to implement, leverage, and monitor and evaluate programs to provide first-time or improved access to safe drinking water, sanitation, and hygiene to the world's poorest on an equitable and sustainable basis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MORAN, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. LEWIS):

H.R. 2902. A bill to require the Supreme Court of the United States to promulgate a code of ethics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENT (for himself, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. PERRY, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. MARINO):

H.R. 2903. A bill to amend section 487(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide increased accountability of nonprofit athletic associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WHITFIELD (for himself, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 2904. A bill to provide for payment to the survivor or surviving family members of compensation otherwise payable to a contractor employee of the Department of Energy who dies after application for compensation under the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000, and for other purposes; 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. WHITFIELD (for himself, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 2905. A bill to amend the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 to strengthen the quality control measures in place for part B lung disease claims and to establish the Advisory Board on Toxic Substances and Worker Health for the contractor employee compensation program under subtitle E of such Act; 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. FITZPATRICK (for himself and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 2906. A bill to amend MAP-21 to improve contracting opportunities for veteran-owned small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, 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. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 2907. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to ensure that members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who have served on active duty or performed active service since September 11, 2001, in support of a contingency operation or in other emergency situations receive credit for such service in determining eligibility for early receipt of non-regular service retired pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 2908. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to allow the use of physical damage disaster loans for the construction of safe rooms; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. GIBSON):

H.R. 2909. A bill to require the Secretary of Labor to maintain a publicly available list of all employers that relocate a call center overseas, to make such companies ineligible for Federal grants or guaranteed loans, and to require disclosure of the physical location of business agents engaging in customer service communications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Oversight and Government Reform, and 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. WAXMAN (for himself, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 2910. A bill to protect American children and their families from the epidemic of gun violence by banning access to certain weapons, strengthening the Nation's mental health infrastructure, and improving the understanding of gun violence; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and 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. RUSH (for himself and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 2911. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to expand eligibility for part 74 licenses to certain wireless microphone users, to establish safe haven channels for wireless microphones, and to authorize access by owners and operators of wireless microphones to the TV bands databases for the purpose of protecting wireless microphone operations from interference; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. TIERNEY, and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 2912. A bill to provide authority for the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction to suspend and debar contractors under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 2913. A bill to authorize certain Department of Veterans Affairs major medical facility leases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. SPEIER (for herself, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 2914. A bill to prevent abusive billing of ancillary services to the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. COTTON (for himself and Mr. GOWDY):

H.R. 2915. A bill to amend section 2423 of title 18, United States Code, to eliminate a defense, to a criminal prosecution under that section, based on the state of mind of the defendant as to the age of the minor engaging in, or intended to engage in, a commercial sex act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHUSTER (for himself, Mr. TERRY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. LATTA, Mr. DENT, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. BUCSHON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. RADEL, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. MARINO, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. TURNER, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. PERRY, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. NUNES, Mr. REED, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. MICA):

H.R. 2916. A bill to require congressional review of certain rules promulgated by the Environmental Protection Agency; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Rules, 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. SERRANO (for himself, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RICHMOND, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MENG, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HONDA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SIRES, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. JEFFRIES):

H.R. 2917. A bill to promote savings by providing a tax credit for eligible taxpayers who contribute to savings products and to facilitate taxpayers receiving this credit and open a designated savings product when they file their Federal income tax returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. BARR, Mr. MORAN, Mr. ENYART, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. WHITFIELD, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. TURNER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. DOYLE):

H.R. 2918. A bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to transfer certain funds to the Multiemployer Health Benefit Plan and the 1974 United Mine Workers of America Pension Plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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 Mrs. LUMMIS (for herself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GARCIA, and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia):

H.R. 2919. A bill to amend titles 5 and 28, United States Code, to require annual reports to Congress on, and the maintenance of databases on, awards of fees and other expenses to prevailing parties in certain administrative proceedings and court cases to which the United States is a party, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. RUSH, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HIMES, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 2920. A bill to improve the financial literacy of students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself and Mr. COLLINS of New York):

H.R. 2921. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the taxation of hard cider; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLDING (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. WATT, and Mr. MARINO):

H.R. 2922. A bill to extend the authority of the Supreme Court Police to protect court officials away from the Supreme Court grounds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 2923. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the Secretary of the Treasury to disclose certain taxpayer rights in the letter of acknowledgment of receipt of an application to be treated as an organization described in section 501(c)(3); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 2924. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that the Secretary of the Treasury follow certain procedures relating to status applications of 501(c)(4) organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. KIND, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. NUNES, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. REED, Mr. PAULSEN, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 2925. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to expand the permissive exclusion from participation in Federal health care programs to individuals and entities affiliated with sanctioned entities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 2926. A bill to prohibit the revocation or withholding of Federal funds to programs whose participants carry out voluntary religious activities; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 2927. A bill to prevent the implementation of certain tax and fee provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act until the Secretary of the Treasury certifies that reporting requirements relating to employer status and employee income levels and health care status may be made with 100 percent accuracy and without fraud; 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 Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 2928. A bill to direct the Election Assistance Commission to develop and publish recommendations for best practices that States may use in establishing and operating independent Congressional redistricting commissions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARNEY (for himself, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 2929. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for contributions to tax-exempt Housing Equity Savings Accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana (for himself, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 2930. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to award grants to eligible entities to establish, expand, or support school-based mentoring programs to assist at-risk middle school students with the transition from middle school to high school; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 2931. A bill to amend the false claims provisions of title 31, United States Code, with respect to health care programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COURTNEY (for himself, Mr. COBLE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. JONES, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. UPTON, Ms. ESTY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. HIMES, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Ms. GRANGER):

H.R. 2932. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the United States Coast Guard; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia):

H.R. 2933. A bill to require States and local educational agencies to report on the achievement of military-connected students in annual report cards under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MOORE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. MENG):

H.R. 2934. A bill to amend the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 to ban flame retardant chemicals from use in resilient filling materials in children's products; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY (for himself and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 2935. A bill to establish more efficient and effective policies and processes for departments and agencies engaged in or providing support to, international conservation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. POLIS, Ms. TITUS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. ENYART, Mr. TONKO, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 2936. A bill to provide for punishments for immigration-related fraud, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HURT (for himself, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 2937. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act with respect to the guidelines for specification of certain disposal sites for dredged or fill material; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. JENKINS:

H.R. 2938. A bill to provide that certain requirements of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act do not apply if the American Health Benefit Exchanges are not operating on October 1, 2013; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 2939. A bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Shimon Peres; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. LEVIN):

H.R. 2940. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the rate of tax on domestic manufacturing income to 20 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (for herself, Mr. COLE, Mr. COOK, Ms. TITUS, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. BARBER, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 2941. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make certain grants to assist nursing homes for veterans located on tribal lands; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:

H.R. 2942. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reestablish the Professional Certification and Licensure Advisory Committee of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LAMBORN (for himself, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. COLE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. JONES, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 2943. A bill to amend the General Education Provisions Act to prohibit Federal education funding for elementary or secondary schools that provide access to emergency postcoital contraception; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 2944. A bill making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for the TIGER discretionary grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. LEVIN (for himself and Mr. GERLACH):

H.R. 2945. 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 Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOBIONDO:

H.R. 2946. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration to assess and report on the risk posed to commercial aviation security if a flight deck door is opened during flight; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 2947. A bill to express United States foreign policy with respect to, and to strengthen United States advocacy on behalf of, individuals persecuted and denied their rights in foreign countries on account of gender, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and the Judiciary, 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. MATHESON (for himself and Mr. HARPER):

H.R. 2948. A bill to require analyses of the cumulative and incremental impacts of certain rules and actions of the Environmental Protection Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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 Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2949. A bill to delay for one year certain amendments to the Medicaid program made by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2950. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to delay the application of the individual health insurance mandate for individuals who have not attained age 27; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2951. A bill to require certain preconditions for allowing premium tax credits, reductions in cost-sharing, and funding of Navigators and related Exchange enrollment activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. MEEHAN:

H.R. 2952. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make certain improvements in the laws relating to the advancement of security technologies for critical infrastructure protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. MICHAUD:

H.R. 2953. A bill to provide Medicare payments to Department of Veterans Affairs medical facilities for items and services provided to Medicare-eligible veterans for non-service-connected conditions; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and 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. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 2954. A bill to authorize Escambia County, Florida, to convey certain property that was formerly part of Santa Rosa Island National Monument and that was conveyed to Escambia County subject to restrictions on use and reconveyance; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. MOORE (for herself and Mr. POCAN):

H.R. 2955. A bill to amend the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act to ensure that recipients of assistance under that Act provide services to sexual and gender minority youth in a manner that is culturally competent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. BARBER):

H.R. 2956. A bill to eliminate unnecessary oil tax credits and subsidies for major oil companies to reduce the national debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. MURPHY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. BARBER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. DENT, Mr. TIBERI, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. MARINO):

H.R. 2957. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Social Security Act to extend health information technology assistance eligibility to behavioral health, mental health, and substance abuse professionals and facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. NADLER (for himself, Ms. HAHN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MORAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. HOLT):

H.R. 2958. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide certain port authorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. NUGENT (for himself and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 2959. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a national standard in accordance with which nonresidents of a State may carry concealed firearms in the State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 2960. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require sponsors of Medicare prescription drug plans to implement procedures to prevent fraud and abuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, 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. PASCRELL (for himself and Mr. RUNYAN):

H.R. 2961. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act and the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require additional disclosures and protections for students and cosigners with respect to student loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, 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. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LANCE, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. PETERS of California, and Mr. O'ROURKE):

H.R. 2962. A bill to provide for an independent assessment of the future resilience and reliability of the Nation's electric power transmission and distribution system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2963. A bill to provide dollars to the classroom; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2964. A bill to establish and provide for the treatment of Individual Development Accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2965. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow nontaxable employer matching contributions to section 529 college savings plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICHMOND (for himself, Ms. FUDGE, and Ms. BROWN of Florida):

H.R. 2966. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to suspend, for a certain period, the use of adverse credit history in determining eligibility for Federal Direct PLUS Loans; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SCHOCK (for himself and Mr. COOPER):

H.R. 2967. A bill to provide for fiscal gap and generational accounting analysis in the legislative process, the President's budget, and annual long-term fiscal outlook reports; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. SIRES:

H.R. 2968. A bill to amend titles 23 and 49, United States Code, with respect to congestion mitigation and metropolitan transportation planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TERRY (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 2969. 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. TIPTON:

H.R. 2970. A bill to facilitate the remediation of abandoned hardrock mines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 2971. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage the deployment of highly efficient combined heat and power property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 2972. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for producing electricity from wasted heat; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 2973. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Interior to carry out projects and conduct research on water resources in the Hudson-Mohawk River Basin, to establish a Hudson-Mohawk River Basin Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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 Mrs. WALORSKI (for herself and Ms. KUSTER):

H.R. 2974. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the eligibility for beneficiary travel for veterans seeking treatment or care for military sexual trauma in specialized outpatient or residential programs at facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FARR, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. POLIS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. KEATING, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 2975. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants for training and support services for Alzheimer's patients and their families; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FARR, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. POLIS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. KEATING, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 2976. A bill to amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 to reauthorize the Missing Alzheimer's Disease Patient Alert Program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITFIELD (for himself and Ms. DEGETTE):

H.R. 2977. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage, as supplies associated with the injection of insulin, of containment, removal, decontamination and disposal of home-generated needles, syringes, and other sharps through a sharps container, decontamination/destruction device, or sharps-by-mail program or similar program under part D of the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. DESANTIS (for himself and Mr. SALMON):

H.J. Res. 55. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the equal application to the Senators and Representatives of the laws that apply to all citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DENT, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WATT, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.J. Res. 56. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.J. Res. 57. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require a two-thirds vote of each House of Congress to increase the statutory limit on the public debt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON OF SOUTH CAROLINA (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DESANTIS, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. CRAMER):

H. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution commemorating the 46th anniversary of the reunification of Jerusalem; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRADY OF PENNSYLVANIA:

H. Con. Res. 49. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States Postal Service should issue a commemorative postage stamp honoring the Reverend Doctor Leon Sullivan and that the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee should recommend to the Postmaster General that such a stamp be issued; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. Con. Res. 50. Concurrent resolution designating a National Railroad Monument located in Diamond District Park in historic

downtown Durand, Michigan, as the ''National Railroad Memorial''; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. JONES (for himself, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H. Res. 323. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to observe a moment of silence in the House on the first legislative day of each month for those killed or wounded in the United States engagement in Afghanistan; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FARR (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H. Res. 324. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of September 22, 2013, through September 28, 2013, as ''National Marine Technology Week'' to recognize the important contributions that marine technology has made to the United States; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER (for himself, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HALL, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. COOK, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. GRAYSON, and Mr. MCCARTHY of California):

H. Res. 325. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should award the Presidential Medal of Freedom posthumously to Glen Doherty and Tyrone Woods, both of whom died from enemy action during the attack on United States facilities in Benghazi, Libya, on the night of September 11-12, 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

122. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to Senate Resolution No. 104 urging the President and the Congress to support the adoption of House Bill 1014; to the Committee on the Budget.

123. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Colorado, relative to Senate Joint Memorial 13-003 urging the Congress to enact comprehensive immigration reform; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

124. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, relative to House Resolution No. 246 urging the Congress to pass the Secure Travel and Counterterrorism Partnership Program Act; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Intelligence (Permanent Select).

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. BROUN of Georgia:

H.R. 2900.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (the Spending Clause) of the United States Constitution states that ''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay for Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.'' This bill restores the proper balance of power between the federal and state governments as intended under the 10th Amendment to the Constitution by devolving the responsibilities related to health care to the states and individuals. It also reinforces the founding constitutional principle that state governments and individuals are properly situated with attending to their own health, safety, and general welfare.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 2901.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 2902.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 2903.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 2904.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 2905.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 2906.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 2907.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The Congress shall have the power to provide for the common defense.

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 2908.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8 which allows Congress to regulate trade with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 2909.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. WAXMAN:

H.R. 2910.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 2911.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

''The Congress shall have Power ''to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 2912.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution: 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; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

Clause 14 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution: To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution: 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 Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 2913.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 2914.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce among the states, and provide for the general welfare.

By Mr. COTTON:

H.R. 2915.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests in the power of Congress:

(1) to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes, as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution;

(2) to make all laws necessary and proper for executing powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SHUSTER:

H.R. 2916.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution, including the power granted Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, of the United States Constitution, and the power granted to each House of Congress under Article I, Section 5, Clause 2, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 2917.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution, which states that that ''The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises. . . .'' In addition, this legislation is introduced pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution, which states that Congress shall have the 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.''

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 2918.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mrs. LUMMIS:

H.R. 2919.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 9: No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law;

and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 2920.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution relating to the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States)

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 2921.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill modifies the Internal Revenue Code, which Congress enacted pursuant to its powers under the U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section VIII as well as the 16th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, and, more generally, its powers to tax and spend for the general welfare. Congress has the power under those provisions to enact this legislation as well.

By Mr. HOLDING:

H.R. 2922.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article III, Section I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 2923.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 2924.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 2925.

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 Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 2926.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment I

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 2927.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 2928.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 2929.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

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; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 2930.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution, Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, and clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 2931.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 which authorizes Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land.

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H.R. 2932.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: Congress shall have the Power to . . . coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures . . .

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 2933.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 2934.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 2935.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 2936.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. HURT:

H.R. 2937.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. JENKINS:

H.R. 2938.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H.R. 2939.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 2040.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:

H.R. 2941.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, 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 the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof''

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:

H.R. 2942.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, 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 the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof''

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 2943.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 2944.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

As described in Article 1, Section 1 ''all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress . . .''

By Mr. LEVIN:

H.R. 2945.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LOBIONDO:

H.R. 2946.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2947.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, which reads: ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes.''

By Mr. MATHESON:

H.R. 2948.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2949.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Congress' legislative powers under Article I, Section 8, clause 3 to regulate Commerce among the several States.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2950.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Congress' legislative powers under Article I, Section 8, clause 3 to regulate Commerce among the several States.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2951.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Congress' legislative powers under Article I, Section 8, clause 3 to regulate Commerce among the several States.

By Mr. MEEHAN:

H.R. 2952.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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 Mr. MICHAUD:

H.R. 2953.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, 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 the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 2954.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section III, Clause II

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 2955.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 2956.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2957.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, commonly referred to for this purpose as the Commerce Clause, which states the following: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 2958.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution and clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. NUGENT:

H.R. 2959.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 2960.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 2961.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 2962.

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 Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2963.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2964.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

Clause 1: 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; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

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 of Officer thereof

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2965.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 2966.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority for this bill stems from Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SCHOCK:

H.R. 2967.

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 as stated in Article I, Section 8 and Article I, Section 9 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SIRES:

H.R. 2968.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 2969.

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. TIPTON:

H.R. 2970.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2:

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 2971.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1,

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 2972.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1,

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 2973.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1,

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 2974.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 2975.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution and

Article 1, Section 8, clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 2976.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution and

Article 1, Section 8, clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 2977.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution.

By Mr. DESANTIS:

H.J. Res. 55.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the U.S. Constitution

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.J. Res. 56.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article V—Amendment. The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate.''

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.J. Res. 57.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Constitutional Amendments Article V

The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no State without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 60: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 148: Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 182: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 183: Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 262: Mr. HECK of Nevada and Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 279: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 281: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 292: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 301: Mr. GARDNER and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 310: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 362: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 363: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 366: Ms. JENKINS and Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 419: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 460: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 474: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 485: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 491: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 508: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. BARBER, and Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 523: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 525: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 533: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 543: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 574: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 578: Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 580: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 620: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 621: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 647: Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 679: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 685: Ms. MOORE, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. KILMER, Mr. NEAL, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 690: Mr. BARLETTA and Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 702: Mr. COHEN and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 720: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 724: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 755: Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 792: Mr. GOWDY.
H.R. 795: Mr. STOCKMAN.
H.R. 846: Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KLINE, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 920: Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 938: Mr. THORNBERRY.
H.R. 961: Mr. BERA of California.
H.R. 975: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1001: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 1014: Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 1015: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 1020: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 1024: Ms. CLARKE, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 1074: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 1091: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. MASSIE.
H.R. 1094: Mr. BERA of California and Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 1105: Mr. MATHESON and Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 1146: Mr. MCHENRY.
H.R. 1175: Ms. BASS.
H.R. 1176: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 1237: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 1249: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 1250: Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 1252: Mr. COOK, Mr. RUNYAN, and Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 1276: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. FARR, and Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 1318: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 1327: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1346: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 1354: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 1389: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida and Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 1416: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 1428: Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 1476: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.
H.R. 1518: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 1526: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 1563: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 1593: Mr. MEEKS and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1677: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 1690: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 1692: Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 1701: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 1705: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. PETERS of Michigan.
H.R. 1725: Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. BARBER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1726: Mr. MARINO, Mr. WOLF, Mr. DESANTIS, and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 1750: Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. BARR, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. RADEL.
H.R. 1779: Mr. DUFFY, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 1780: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 1787: Mr. CLAY, Mr. LONG, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. GARDNER.
H.R. 1795: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 1798: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 1801: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 1814: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. FINCHER, and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 1818: Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 1823: Mr. HONDA and Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 1825: Ms. GRANGER and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
H.R. 1830: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1852: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1869: Mr. KILMER and Mr. BENTIVOLIO.
H.R. 1878: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 1880: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 1905: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. HANNA, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 1921: Ms. NORTON and Ms. BASS.
H.R. 1923: Mr. LONG.
H.R. 1967: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1979: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 1980: Mr. RIGELL.
H.R. 1985: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 1998: Mr. VEASEY, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 1999: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 2000: Mr. RUIZ, Mr. VELA, Mr. CARNEY, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ISSA, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2003: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 2009: Mrs. NOEM.
H.R. 2012: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 2016: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. YOHO, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. CHU, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. HAHN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. DENHAM, and Mrs. LUMMIS.
H.R. 2018: Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 2022: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 2026: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
H.R. 2041: Mr. CAMPBELL.
H.R. 2046: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 2058: Mr. POLLS and Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 2061: Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 2068: Mr. HUFFMAN and Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 2072: Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 2083: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2101: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 2116: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 2130: Mr. COHEN and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 2131: Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 2154: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2175: Mr. BARR.
H.R. 2207: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2241: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee and Mr. YODER.
H.R. 2273: Mr. PETERS of Michigan and Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 2278: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 2302: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. NUNNELEE, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2308: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 2317: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 2324: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2328: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 2355: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2356: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 2382: Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 2387: Mr. WALDEN and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 2399: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 2424: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 2429: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 2445: Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 2453: Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 2476: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 2505: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2509: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2510: Mr. VEASEY and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2512: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2527: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2539: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 2540: Mr. RIGELL, Mr. HIMES, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2578: Mr. PETERSON and Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 2585: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2590: Mr. KILMER, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 2591: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. ENYART, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 2633: Mr. FARR, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. POCAN, Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 2654: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2663: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 2665: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2670: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 2682: Mr.STIVERS.
H.R. 2687: Mr. HALL, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. ROHRABACHER.
H.R. 2691: Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 2694: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2710: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 2717: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. SALMON.
H.R. 2720: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 2725: Mr. SARBANES, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
H.R. 2743: Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 2752: Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 2770: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2773: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. BENISHEK, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, and Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 2775: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. CARTER, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DENHAM, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 2783: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 2799: Mr. HANNA, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2804: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 2805: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2809: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 2810: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. CARTER.
H.R. 2812: Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 2825: Ms. BASS, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 2826: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 2833: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 2835: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 2837: Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 2839: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 2845: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2851: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. WATERS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 2863: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 2869: Mr. RADEL.
H. J. Res. 20: Ms. HANABUSA.
H. J. Res. 34: Mr. CAPUANO.
H. J. Res. 44: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. VEASEY.
H. J. Res. 50: Mr. CAMP, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. FINCHER, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H. Con. Res. 24: Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H. Con. Res. 45: Mr. AMASH. H. Res. 19: Mr. ENGEL.
H. Res. 30: Mr. DINGELL.
H. Res. 36: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H. Res. 75: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H. Res. 109: Ms. GABBARD and Ms. ESTY.
H. Res. 153: Mr. MASSIE. H. Res. 187: Ms. TSONGAS. H. Res. 188: Ms. TSONGAS. H. Res. 227: Mr. CAPUANO. H. Res. 250: Mr. MULLIN, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 281: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr . Capuano, Ms. ESTY, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. FARR, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. KEATING, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. OWENS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. DENT.
H. Res. 293: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. WAGNER.
H. Res. 301: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H. Res. 308: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. KEATING, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. KING of New York and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H. Res. 314: Mr. HIMES.

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:

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Judiciary in H.R. 2879 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

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. 2783: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H. Res. 319: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

43. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City of Falls City, Texas, relative to Resolution No. 061213A calling upon our elected officials to affirm the rights of the citzens under the 2nd Amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

44. Also, a petition of the Municipal Assembly of Jayuya, Puerto Rico, relative to Resolution No. 76 expressing the condemnation of the application of the death penalty by the Federal District Court of the United States at the District of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

45. Also, a petition of the Municipal Assembly of Jayuya, Puerto Rico, relative to Resolution No. 77 requesting the President to grant the immediate and unconditional release of Oscar Lopez Rivera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, AUGUST 1, 2013 *No. 113*

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ, a Senator from the State of Hawaii.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Lord God, the source of our life, You are high above all, yet in all. Keep us from becoming weary in doing what is right, as You use us for Your instruments in these challenging times. Empower our Senators to bring Your freedom to those shackled by fear. Help them to lift the burdens that are too heavy for people to carry. Lengthen their vision that they may see beyond today and make decisions that will have an impact for eternity.

And, Lord, in a special way, bless Dave Schiappa, as he prepares to transition to new vocational opportunities. Thank You for his decades of faithful service for You and country on Capitol Hill. Be gracious to him and his family. We pray in Your loving Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer 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.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, August 1, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ, a Senator from the State of Hawaii, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. SCHATZ thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following leader remarks the Senate will be in morning business until 11 o'clock this morning. The time until then will be equally divided and controlled between the majority leader and the Republican leader.

At 11 the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the Chen nomination to be a U.S. circuit judge for the Federal circuit. Also, at 11 there will be a filing deadline for all second-degree amendments to the Transportation bill.

At noon there will be two rollcall votes on confirmation of Chen and cloture on the THUD bill. Following those votes, the Senate will recess until 2 p.m. for a bipartisan caucus meeting.

This afternoon there will be a rollcall vote on the confirmation of the Power nomination to be Ambassador to the United Nations.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

COMMENDING DAVID J. SCHIAPPA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this morning I wish to say a few words about somebody who will not be around when we get back after the recess. After nearly 30 years of service, Dave Schiappa is hanging up his cleats. Dave is not exactly a household name. I think he likes it that way, but there is no question to those who work here day in and day out that nobody is more essential to the running of this place than Dave. To the extent we get anything done around here, it is largely because of Dave. To the extent we are not getting into shouting matches and food fights the rest of the time, well, that is largely thanks to Dave too. He has been the glue and he has been the grease that keeps this place functioning and we are really going to miss him.

As Secretary for the Republican majority and minority under three different leadership offices, Dave has been the eyes and ears on the floor for Republican leaders going back more than a decade. He has also been our chief diplomat to the other side. He has answered a million questions from all of us at all hours, always with the same tact, wicked sense of humor, and sharp mind that has made him not just an indispensable help to our conference but also the kind of guy we just like having around this place. I know I am speaking for everybody when I say that.

When I announced Dave's departure to the leadership team earlier this week, the entire room, Senators and staff, erupted in applause. I assure you it was not because folks were glad to see him go. There is just nobody you would rather be with, in a foxhole or just killing time on the Senate floor, than Dave.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Dave had a pretty illustrious career before he got the big office up on the third floor. Prior to joining the Senate as a cloakroom assistant at the tender age of 21, legend has it he did stints as a bartender—that was while he was in college—and as a hot dog vendor out on the National Mall during summers in high school. As far as I know, these are the only two jobs outside the Senate Dave has ever had. Somehow they turned out to be great preparation for this place. I am not exactly sure why that is, but I am sure we could all come up with some interesting theories about that.

So Dave came here right out of college, back when there were no cameras on the floor, just a radio. His job back then was basically to perform the role of play-by-play announcer, telling offices what was happening out here on the floor, matching the voices with names, and just letting everybody know where things stood at all times. I wanted to have a poster out here with a photo of Dave from those days, but all the photos have mysteriously somehow disappeared. Someone suggested it might have something to do with the fact that Dave sported a pretty serious eighties mustache back then. Maybe Cheryl can dig up that good photo from the family collection.

In 1994, Dave moved out of the cloakroom and onto the floor as Republican floor assistant. Two years after that, he was named Assistant Secretary for the majority and 2 weeks before 9/11, in August 2001, Senator Lott named him Secretary for the majority. Since then, the two parties have swung back and forth a couple of times, but Dave has been one of the constants—smoothing out all the rough edges during a thousand legislative fights, providing indispensable strategic advice to me and to the rest of our conference, and just generally keeping everybody on both sides informed of everything that is going on out here.

It is not easy. It is not easy telling Senators they will not get an amendment they have been fighting for or that they have to wait. But Dave has always had the perfect temperament for that job.

Nobody on Earth—nobody—knows more about Senate precedent and procedure than Dave Schiappa, and nobody wears their knowledge and skill more lightly.

So we are going to miss him a lot. We will all miss his ''Davisms,'' whether he is reporting that some Senator just showed up in the cloakroom ''in a three-point stance'' or that the week is shaping up to be a ''nothing burger.'' Those are Davisms.

He will take some secrets, hopefully, with him. It will forever remain a mystery, for example, how Dave stuffs all of those cards into his suit coat pocket. Ask Dave a question about anything and he will have the answer written on some card inside his coat. The secrets of the Senate are contained on those cards.

They say there are no indispensable men, though many of us have long suspected that Dave is the exception. I guess we will soon find out.

Dave, thanks for all you have done for all of us and for your devotion to the institution. I know how much the Senate means to you personally and we all appreciate how much you have given to it over the years. Some folks complain about the hours and the unpredictable schedule around here, but Dave has us all beat. He is not only here whenever we are, he is here after the lights go out, finishing up the business of the day, sending out e-mails, tying up loose ends or ''loose tarps,'' as he might put it. We are all glad you will finally have a little predictability in your life.

Which brings me to my last point which is almost, actually, the most important. Nobody who has a family can handle this place without an understanding spouse. So I want to thank Cheryl for putting up with this place over the last 23 years. Dave tells the story that early on in their marriage, Cheryl got Dave tickets to a show at the Kennedy Center for his birthday. When he called to tell her something had come up and he couldn't make it, she didn't know what he was talking about. Dave explained that he was stuck and there just wasn't anything he could do about it; it is just how the Senate works. It was the last time she questioned his job or his schedule.

So as much as I am here to thank Dave today, I want to thank Cheryl. I want Cheryl to know we are grateful to her for all the sacrifices she has made over the years for Dave and their family.

Ask Dave why he has been here so long and he will tell you it is the people, but the truth is Dave is one of the best this place has ever seen. I have no doubt about it.

Dave, on behalf of the entire Senate family, thanks for everything. You will be missed.

I see my friend the majority leader. Let me call up a resolution before his comments and then we will move on.

COMMENDING DAVID J. SCHIAPPA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 212 and for the clerk to read the resolution.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 212) commending David J. Schiappa:

S. RES. 212

Whereas, David Schiappa has loyally served the Senate for 29 years, his entire professional career, starting in the Senate in December 1984;

Whereas, David Schiappa grew up in Maryland and graduated from DaMatha Catholic High School, the University of Maryland, and Johns Hopkins University;

Whereas, David Schiappa rose through all the positions in the Republican Cloakroom finally serving as either Secretary for the Majority or Secretary for the Minority for the last three Republican Leaders;

Whereas, David Schiappa has at all times discharged the duties of his office with great dedication, diligence, and sense of service, thus earning the respect of Republican and Democratic Senators alike, as well as their staffs; and

Whereas, his good humor, storytelling ability, and easy-going manner have made him an invaluable member of the Senate family: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate expresses its appreciation to David Schiappa and his family and commends him for his outstanding and faithful service to the Senate.

The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to David J. Schiappa.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid on the table with no intervening action or debate.

Mr. REID. I object.

(Laughter.)

I will withdraw my objection.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 212) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. President, when I learned David Schiappa was going to leave, I had a brief conversation with him at the back of the Chamber. I am not very much for being emotional, but if ever there was a time I felt like shedding a tear, it was when I said goodbye to Dave Schiappa.

''Parting is such sweet sorrow,'' and it really is. It is from Shakespeare:

''Good night, good night! Parting is such sweet sorrow.''

And it really is.

If you are looking for someone who is a true Washington insider, you need look no further than Dave. He was actually born in Washington, DC, and for a quarter of a century he has made the trains run on time in the Republican cloakroom. For 13 of those years he served as the Republican secretary. He has been the secretary, as the Republican leader mentioned, when the Republicans held the majority and the minority.

Regardless of who controlled this Chamber, my observation was that he has always managed the floor with integrity and an even temper. He has been a real pleasure to work with. When Gary, his counterpart, wasn't around, I would go to Dave and ask him questions. I never had any concern about the answer because he would always tell me the truth. Sometimes I didn't like to hear the truth, but he was always very forthright and candid.

No matter how bad things got on the floor between Members, Dave and his Democratic counterpart Gary Myrick were always looking for a path forward. Gary Myrick has been so important to this body, along with Dave.

How these staff members love their jobs. I try to tell people about my staff,

and about the Senate staff in general. They do this because it is public service. He has put in 20 years—longer than 20 years. He is 50 years old and moving on to another career. I understand his doing that for himself and his family.

Gary Myrick has been my chief of staff. He ran my office. He loved this floor very much. This was always his dream job even though on paper he was a big shot by being the Democratic leader's chief of staff, but that is not what he wanted to do. He wanted to come to the Senate floor where he was raised in his employment. He knew this was the job that he wanted, and he told me that. I arranged things so he would come and be the secretary to the majority here.

Gary Myrick and David Schiappa were literally always looking for a way forward. They sorted through what I wanted, what the Republican leader wanted, and what Members wanted. They didn't always arrive at the conclusion the Republican leader or I wanted because sometimes that wasn't possible, but they worked through long hard days—and even longer nights—as well as holidays and birthdays. He has a friendly demeanor—Gary is not nearly as friendly as Dave but is just as effective.

They worked so well together. They are a team. Some day, when the history of this institution is written, they will have to talk about these two good men who made this place work through some of the most difficult times this body has ever seen.

He will be missed by Democrats and Republicans alike, and that is the truth.

In all of the times we talked—and we talked about important things most of the time. I understand he and Gary have been working together since the 1980s, and they are supposedly great storytellers—one and all. They have been known to talk for hours on end. They would disappear, and when Gary came back, we would ask: What did you talk about? And Gary would say—and I want to make sure I get this right—''I have no idea.'' But that was only a way of covering for both of them because they were so candid and forthright with each other. They always have been, and they would never ever divulge anything I was doing or going to do or anything Leader MCCONNELL was going to do or had done. They were absolutely confidential in their communications with each other. That is how they trusted each other. So when Gary said, ''I have no idea,'' he knew every idea, but he wasn't going to tell me what they talked about.

They are two such fine men. Even though there were difficult situations where they found themselves forced to talk, I am sure time passed quickly because they are such good people.

I know David will be successful at whatever he does. I congratulate him and thank him for three decades of valued service to the United States Senate and to our country.

I wish him, his wife Cheryl, and his children Aly and Mason—by the way, that is my middle name—happiness. I mean it when I say: Parting is such sweet sorrow.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am both saddened and heartened by the departure of Dave Schiappa from the Senate family.

I share the sadness felt on both sides of the aisle that the Senate is going to lose a valuable, dedicated, and inspiring resource.

I am heartened to know, without doubt, that Dave will move on to pursuits in which everyone around him will benefit from his productive presence. I am heartened to think, also, that his family might be able to see him a bit more often.

Dave's work in the Senate involves a challenging schedule, often involving brutal hours. He is often here morning, noon, and night—and sometimes overnight—helping to ensure that the Senate operates. With Dave at the helm, the operations are smooth, predictable, and disciplined. When things go smooth, as they normally do with Dave around, rest assured that much of that is the direct cause of Dave's tireless work and devotion.

Amazingly, with all of his tireless devotion, Dave always has a positive and uplifting disposition, and is always a pleasure to be around. Whether it is idle friendly chat, or discussions of Senate-rule intricacies, discourse with Dave always leaves you in a better place.

As Leaders MCCONNELL and REID and many others have attested, Dave always tells you the truth and is a straight-shooter, whether you like it or not. He tells the truth to any Senator on the floor, no matter what side of the aisle. That is what has helped the Senate work smoothly for the many years Dave has been at the steering wheel on our side.

Dave's tenure in the Senate began almost 30 years ago when he began working in the cloakroom. Since those earlier days, he has moved up the ranks to be one of the few people around here who understands all of the intricacies of the Senate, and he uses that understanding to help all of us and to make this place work. Dave is ending his illustrious Senate career with more Senate years under his belt than most Senators he works with on the floor.

Dave Schiappa has been a true treasure for me, for the Senate, and for the American people. The Senate is losing a valuable resource, and I am sad to see him go. I, and I am sure all of my colleagues, wish Dave and his family all the very best, and I am confident that in whatever Dave chooses in his future endeavors, we will continue to see nothing but the very best from him.

When people talk about America's best and brightest, they refer to folks like Dave who is truly one of our best and brightest.

In addition to thanking Dave for his counsel, camaraderie, guidance, and hard work, I also would like to give sincere thanks to Dave's wife and family. They have endured the often-grueling schedule demanded by Senate hours, which for Dave often stretches well before and well after when the Senate is actually in session. We owe Dave's family an enormous amount of gratitude for the time demands that the Senate has placed on them.

I am going to miss Dave Schiappa, as will the entire Senate as a collection of people and as an institution which Dave has nurtured and preserved.

COMMENDING ROHIT KUMAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, in addition to David leaving, Rohit Kumar is also leaving. I don't know what he did for Senator MCCONNELL, but most of the time I didn't like it. But I learned in our conversations, most of them in the back room, what a fine man he is and how smart he is. He is incredibly intelligent, he is good at his job and, as I have just indicated, a little too good sometimes.

Even though we at times knew what was happening was happening because he was behind it, I am really sorry to see him leave the Senate. He is a good person. I admire him and have such great respect for him. I wish him success and happiness in his next endeavor.

He has a beautiful young daughter that he boasts about all the time, and rightly so. He and his wife Hillary, I am confident, will have a very pleasant life outside the Senate, even though we will all miss him.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Would the Chair announce the business of the day.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 11 a.m. with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID SCHIAPPA

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader and the Republican leader for what they expressed about David Schiappa. We rank-and-file Senators feel the same way on both sides of the aisle.

I was reminded that the late Alex Haley, the author of ''Roots,'' once said: ''When an old person dies, it's like a library burning down.'' Dave is neither old nor dying, but there is some similarity in what is happening. With his leaving after 30 years, a number of volumes from the Senate library are going out the door. We won't have that wisdom, that experience, or that knowledge that has been so valuable to

us, and that has been especially important to the Senate where nearly half the Members are in their first term. This is an institution that depends on precedent, understanding, and respect of its strengths over a long period of time.

I had a chance to work with Dave at the request of Senator MCCONNELL at the beginning of the last two Congresses to work on the Senate rules. In working with Dave and with Gary, what I found was they were representing our point of view, but they also had such a love of the institution, they wanted to make sure whatever we came up with enhanced it, strengthened it, and didn't destroy it.

We wish Dave the best. We have admired his service and his friendship, and we hope that over the next few years he will allow us to bring those volumes of wisdom, knowledge, and experience back because occasionally we may need to read them.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I am very pleased to be able to join my colleagues in wishing Dave Schiappa well in his next adventure in life, and I know he will be successful and also build upon his knowledge and experience here in the Senate. I know his contributions will continue, and it will be a pleasure to continue to follow Dave in his career, noncareer, or long vacation. Whatever he chooses to do will be happy and rewarding as has his tenure here in the Senate.

No one is more respected or more appreciated than David Schiappa. So is it a sad day, in many ways, to see him leave, but a happy one to know he is going to begin a new era. We will watch him closely and stay in touch with him and continue to appreciate him throughout his career.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to add to the comments. In Wyoming we have what is called the code of the West. While Dave Schiappa may be the man of Washington, he abides by the code of the West. There are 10 points, and I won't name them all, but it is to live each day with courage, take pride in your work—and we see that year after year—do what needs to be done, if you make a promise, keep it. We also say ride for the brand.

Finally, we say—and this really applies to David—it is: Speak less and say more. When he speaks, we all listen, just like the old EF Hutton commercial. But he does epitomize what we look to in terms of leadership, and his guidance has been so wonderful for all of us. So I wanted to rise from the West to say that David Schiappa has done a remarkable job for all of us, both parties, and a wonderful job for this country.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

OBAMACARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, many of us will be leaving in the next day or so and heading to States across the country. As we travel across our States, we will be listening to our constituents and hearing what is on their minds.

One of the things I hear about every weekend in Wyoming is that people are concerned about the President's health care law, and specifically how the law affects their lives, their families, and their jobs. People all across Wyoming—and I believe all across the country—are angry. They are angry that the White House is unfairly giving employers a 1-year delay in the mandate to offer insurance but did not delay the individual mandate that says every American must buy or hold Washington-approved insurance. For many of these people this is very expensive insurance.

Instead of granting a permanent delay or helping all Americans, President Obama and his supporters are trying to convince the American people that this health care law is working fine. Once again, the Obama administration is lecturing the American people instead of listening to the American people. They think if they give more speeches and deliver more sales pitches the American people will finally like this law. It is not going to happen.

Look at how far the Obama administration is willing to go with its latest sales pitch. Last week CNN reported the administration called together a bunch of Hollywood celebrities to help convince young Americans to buy expensive health coverage. The youth of America are not going to fall for it. Even though many of these Hollywood stars are great actors who always remember their lines, young Americans understand that ObamaCare is the wrong script for America. Even though some of these stars deliver funny jokes on ''Saturday Night Live,'' they are about to find out that this health care law is no laughing matter.

In fact, Americans of all ages believe the law is unworkable, unaffordable, and deeply unpopular. They are also finding out it is unfair, and that is what CBS found out last week. They did a poll. They found that 54 percent of Americans disapprove of the law. They also found that only 13 percent of the people say the law will actually help them personally. Three times as many Americans in the poll believe the law will hurt them personally. Three times as many people believe the law will hurt them personally than the people it will help. So over the next couple of months the American people can expect a barrage of advertising.

There was a big story about it today in the New York Times. Musicians are playing songs on the west coast and trying to get people to sign up for the exchanges. It was all aimed at trying to distract the American people from the health care train wreck that is coming.

According to the Associated Press, at least $684 million will be spent nationally on publicity, marketing, and advertising for the law. The Washington Post found that the States will be running ads not just on TV and radio—and you are not going to believe this—they are also putting slogans on coffee cups, on airplanes flying banners across beaches, and even, believe it or not, on portable toilets at a cost of nearly $700 million. It is a windfall for advertising agencies and a hard sell for hard-working taxpayers.

The administration is picking the pockets of the American people for advertising while the health care law is shrinking the paychecks of the people who can only find part-time work.

Speaking of part-time workers, I wish to talk about a new story that is out that demonstrates the height of hypocrisy surrounding the President's health care law. Frankly, the story is so outrageous that it is one of those things a person can't make up. The headline of the article reads ''Half of Affordable Care Act call center jobs will be part-time.'' Here are the details.

The article is about a new call center in Contra Costa County, CA. This is part of the effort to have so-called navigators who will answer Americans' questions about the health care law. The call center ran ads for more than 200 jobs that said all of these jobs would be full time. That is what people are looking for in America—full-time jobs, full-time work. But once the new workers started training, some of them got a different story. They found out that they would actually be part-time employees with no health benefits.

Let me emphasize that point. Even the ObamaCare navigators are not going to be covered by the health care law and are not going to be provided health care. Even some of the navigators will not know how they can get affordable health care coverage even though they are the ones who are supposed to be giving advice to Americans. Some navigators are being forced to work part time because the company cannot afford to provide the expensive government-mandated, government-approved insurance they are supposed to teach others how to get. It turns out the ObamaCare navigators need their own ObamaCare navigators.

The article even quotes one worker saying, ''What's really ironic is working for a call center and trying to help people get health care, but we can't afford it ourselves.'' That is what this

administration has done to this country. I don't call that ironic; I call it outrageous.

So the question is, Who are the navigators going to call for help and how are they going to answer Americans' questions when many of them don't know how they are personally going to be able to afford the health care coverage the government and the President of the United States mandate they have?

The bad news is this story is only one of many new examples of hypocrisy recently surrounding the President's health care law. Week after week we have seen labor unions—one after another—that originally supported the law now express concerns about how the health care law will impact their members' access to care. Late last week we even heard from something called the National Treasury Employees Union. It is important to know that this union represents most of the IRS workers—the 100,000 IRS workers—who are going to be enforcing the health care law. What about these IRS workers? What are they saying? Well, it turns out the IRS employee union said they are very concerned they might actually have to buy their own health insurance in the exchanges, just as other Americans will. These are the exact same IRS agents who will collect massive amounts of data—personal data—on people's individual lives and their health care choices. They will investigate whether people have the right coverage. They will apply the tax penalties to anyone who doesn't. These are the agents who now say they want no part of the health care law's exchanges for themselves. They actually have sample letters the union has sent to the IRS agents to send to Members of Congress to say: I am one of your constituents, and we don't want it to apply to us, and we want to hear back.

This health care law is bad for all Americans. Each of those stories demonstrates again that the President's health care law is fundamentally broken. Instead of spending the rest of the summer trying to sell an expensive failing product, the President should simply listen. He should listen to young people who are about to see their premiums soar. He should listen to ObamaCare navigators who can't find affordable health care. He should listen to the IRS agents who enforce the law and who don't want to live under the law. He should listen to the American people and what they have to say about the high costs of their health insurance coverage. He should listen to what Americans have to say about how hard it is to find a doctor who will take care of them.

Front-page story: So many people on Medicare cannot get a doctor to take care of them. Why? Because of the health care law. Twenty percent of family physicians in this country—this story was reported in the Wall Street Journal—20 percent of family physicians are not taking new Medicare patients. Thirty-three percent are not taking new Medicaid patients. But a big part of the President's health care law was to force people onto Medicaid—a program that is not working already.

The President should listen to what Americans have to say about how hard it is to keep their current coverage. And the President should listen to what the American people have to say about trying to make ends meet on a part-time salary—a part-time salary because of the health care law, because of the incentives of the health care law to knock down employees' work hours to less than 30.

Then the President should come back to Washington after he actually listens, not lectures, and sit down with Congress—Republicans and Democrats working together—and work on real solutions that will give Americans what they wanted in the first place with health care. Americans want the care they need from a doctor they choose at lower cost. These are the things that have not been provided under the health care law.

Remember what NANCY PELOSI said: First we have to pass it to find out what is in it. The American people now know more and more what is in this health care law, which is why it is even less popular today than it was the day it passed and why; for every American who thinks they will be helped by the health care law, three Americans believe their lives will be made worse by the law forced through this body.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

TRIBUTE TO DAVID LYLES

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, if you come to my office in the Russell Building, you will usually be greeted by one of the young and eager staffers who welcome visitors and answer the phones at the front desk. Every once in a while, you will find, instead, someone with a little more experience—my chief of staff, who has now about 30 years of Senate service in fact.

David Lyles often takes time to sit at the front desk and to answer phone calls—not during the slower, easier days of a summer recess, but always, instead, when the constituent calls are the hottest and the heaviest. It is his way of staying connected to the flow of feedback coming into the office and of letting the staff know that everybody, from the most experienced staffer to the most recent college graduate, is responsible for responding to the people we all serve. But it is also his way of providing some relief to the pressure these young new staffers are under—particularly when answering the phone calls at various times when issues are very contentious. That hands-on approach is emblematic of David's leadership—leadership that has meant so much to my work in the Senate and to me personally.

At the end of this week, when David Lyles retires from the Senate, we are going to miss his passion, his dedication, his South Carolina maxims, his encyclopedic knowledge of the Senate, Civil War history, and also his vast knowledge of the best bicycling routes in Northern Virginia.

Nearly all of David's professional life has been in public service, and nearly all of that service has been spent with the aim of strengthening our Nation's security and honoring our commitments to the men and women of our military. Of more than 30 years of Senate service, most has been spent with the Armed Services Committee, first as a professional staff member, then as deputy staff director, and from 1997 to 2003 as director of the Democratic staff, before agreeing to serve as my chief of staff in my personal office.

He also served earlier with the Senate Appropriations Committee, as a civilian member of the Pentagon staff. and as staff director of the 1995 Base Realignment and Closure Commission—a difficult and at times thankless job that was nonetheless of major importance to our Nation.

His Armed Services Committee career even encompassed some of the most significant national security challenges of our time: the end of the Cold War, the Persian Gulf war, the 2001 terrorist attacks, the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as the immense technological changes and major budget challenges we have faced during his years here.

I have asked David twice to change jobs: first in 1997 when I asked him to leave a brief stint in the private sector to serve as Democratic staff director on the Armed Services Committee and, second, when I asked him to give up that position to join my personal office as the chief of staff.

I made these requests because I value his judgment, his knowledge, and his integrity, because I know of his love and his respect for this institution. When new staffers join our office, David will usually walk them down to the Senate floor, bring them to the staff benches behind me along the walls, give them a chance to see in person what most have only seen on C–SPAN and to share some of the mix of excitement and responsibility that David still feels when he comes to this floor.

David once told a reporter for the Washington Post, ''I've always felt that anonymity was the key to job security.'' Well, I am sorry to blow his cover, but David's outstanding career is worthy of public praise. He has served the American people and the

Senate with great distinction. He has helped protect the men and women in uniform and their families. He has led the men and women in his charge with patience and loyalty and modesty at times of great challenge for the Senate and the Nation.

I am and I always will be deeply grateful to David Lyles for his wise counsel, for his loyalty, for his friendship, and above all for his integrity. I wish David and his wife Annie a long and happy retirement full of visits with laughing grandchildren, untroubled waters to paddle, and smooth roads to ride.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to speak as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

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

TRIBUTE TO DAVE SCHIAPPA

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I rise this morning to speak about my good friend and a great friend of this great institution who will be leaving us this week, Dave Schiappa.

I remember after I was elected in 2002 there was a transition in the leadership on the Republican side from Trent Lott to Senator Bill Frist. Trent told me one day that the first thing he told Bill Frist was make sure that Dave Schiappa is going to be your floor leader, and that is exactly what Bill did.

I was new to the Senate, did not know my way around at all, much less know the rules. I simply don't know how I would have functioned over the last 10 years without Dave Schiappa being here. He has been that valuable to all of us as Members of the Senate. He is available, frankly, to both sides of the aisle. I have heard a number of my Democratic friends over the last 24 hours, since we have been aware of Dave's departure, who have said: Gee, I don't know what I am going to do without Dave Schiappa being here.

Our floor leaders are all so vitally important. We do reach out to those Members on the other side who inform us from time to time of what is going on. They are always straight with us. This institution couldn't operate without them.

Dave has certainly been our leader. He is very smart, very knowledgeable, and he is very hard-working. All of these folks work such long hours. They are here long after we are here, and they are here well before we get here the next morning. We owe a deep debt of gratitude to all of them, and particularly when someone such as Dave Schiappa, who has been here for 28 years, makes a move on to another life. It is imperative that we say: Dave, thanks for your great work. Thanks for your inspiration to all of us.

Dave probably knows this institution better than any Member on the Republican side, certainly. The one thing I will always remember about is Dave, No. 1, keeps his word. If you tell him you have an issue with the bill, an issue with a nominee, or you have an amendment you wish to call up, Dave takes care of you.

He has been so valuable to all Members of the Senate during his tenure. We are truly going to miss him. I know his next life will hold great things for him. He will be very successful there, and we certainly wish him the best.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. We are in morning business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. We are.

OBAMACARE

Mr. RUBIO. I wish to speak briefly about ObamaCare once again. This is an issue that is now coming to the forefront over the next few weeks.

As we get ready to start to implement portions of it across the country, we are starting to see the implications of it.

There is so much coverage given to this as a partisan fight between Republicans and Democrats or liberals and conservatives, but I actually think this issue goes much farther than that because it is impacting all Americans.

I understand the President was here yesterday and individuals from the White House as well. According to the press reports, they were here to reassure nervous Democrats about the implementation of ObamaCare and what it could mean.

I understand why people are nervous about this bill. They have the right to be. For example, the exchanges, health care exchanges which, if you can't get insurance, you are supposed to be able to go to them and buy health insurance, are not going as planned. Only yesterday there was a news report that in Georgia they have asked for an emergency extension because they won't be up and running by October 1.

There are more news reports of more people being pushed from full-time work to part-time work. The reason why is because ObamaCare says if a company has more than 50 employees at full-time status, there are certain rules to follow that are going to cost money. We are starting to see evidence that people are being moved from full time to part time. Some major companies are announcing that they are moving more people to part time. There are reports of impending rate increases.

In my home State of Florida 2 days ago, the insurance commissioner announced that the individual market rates, if you are buying as an individual, are going to go up 30 or 40 percent.

We know there are many people in the middle class, hard-working Americans who are happy with the health insurance coverage they have now. They are probably going to lose that coverage. They are going to have to go to an exchange or another company their company is now offering. This doesn't mean you lose only the insurance with which you are happy, it means you lose the doctor, potentially, because you can only go to a doctor that is in the network on your insurance plan. If your new insurance doesn't have that doctor, you can't keep going to that doctor. There are a lot of reasons to be nervous.

Add to this a lot of the original supporters of this; for example, the labor unions. The Teamsters came out 2 weeks ago saying they want this suspended or repealed because it is breaking the promises it made in terms of the 40-hour workweek and the whole argument I made about full time to part time.

Here is the irony. The labor union that represents the IRS workers is asking to be exempted from ObamaCare. This is ironic, because they are the very workers who are in charge of enforcing the law. The people who are going to be in charge of enforcing ObamaCare have asked to be exempted from ObamaCare. There are a lot of reasons to be nervous about it if you are a supporter.

One more reason is the impact it is going to have on our insurers. We haven't heard a lot of talk about this yet, but I will focus on one group of seniors in particular, and that is seniors who are on something called Medicare Advantage. Medicare Advantage is the Medicare Program where basically you contract with a private company to administer your benefits under Medicare. How these companies compete for your business is they add all sorts of value-added services.

One example is transportation. My mom is on Medicare Advantage. One of the reasons they get her business is that in addition to good doctors, they actually will pick her up from home, because she can't and doesn't drive. They take her to her doctors' appointments. These are the kinds of benefits Medicare Advantage offers.

The problem is ObamaCare cuts about $156 billion out of Medicare Advantage—not to save Medicare; it throws it into the overall budget on ObamaCare.

Who uses Medicare Advantage? This is an interesting statistic: Forty percent of African Americans on Medicaid use Medicare Advantage, 53 percent of Hispanic beneficiaries who are on Medicare use Medicare Advantage, and 38 percent of people on Medicare Advantage make less than $30,000 a year.

What is the impact of taking $156 billion out of Medicare Advantage? It is

about $11 billion this year alone being taken out of the Medicare Advantage Program.

This means—and the President would say we are going to pay less money to these insurance companies. Fine. What is the impact of that? Let me describe to you the impact of what it is going to be.

First, you are going to see reductions in benefits, meaning a lot of these companies are going to have to save that money somewhere. Where they are going to save it is by reducing the benefits they offer you on Medicare Advantage.

For example, maybe there won't be anymore transportation in my mom's Medicare Advantage plan. We don't know.

There will be increases in copays, the amount of money seniors are going to have to pay every time they go to the doctor or hospital. They are going to have to tighten physician networks, which means the number of doctors available is going to shrink. If you have a doctor now who has been seeing you, and he or she gets kicked out of the network because they are tightening the network, you may not be able to keep going to the same doctor. That is the disruption it has.

One study found that by 2017, seniors on Medicare Advantage could lose on an average about $1,841 a year. This is the impact.

I will say why this is pernicious, why this hurts. Medicare Advantage has some things about it that need to be fixed, but it is a good program. It has good outcomes. The fact is these companies want you to go to your doctors' appointments. They want you to be getting your flu shots and your vaccine against pneumonia and other things. Why? Because they want to you stay healthy. They need you to stay healthy in order for the plan to work. We see it in the results.

Medicare Advantage patients have 39 percent fewer hospital readmissions. When people leave the hospital, there is a 39-percent reduction in people who go back because something went wrong. There are 24 percent fewer emergency room visits and 20 percent fewer hospital days.

Medicare Advantage is the program that works. I say this firsthand because I see it in my mom's life, and I see it in the lives of thousands of seniors in Florida who are on Medicare Advantage.

You may ask yourself: Well, if this is so bad why haven't we heard any of this before? The reason is the insurance companies, because of a gag order, are prohibited from talking about any of this until you start getting your benefits letter, and they are coming. If you are a senior on Medicare Advantage, the chances are that soon you will open your mail to the bad news that the Medicare Advantage you have and are happy with has been changed in a negative way for you because of ObamaCare. They don't know that yet, because the companies have not been allowed to tell them yet, but they will have to tell them soon. When they do, this will add one more concern that people should rightfully have about ObamaCare and the impact it is going to have on our people, particularly on seniors. This is why, my colleagues, I have become so passionate about this issue, one more reason why it is so important that we stop ObamaCare.

One may say what can we do to stop it? It is already the law. It is already in place. A lot of people have told me this. The answer is there is something we can do and it comes as soon as September. In September, in order for this government to continue to function, we have to pass a short-term budget. I wish it were a long-term budget that was balanced, but it looks as though it is going to be a short-term budget.

We should pass the budget. We have to. We can't shut down the government. I am not for shutting down the government. When we do this short-term budget, let's fund the government. Let's make sure Social Security checks go out. Let's make sure we are funding defense to keep our Nation safe. Let's make sure we fund the government, but let's not keep funding ObamaCare. Let's not keep pouring money into a program that even the unions are now against. Let's not keep pouring money into a program that not even the IRS workers, who are going to enforce this, want for themselves. Let's not keep funding this program that is going to hurt seniors on Medicare Advantage. Let's not keep funding it.

I will say what the blowback is: Oh, you are threatening to shut down the government. No, I am not. I don't want to shut down the government. In fact, the only people who are talking about shutting down the government are the people who go around saying: We will not support a short-term budget unless it funds ObamaCare. Those are the people who are threatening to shut down the government. Their position, basically, is that ObamaCare is so important we can't possibly fund government without funding it.

So if the government is shut down—and I hope that doesn't happen—because of ObamaCare, that is an unreasonable position, especially in light of all the problems we know this program has. And this idea that unless we fund ObamaCare we must shut down the government is a false choice. That is not true.

Let me just say every single Republican opposes ObamaCare. And I must share with you that there are a growing number of Democrats who are at least nervous about ObamaCare and would love for it to go away in some way, shape, or form. In fact, one of them is the President. The President has actually delayed a major portion of ObamaCare because he knows it is going to be a disaster.

I would just suggest to those who oppose ObamaCare to ask themselves this question: How can I possibly go back to the people who sent me here—to the people who are going to be hurt by this, to the people being moved from full-time to part-time employment, to the businesses that can't grow, to the individuals who are going to lose the coverage they are happy with and the doctor they have gotten to know, to the seniors on Medicare Advantage who are going to see their benefits reduced and their out-of-pocket costs go up—and say to them I did everything I could to prevent these things from happening? How can I possibly say that to them if I vote for a budget that pays for this?

This September gives us the last best chance to slow this down or to stop it. Once this law starts kicking in and starts hurting our economy, we will start crossing some points of no return.

To my colleagues on the Republican side, I would just say: Look, if we are not willing to draw a line in the sand on this issue, what issue are we willing to draw a line in the sand on? If we are not willing to fight on this issue, what issue are we willing to do it on?

Right now I can think of nothing that is hurting our economy and nothing that is hurting job creation more than the uncertainty and the fear this law is imposing on our small businesses, on our middle class, on our working class, and on our seniors. I hope we will not let this last best chance go by. I hope we will take this opportunity to stop this law from hurting Americans, especially the millions of seniors who rely on Medicare Advantage for their health care.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF RAYMOND T. CHEN TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Raymond T. Chen, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will be 1 hour for debate equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Vermont

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, 3 months ago, I noted in my statement on April 18 that it had taken the Senate almost 1 year longer to confirm 150 of President Obama's district court nominees than it took the Senate to confirm the same number of President Bush's district court nominees. Unfortunately,

we have not picked up the pace, and we remain almost 1 year behind the record we set from 2001 to 2005. Today, the Senate confirms the 200th of President Obama's circuit and district nominees. Thanks to Senate Republicans' concerted effort to filibuster, obstruct and delay his moderate judicial nominees, it took almost 1 year longer to reach this milestone than it did when his Republican predecessor was serving as President—over 10 months, in fact. I have repeatedly asked Senate Republicans to abandon their destructive tactics. Their continued unwillingness to do so shows that Senate Republicans are still focused on obstructing this President rather than helping meet the needs of the American people and our judiciary.

Earlier this month, the senior Senator from Tennessee observed that at the time there were only three circuit and district nominees on the Executive Calendar. He said, correctly, that we could clear those three nominees in just one afternoon. Weeks later, we are now being permitted to vote on just one of those nominees. As Senator ALEXANDER said, we could very easily be voting on several others as well. There are now 12 circuit and district nominees pending before the Senate. The only reason we are not voting on all 12 is the refusal of Senate Republicans to give consent. This refusal means that by the time the Senate returns in September, our district courts will once again be facing a period of what the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service calls ''historically high'' vacancy levels, which they last experienced 2 years ago. So the Republicans' effort to obstruct and delay the confirmations of President Obama's nominees means that we have essentially not been permitted to make any net progress in filling vacancies. We have barely kept up with attrition.

Over the past month, some Senate Republicans have been claiming that ''at this same point in their presidenc[ies]'' President Obama has had more circuit and district nominees confirmed than President Bush did. Of course, these Senators fail to mention that they are referring only to the fifth year of those presidencies, and ignoring both presidents' first terms. Such comparisons are misleading—the reason President Bush had so few confirmations in his fifth year is that we had made such good progress already in his first term—but I appreciate the Ranking Member of the Judiciary Committee for at least being honest when he makes this comparison by saying that it is between fifth years, and not entire Presidencies.

The assertion by some Senate Republicans that ''there is no difference in how this President's nominees are being treated versus how President Bush's nominees were treated'' is simply not supported by the facts. Compared to the same point in the Bush administration, there have been more nominees filibustered, fewer confirmations, and longer wait times for nominees, even though President Obama has nominated more people and there are more vacancies. Anyone can point to this example or that example, but when one looks at the whole picture, it is clear that President Obama's nominees have faced unprecedented delays on the Senate floor and that his nominees have been less likely to be confirmed than President Bush's at the same point.

But if Senators wish to claim that there is no obstruction of the Senate's consideration of judicial nominees, or that we are matching or even exceeding the pace of confirmations from the Bush administration, let us make it a reality. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service, it would require 27 additional circuit and district confirmations this year to reach the same number of confirmations as President Bush had achieved by the end of his fifth year in office. That means we must pick up the pace, since we have had only 26 circuit and district confirmations so far this year, and just two confirmations in the past month.

Fortunately, the Senate had already received more than enough judicial nominees to make this happen. There are eight circuit and district nominees pending on the calendar today, and another four were reported this morning. One of the nominees reported today is Patricia Millett, one of three well-qualified nominees for the vacancies on the D.C. Circuit. I hope Senate Republicans will end their misguided attempt to strip the D.C. Circuit of three seats and that we will be allowed to consider her nomination on the merits of the nominee. Five more nominees had a hearing last week, as the Judiciary Committee continues to do its job. If we do confirm 27 more nominees this year, we might even bring the number of vacancies below 70 for the first time in more than 4 years.

However, even if we do bring the number of vacancies down to 70, that number is still far too high. These vacancies impact millions of people all across America who depend on our Federal courts for justice. In addition to the 87 current vacancies, the Judicial Conference has identified the need for 91 new judgeships, so that the people who live in the busiest districts can nonetheless have access to speedy justice. Earlier this week, Senator COONS and I introduced a bill to create those judgeships, and I hope we can pass this long-overdue legislation into law. The Nation's growing demands on our courts also shows how important it is that we reverse the senseless cuts to our legal system from sequestration. I continue to hear from judges and other legal professionals about the serious problems sequestration either has caused, or will cause, if we do not fix it. Last week the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and the Courts held a hearing on the impact of sequestration and highlighted how it is devastating our public defender service. This was an important and timely hearing, and I commend Chairman COONS for chairing it.

Today the Senate will vote on the nomination of Raymond Chen, who is nominated for the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. Mr. Chen currently serves as Deputy General Counsel for Intellectual Property Law and Solicitor in the Office of the Solicitor at the United States Patent and Trademark Office, a position he has held since 2008. Prior to 2008, he was an Associate Solicitor in the Office of the Solicitor at the USPTO, a Technical Assistant for the Federal Circuit, and an Associate at Knobbe, Martens, Olson & Bear. Before practicing law, Mr. Chen was a scientist at Hecker & Harriman. The ABA Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary unanimously gave him its highest rating of ''well qualified.'' Mr. Chen was reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee over 3 months ago by voice vote.

We must work to reduce the number of judicial vacancies so that Americans seeking justice are not faced with delays and empty courtrooms. So let us act quickly on consensus nominees. And if Senate Republicans have concerns about a nominee, let us debate that nominee, for however long is necessary, and then have an up-or-down vote. Eleven of the twelve circuit and district nominees currently pending before the Senate were reported by voice vote. There is no reason we cannot consider all 12 today. If Senators are willing to work together to focus on meeting the needs of the Federal judiciary, then I am confident that we will be able to make real progress for the millions of Americans who depend on our courts for justice.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia.

POWER NOMINATION

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, let me express my thanks to Senator SANDERS for his willingness to yield to me and give me this time.

I am here very briefly to commend Samantha Power to the entire Senate as President Obama's nominee to be the U.N. ambassador representing the United States.

I do so proudly because of the great work she has done against genocide and atrocities around the world, because she has been an outspoken leader in terms of doing what is right, and I think she has the courage to represent our country on the Security Council better than anyone I know.

I got to know Samantha Power by reading her book, ''A Problem from Hell: America and the Age of Genocide.'' It is the story about Rwanda and the genocide where 1 million people died while the rest of the world turned and looked away, and her calling on all people of democracies and freedom around the world to not let that happen again.

When she came to the White House, she created the Commission on Atrocities for President Obama to focus on that and see to it that it didn't happen again. It was through her leadership that she forced President Obama and the administration to engage in Libya and end what would have been a genocide in Libya by Muammar Qadhafi.

She is smart, she is intelligent, she is tough, and she has a Georgia tie of which I am very proud. She graduated from a high school in DeKalb County, GA, in the 1980s called Lakeside High School. She did an internship between her first and second year at Yale University in Atlanta, GA, for a sports broadcaster on a sports station in the city. He was asked a few days after she left to give some description of what kind of person Samantha Power was, and I want to read that quote because it reflects the kind of person we want representing us as an ambassador at the U.N. He said:

Oh, my God, was she bright. Acerbic, lightening-witted, and the depth of the Mariana Trench.

That is a quote from Jeff Hullinger, the first person she worked for in 1988.

Samantha Power is the right person, at the right time, to represent the right country in the U.N. on the Security Council. I commend her to the Senate and hope she receives a unanimous vote.

I yield back the remainder of my time and thank the Senator from Vermont.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont.

THE MINIMUM WAGE

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate hundreds and hundreds of young people throughout the country who are standing up for justice, who are putting a spotlight on one of the major economic crises facing this country.

Today—this week and in recent weeks—we have had young people in New York City, in Chicago, in Washington, DC, in St. Louis, in Kansas City, in Detroit, in Flint, MI, and other areas around this country who are fast-food workers—the people who work at Burger King and McDonald's and Popeye's; the ones who give us the hamburgers and the french fries—saying that workers all over this country cannot make it on $7.25 an hour, $7.50 an hour. Often they are unable even to get 40 hours of work and, in most cases, they get no or very limited benefits.

So all over the country these workers, often young people, are walking out of their establishments, their fast-food places, and are educating consumers about the economic injustice taking place in these fast-food establishments. What they are saying is that we need to raise the minimum wage in this country; that American workers cannot exist on $7.25 an hour, which is the national minimum wage now, or $8 an hour or $9 an hour.

My own view is, at the very least, we should be raising the minimum wage to $10 an hour. Just do the arithmetic, with somebody making $7.25 an hour, and if they are lucky enough to be getting 40 hours a week—and many workers are not.

I was in Detroit a couple of months ago talking to fast-food workers, and what they are saying is they get 20 hours a week in one place to make a living and then they have to work at another place. One young man I talked to is working at three separate locations, having to travel, in order to cobble together what, in fact, is by far less than a livable income. So just do the arithmetic. If you make $7.25 an hour, and if you are lucky enough to be working 40 hours a week, you are making about $15,000 a year. Then, of course, your Social Security taxes are coming out of that and your Medicare taxes are coming out of that, and maybe some local taxes. You can't survive on $14,000 or $15,000 a year.

The point is these fast-food workers are educating the Nation about the fact that hundreds and hundreds of thousands of people are working hard every single day and are falling further and further behind economically. We have to stand with them and we have to raise the minimum wage in this country.

While workers at fast-food establishments and other places such as Walmart are earning the minimum wage, I should mention that the CEOs of these large corporations are, in many cases, making exorbitant compensation packages. The CEO of Burger King, a corporation with over 191,000 mostly low-wage workers gave its CEO Bernardo Hees a 61-percent pay raise last year, boosting his total compensation to $6.5 million in 2012.

Well, if a millionaire can get a 65-percent pay raise, maybe it is time to get a pay raise for the workers who are making $7.25 an hour.

Last year, McDonald's, a corporation with over 850,000 mostly low-wage employees, more than tripled the compensation of its CEO Don Thompson. In 2011, Mr. Thompson received a mere, paltry $4.1 million. But last year, because of his significant raise, the CEO of McDonald's received $13.8 million.

Well, if Mr. Thompson can make $13.8 million as the head of McDonald's, surely the workers at McDonald's can make at least $10 an hour, not $7.25 an hour, not $8 an hour.

David Novak, the CEO of Yum! Brands—the owners of Taco Bell, Pizza Hut, Kentucky Fried Chicken, and Long John Silvers—was paid $11.3 million last year and received over $44 million in stock options.

Well, if this company has enough money to give this gentleman $44 million in stock options, maybe we can end starvation wages at Yum! foods.

In terms of the minimum wage, since 1968, the real value of the Federal minimum wage has fallen by close to 30 percent. The purchasing power of the minimum wage has gone down by some 30 percent since 1968. If the minimum wage had kept up with inflation since 1968, it would be worth approximately $10.56 per hour today.

The issue our young people working at these fast-food places are highlighting goes beyond the fast-food industry. The reality is that many of the new jobs being created in America today are low-wage jobs.

I think we all recognize, even some of my Republican colleagues understand, we have made significant economic gains since the collapse of the economy at the end of President Bush's tenure in 2008 when we were losing 700,000 jobs a month—an unsustainable reality, 700,000 jobs a month. Now we are gaining jobs, and that is a good thing, but not enough jobs. Unemployment remains much too high. Real unemployment today is close to 14 percent. But in the midst of understanding the job creation process in this country, we need to know that nearly two-thirds of the jobs gained since 2009 are low-wage jobs that pay less than $13.80 an hour.

So the good news is we are now creating some jobs—not enough jobs; unemployment remains much too high—but we cannot lose track of the fact that most of the new jobs being created are not paying working people a living wage. While most of the new jobs being created are low-wage jobs, we should remember that nearly two-thirds of the jobs lost during the Wall Street recession were middle-class jobs that paid up to $21 an hour. So the economic trend is not good. The Wall Street crash resulted in mass unemployment, and though we are gaining new jobs, many of the jobs we are gaining are low-wage jobs. Yet the jobs we have lost are higher wage jobs.

Also, while we discuss the state of the economy, let us never ever forget that middle-class families have seen their incomes go down by nearly $5,000 since 1999, after adjusting for inflation.

Opponents, and there are many—the entire fast-food industry and all the big-money interests, the guys who make millions and millions of dollars a year, the people who have unbelievable pensions, who have all kinds of benefits, the CEOs—are working very hard to tell us in Congress not to raise the minimum wage, which is $7.25. Among many other arguments they say: Well, if you raise the minimum wage, it is going to be a job killer. It will kill jobs.

Let me say this on a personal basis. I represent the State of Vermont. The State of Vermont has the third highest minimum wage in the country; it is $8.60 an hour. Meanwhile, with an $8.60-an-hour minimum wage, I am happy to say that the State of Vermont has the fourth lowest unemployment rate in the United States at 4.4 percent. And to be very honest, I have not bumped into many employers who tell me: I would be hiring more people if we lowered the minimum wage in Vermont. It does not happen. I think that is a bogus argument.

The State of Washington, if my memory is correct, has the highest minimum wage in the country. Their unemployment rate is lower than the national average.

There is another point I would like to make that needs to be made over and over. We talk a lot in this country about welfare reform. I think that in general, when people use that expression, what they are talking about is lower income people who may be breaking the law and taking advantage of programs for which they are not quite eligible.

Let me say a word about the need for welfare reform but in a somewhat different tone, and let me say that the biggest welfare recipient in this country happens to be the wealthiest family in the United States of America; that is, the Walton family, who owns Walmart, a family that is worth $100 billion—more wealth, by the way, than the bottom 40 percent of the American people. The wealthiest family in America is the largest welfare recipient in America. How is that? Well, the reason they are so wealthy, the reason that family is worth $100 billion is they make huge profits because they pay their workers starvation wages. But in order to keep their workers going, the taxpayers of this country—through Medicaid, through nutrition programs, through affordable housing—give assistance to Walmart so that their workers can keep coming to work. So somebody who works at Walmart for $7.25 or $8 an hour, more often than not their children are on Medicaid paid for by the taxpayers of this country. They and their kids are on food stamps paid for by the taxpayers of this country. Many of their employees live in affordable housing subsidized by the taxpayers of this country.

So the Walton family becomes the wealthiest family in this country while working-class and middle-class taxpayers provide assistance to their workers so they can continue going to work. Let me make the very radical suggestion that maybe the wealthiest family in America might want to pay their employees a living wage so that the taxpayers of this country do not have to subsidize them.

I would conclude by telling those young people in major cities around this country that many of us respect and appreciate the courage they are showing. It is not easy to walk out of a job when you don't have any money, because your employer may say: You are out of here; you are fired. But these young people have the courage to stand and say: No. We are human beings. We live in the greatest country on Earth. We have to earn a living wage. We can't make it on starvation wages.

So I thank those young people for standing for justice not only for themselves but for all Americans, and I hope that Members of Congress listen carefully to what they are saying and that we go forward as soon as possible in passing a minimum wage that will provide dignity for millions of workers.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we know what is ahead of us the next hour or so. I ask unanimous consent that we change that.

In between the vote on Chen, the judge, and the next vote, I ask that there be 10 minutes, and 2 minutes of that would be 1 minute on each side, and 8 minutes would be given to the comanager of that bill, SUSAN COLLINS. That would be for debate only.

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

THUD APPROPRIATIONS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, we have spent the last 2 weeks here on the Senate floor talking about our bipartisan transportation and housing bill. This is a bill that is all about creating jobs, investing in our families and in our communities, and laying down a strong foundation for a long-term and broad-based economic growth. This bill is not exactly a bill I would have written on my own. I know it is not exactly a bill Senator COLLINS would have written on her own. But it is a compromise bill that reflects the deep cuts we made when we set spending levels in the Budget Control Act as well as the best ideas from both sides of the aisle of ways we can improve and reform our transportation and housing investment.

The transportation and housing investments in this bill have a direct impact on the families and communities we represent, from improving our roads, to reducing traffic and helping Main Street businesses, to making sure our bridges are safe so we do not see more collapses like the one back home in my State of Washington, to supporting our most vulnerable families, seniors, and veterans with a roof over their heads when they need it the most and making investments in our communities that mayors across our country use to create local jobs in their hometowns and so much more.

Senator COLLINS and I worked very hard together to write a bipartisan bill to invest in programs that should not be partisan. I think we succeeded. Six Republicans voted for this bill in committee; 73 Senators voted to bring this bill to the floor for a debate. That debate was a full and open one, with amendments and votes from Democrats and Republicans.

I wish to personally thank Senator COLLINS for her hard work on this bill, and I also thank all of our staff on the appropriations subcommittee: Alex Keenan, Dabney Hegg, Meaghan McCarthy, Rachel Milberg, and Dan Broder; as well as the staff of Senator COLLINS, who spent endless hours: Heideh Shahmoradi, Kenneth Altman, Jason Woolwine, and Rajat Mathur—all of whom worked so hard and put in so many hours and late nights on this strong bipartisan bill.

After 2 weeks of debate and discussion and a bipartisan bill before us, we are now going to move very shortly to a final vote. I want to be clear. This bill has the support of the majority of the caucus. In the House of Representatives, what did we see happen yesterday? They pulled their transportation and housing bill off the floor. The Republican leadership would not even allow a vote on their bill because they did not have a majority in their caucus. The chairman of the House Appropriations Committee said that showed that sequestration is unworkable and needs to be replaced. That is the House Republican chairman. But here in the Senate we have a majority, and we should move to pass this bill.

The only thing that can block the passage of this bill, the only way a bipartisan bill with the support of the majority could be stopped is if Republican leaders whip their own Members into filibustering a jobs and infrastructure bill that many of those Republicans actually support. That is the only way.

The choice before us is clear, and I urge my colleagues to make the right one. This vote is not about whether you support this exact bill or agree with the exact spending level. As Senator COLLINS has made clear again and again, you can think the spending level is too high and still support this process in which we pass a bill in the Senate and work with the House bill on a compromise. You can certainly disagree with the bill and not think it should be subjected to a filibuster.

The bottom line is that a vote to wrap up and vote on this bill is a vote for jobs and the economy and for bipartisan solutions to the problems facing our Nation. A vote to filibuster this bill is a vote for more gridlock, more obstruction, more partisanship, and more political games.

I know when I go home to Washington State I want to be able to tell my constituents that Democrats and Republicans worked together to solve some problems, help them, and grow the economy. I know there are many Democrats and Republicans here today who want to be able to say the same to their constituents, and I hope they will stand with me and Senator COLLINS and vote against a filibuster of our bipartisan bill.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 101

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I stand today to discuss and strongly support my bill, S. 101, the State and Local Government Bailout Prevention Act. I urge all of us to unite to pass this bill

expeditiously. Let me briefly explain what it is about.

I first introduced this bill in early 2011, February 2011, because two things were happening. First of all, several significant State and local entities were teetering on the verge of bankruptcy. At the same time, the Federal Government—things in Washington—was in a horrible state fiscally, such that we could clearly not afford to take on more spending, more debt, more responsibility. I wanted to pass legislation that would make it crystal clear that neither we, the Congress, nor the Treasury Department, nor the Federal Reserve, nor any other Federal entity was going to bail out State or local governments that had acted irresponsibly and tipped into bankruptcy.

Things have not gotten better since then. In fact, in many ways things have gotten worse, and very recently, just in the last few weeks, the city of Detroit filed for bankruptcy—the largest municipal bankruptcy in U.S. history. Other large States and local communities are teetering on the verge of bankruptcy. Many States are in a horrible fiscal situation, such as California and Illinois.

Meanwhile, we are not in a fundamentally more sound place here in Washington at the Federal level. Even if we stick to the Budget Control Act numbers—and that is very much up in the air, but even if we stick to those numbers, Congress will spend $967 billion in discretionary money this year, and that will result in a $810 billion deficit—almost a $1 trillion deficit this year.

This Nation, total, is almost $17 trillion in debt. The balance sheet of the Federal Reserve has swollen from $800 billion in August of 2007 to over $3.5 trillion today.

Now more than ever, S. 101, the State and Local Government Bailout Prevention Act, is appropriate, is needed. That is why I come to the floor today to urge expeditious passage of S. 101. This bill is very simple, basic, straightforward, but important. It would simply do four things: First, it would prohibit the use of Federal funds to bail out State and local government budgets. Second, it would prevent the Federal Reserve from providing assistance to or creating a facility to help, again, State and local governments in a bailout situation. Third, it would prevent Congress and the Treasury Department from bailing out State and local governments. Fourth, there is specific language so we do not create any confusion that this is not intended to stop or deter or interfere with appropriate assistance in declared disaster areas.

That is the sum and substance of S. 101, the State and Local Government Bailout Prevention Act. When you look at situations such as Detroit—the largest ever municipal bankruptcy—and when you look at our fiscal situation in Washington at the Federal level, this clear bar of the Fed bailing out State and local governments is very much needed.

I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Development be discharged from further consideration of S. 101 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration and that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I will be very clear. First, I say to my colleague from Louisiana, he and I have worked together often on a whole host of issues. He is on Environment and Public Works; I chair Energy. I want him to know I am happy to continue working with him on this and other issues. The reason I have to object at this time is that the language as it is written would deal a huge body blow to more than 700 rural and heavily forested counties across the country in more than 40 of our States. It, in effect, could prohibit payments under the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act.

This legislation, which was a bipartisan bill—Senator Larry Craig and I authored this legislation—is a lifeline for these hard-hit rural communities that are walking on a tightrope. They are trying to balance, for example, how they are going to keep the schools open and how they are going to have law enforcement in their communities. Declining revenues from Federal forests spurred the creation of this program to compensate for the loss of receipts from the Federal forests. Suffice it to say that without this legislation we could have school perhaps 3 days a week in a big chunk of rural America. I mentioned law enforcement. The question of how you maintain 24-hour law enforcement in a lot of these areas has been drawn into question. I think that without this assistance we might have some counties facing bankruptcy.

Given the fact that this language does not clarify the status of the Secure Rural Schools Program, I have to object. I am going to continue to object until the legislation does clarify that it will not prohibit payments under that legislation, which is a lifeline for rural America.

We have had a number of recorded votes on that particular legislation here in the Senate. It has received overwhelming bipartisan support. It was authorized on a bipartisan basis.

I am going to yield the floor. I know colleagues want to speak on this issue. I want it understood how concerned I am about the legislation in its present form. That is why I have to object at this time.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I too join with our colleague from Oregon in raising great concern about what this proposal would do. This is a proposal—we have seen, actually, three of them now—that would cut all Federal funding for any community that has either defaulted or, more important, is at risk, has problems financially. What does that mean? It means that any city, any county, any local unit of government that is struggling with a tight budget could potentially lose all Federal funding. We are not talking about a bailout here. We are talking about the same Federal funds that go to every community—no funding for emergency services such as police departments and fire departments; no funding for transportation, for roads and bridges; cutting off funding for special education and for our schools; no funding for economic development to help these communities that are challenged because of, possibly, economic circumstances such as a shifting manufacturing base or other economic issues beyond their control.

This is extremely broad. According to some legal definitions, ''default'' could mean anything—late payments on any kind of an obligation. It makes absolutely no sense.

Let me also indicate that one of the real concerning problems here is that it would exempt emergency spending for a natural disaster. I appreciate that the Senator from Louisiana would want to do that given the fact that we had Hurricane Katrina hit in New Orleans and our whole country came together. People in Detroit raised money to help with Hurricane Katrina. But I suggest that for the 41 cities and counties that filed bankruptcy over the last 20 years or the hundreds from Texas, to Kentucky, to Alabama, and beyond who now have troubled bond ratings and are considered at risk—this is really a slap in the face to every city and community across our country.

This is not about stopping a bailout for Detroit. We are working hard. People are coming together. This is a community that is coming back thanks to a tremendous amount of grit, hard work, and leadership from the business community, religious community, community leaders, and so on. This is about whether we are going to support communities that need some help.

Think about this: If a city is doing well and has a wealthy tax base and an upper middle-income community with high-powered lobbyists, then they should get Federal money—taxpayer money? Children with disabilities can get special education. We are going to help build roads and bridges in communities. But if a community is having some financial difficulty, then, unfortunately, we would say we would not allow the same ordinary Federal funding every community gets to be available for that community. That is not the right values for America.

That is why the International City/County Management Association, the National Association of Counties, the National League of Cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the Government

Finance Officers Association strongly oppose this effort.

I have one final statement to make before turning to our distinguished senior Senator from Michigan.

When we are looking at what is happening right now in Detroit and around the country, once again we are seeing workers and retirees on the frontline who have lost their pensions and their wages. In the auto rescue, we saw Delphi retiree pensions were not protected. Now in the city of Detroit, police, fire, and city workers are not protected. So when we talk about the middle class of this country—people working hard every day—we need to put them first. We need to make sure nobody loses their pension. We need to make sure we stand as a country with cities that are in distress and working hard to become vibrant and strong again.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I too object to the unanimous consent request. While the sponsor says it is aimed at bailouts, no one I know of is seeking a bailout from the communities that would be impacted. Despite the stated intention, the effect of this bill is to endanger the financial health of hundreds of cities and counties in every corner of this country. It would weaken the safety and security of countless Americans who call those communities home. I don't know of anyone seeking a bailout. Yet bailout is the word that is used frequently here by the sponsor of this legislation.

What is the definition? Communities at risk of defaulting. Hundreds and hundreds of communities are ''at risk of defaulting.'' It is unclear what that means. But the strains on local governments in the last few years—particularly following the financial crisis we had—are real. To say that any community, city, or State, for that matter, that is at risk of defaulting is to be challenged in terms of getting regular support from the Federal Government.

This is not limited to loans. This bill affects grants as well as loans. In the words of the bill, ''grants and aid'' would be prevented. All sorts of Federal funding, in other words, besides those kind of actions of the Federal Government involving credit or reliance on credit of the donor or for repayment.

The Congressional Research Service says this, again, applies not just to loans but to grants as well. Why in Heaven's name would struggling communities—whether it is my hometown of Detroit or any other community in this country—be denied the ability to seek grants is beyond me. It is not limited to loans but grants as well. This bill goes way beyond the bailouts that no one is seeking and would have a severe impact on cities and towns across the country.

Standard & Poor's lists more than 250 securities offered by Louisiana municipalities that are below investment grade. One State has 250 communities with securities below investment grade, which presumably means there is a significant credit risk in those communities. Under this bill, are those communities not eligible to seek regular grants? I am afraid so, and that is not just me saying that. Again, that is from the CRS.

Finally, Senator STABENOW has made reference to a letter that we received from the National League of Cities, National Association of Counties, the United States Conference of Mayors, and others, opposing this legislation because it goes way beyond its stated purpose of preventing bailouts.

Again, my town—and I don't know of any town that has—has not asked for a bailout. I am proud to have been living in Detroit all of my life. It doesn't need this kind of legislation poking at it to stop something from going to Detroit, which it has not applied for.

I know this legislation was introduced before this recent bankruptcy application on the part of the city of Detroit, but nonetheless to seek a unanimous consent in this context and in this moment to pass legislation—apparently without even a hearing—seems to me to be beyond the pale.

As a lifelong resident of Detroit, I oppose this proposal. I oppose it because thousands of municipalities that have suffered in the aftermath of the recent recession would be negatively affected. Our residents, their residents, our employees, their employees, and retirees around the country deserve better.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I appreciate the two Senators from Michigan being the only ones on the floor right now objecting and saying this has nothing to do with Detroit, but, of course, it does.

I am very sorry to hear this objection. There is no objection on the Republican side. Of course there would be an objection if, in fact, this legislation would bar normal Federal grants and normal Federal loans unrelated to a bailout of a State or a municipality in bankruptcy mode, but it doesn't do that.

The legislation is very specific and very targeted. It is about a bailout of a State or locality in bankruptcy mode, and that is what it is about. It is not about normal routine Federal funding, and that is why there is no Republican objection.

One of the distinguished Senators from Michigan makes the point that Detroit has not formally asked for a bailout. That is true so far. But when the mayor talked to the Wall Street Journal about this, he ''left the door open for a Federal bailout after the city's bankruptcy filing.'' When asked directly whether Detroit would seek a Federal bailout, Mayor Bing said, ''Not yet.''

Similarly, the Governor of Michigan Rick Snyder didn't support a bailout but said on CBS's ''Face the Nation:'' ''If the Federal Government wants to do that, that's their option.'' That is not exactly not opening the door and considering that opportunity.

Again, I didn't file this bill in the last 2 weeks. I originally filed this bill in February of 2011. Unfortunately, Detroit isn't the only municipal or State bankruptcy on the maps. States can't formally file bankruptcy, but in laymen's terms they can essentially go bankrupt. Detroit is not the only issue on the map. Many States face a horrible fiscal situation as well, such as California and Illinois. There is a real danger of these States and localities seeking a Federal bailout. This bill is about that. It is not about normal Federal funding. It is not about the safe and secure rural schools program. It is not about any of that routine stuff. It is about a bailout of a State. It is about a bailout of the municipality or other local jurisdiction. Of course, Detroit, unfortunately, is the most obvious example after its historic bankruptcy filing very recently.

Again, I am sorry to hear their objection. I am sorry the two Senators from Michigan are here on the floor about this. I don't think that is a coincidence because this is a bill about bailouts. I think we should pass it, and be very crystal clear at the Federal level that we are not going to take on that bailout role and responsibility.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. On line 7, page 1: ''Notwithstanding any other provision of law''—and then after talking about Federal funds not being used to purchase or guarantee obligations, it then says:

> no Federal funds may be used . . . or provide direct or indirect grants-and-aid, to any State government, municipal government, local government, or county government which, on or after January 26, 2011, has defaulted on its obligations.

It is very clear. It is line 7, page 1, and lines 1 and 2 on page 2: ''direct or indirect grants-and-aid to'' may not be provided to any city which has defaulted on its obligations. This is the language of the bill.

It also says on line 12 of page 2 that the funds of the United States may not be used ''to assist such government entity.'' ''Assist any such government entity.''

Hundreds of governments would be covered by this legislation. It is no coincidence that the Senators from Michigan are here on the floor because we are the most current victims of this language if it were ever passed. There are hundreds of others who would be victimized by this language because of its breadth, and that is what the Senator from Oregon was very dramatically pointing out.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the language from the bill be printed in the RECORD at this time.

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

S. 101

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

SECTION 1. PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS TO PAY STATE AND LOCAL OBLIGATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no Federal funds may be used to purchase or guarantee obligations of, issue lines of credit to, or provide direct or indirect grants-and-aid to, any State government, municipal government, local government, or county government which, on or after January 26, 2011, has defaulted on its obligations, is at risk of defaulting, or is likely to default, absent such assistance from the United States Government.

(b) LIMIT ON USE OF BORROWED FUNDS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall not, directly or indirectly, use general fund revenues or funds borrowed pursuant to title 31, United States Code, to purchase or guarantee any asset or obligation of any State government, municipal government, local government, or county government, or otherwise to assist such government entity, if, on or after January 26, 2011, that State government, municipal government, or county government has defaulted on its obligations, is at risk of defaulting, or is likely to default, absent such assistance from the United States Government.

(c) PROHIBITION ON FEDERAL RESERVE ASSISTANCE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall not provide or extend to, or authorize with respect to, any State government, municipal government, local government, county government, or other entity that has taxing authority or bonding authority, any funds, loan guarantees, credits, or any other financial instrument or other authority, including the purchasing of the bonds of such State, municipality, locality, county, or other bonding authority, or to otherwise assist such government entity under any authority of the Board of Governors.

(d) LIMITATION.—Subsections (a) through (c) shall not apply to Federal assistance provided in response to a natural disaster.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I support the nomination of Raymond T. Chen, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal circuit. This is the 29th judicial confirmation this year. With today's confirmation, the Senate will have confirmed 200 lower court nominees; we have defeated two. That's 200 to 2. That is an outstanding record. That's a success rate of 99 percent.

We have been doing that at a fast pace. During the last Congress, we confirmed more judges than any Congress since the 103rd Congress, which was 1993 to 1994.

So far this year, the first of President Obama's second term, we've already confirmed more judges than were confirmed in the entire first year of President Bush's second term. At a similar stage in President Bush's second term, only 10 judicial nominees had been confirmed. We are now at a 29-to-10 comparison with President Obama clearly ahead of where President Bush was. And, as I said, we have already confirmed more nominees this year—29—than we did during the entirety of 2005, the first year of President Bush's second term, when 21 lower court judges were confirmed.

With regard to hearings, the record shows that President Obama is being treated much better than President Bush during his second term.

Last week we held the 11th judicial nominations hearing this year. In those hearings we we have considered a total of 33 judicial nominees. Compare this favorable treatment of President Obama during the beginning of his second term versus the first year of President Bush's second term. At this stage in President Bush's second term, the Committee had held not 11 hearings with 33 judicial nominees, but only 3 hearings for 5 nominees, and all of those were hold-overs from the previous Congress.

In fact, for the entire year of 2005, Senate Democrats only allowed 7 hearings for a grand total of 18 judicial nominees.

It is hard to believe, but no nomination hearings on judicial nominees were held during April, May, June, or July. Four months with no judicial nomination hearings. Yet, we recently rushed through hearings on nominees to the DC Circuit Court of Appeals, plus a number of District nominations. In fact, in just the last few weeks, we have held hearings for 14 judicial nominees. That's not very far behind the entire output of 2005—7 hearings, 18 nominees.

Again, we have already exceeded that number—11 hearings and 33 judicial nominees. The bottom line is that the Senate is processing the President's nominees exceptionally fairly.

President Obama certainly is being treated more fairly in the first year of his second term than Senate Democrats treated President Bush in 2005. It is not clear to me how allowing more votes and more hearings than President Bush got in an entire year amounts to ''unprecedented delays and obstruction.'' Yet, that is the complaint we hear over and over from the other side. So I just wanted to set the record straight—again—before we vote on this nomination.

Raymond T. Chen is nominated to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal circuit. He received his B.S. from the University of California, Los Angeles, in 1990 and his J.D. from New York University School of Law in 1994. Upon graduation, Mr. Chen worked at Knobbe, Martens, Olson & Bear in California from 1994 to 1996. As an associate, he drafted district court briefs and legal memoranda on specific patent and trademark issues as well as several patent applications spanning various technologies.

In 1996, Mr. Chen joined the senior technical assistant's office at the Federal circuit in Washington as one of three technical assistants. There, he researched and wrote memoranda, commenting on drafts of court opinions for both legal and technical accuracy as well as identification of conflicting legal precedent, occasionally writing for individual judges.

From 1998 to 2008, Mr. Chen served as an associate solicitor in the Office of the Solicitor at the United States Patent and Trademark Office. During that time, he was first or second chair on several dozen Federal Circuit briefs defending the agency's patent and trademark decisions, and he presented approximately 20 arguments in the Federal Circuit.

He regularly appeared in district court defending the agency against lawsuits brought under the Administrative Procedure Act. He was also a legal advisor on several patent policy and legal issues within the agency, occasionally prosecuting patent attorneys in administrative proceedings for violating the agency's code of professional responsibility.

In 2008, Mr. Chen became the Deputy General Counsel of Intellectual Property Law and Solicitor. There he supervises other lawyers in the Solicitor's Office and has presented oral arguments in some of the seminal patent cases before the Federal circuit.

In addition, Mr. Chen deals with higher-level patent and trademark policy issues within the agency. He also coordinates the determination of what positions the United States should take as an amicus in intellectual property cases before both the Supreme Court and the Federal circuit.

Lastly, Mr. Chen is responsible for the review and clearance of all new regulations and amendments to existing regulations for the Office of the Solicitor.

The ABA Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary gave him a unanimous ''well qualified'' rating.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). All time has expired.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask my colleagues to vote for this nomination.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent for 30 additional seconds.

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

Mr. LEAHY. I believe we should act quickly on a number of judicial vacancies. Eleven of the twelve circuit and district nominees currently pending before the Senate were reported by voice vote. All Democrats, all Republicans on the Judiciary Committee voted together. There is no reason why we couldn't consider all 12 today, along with Mr. Chen. If we work together, then we can fulfill the needs of the Federal judiciary.

Madam President, have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not.

Mr. LEAHY. I request the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

There is a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of

Raymond T. Chen, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit?

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 198 Ex.]

YEAS—97

Alexander	Flake	Murphy
Ayotte	Franken	Murray
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Barrasso	Graham	Paul
Baucus	Grassley	Portman
Begich	Hagan	Pryor
Bennet	Harkin	Reed
Blumenthal	Hatch	Reid
Blunt	Heinrich	Risch
Boozman	Heitkamp	Roberts
Boxer	Heller	Rockefeller
Brown	Hirono	Rubio
Burr	Hoeven	Sanders
Cantwell	Isakson	Schatz
Cardin	Johanns	Schumer
Carper	Johnson (SD)	Scott
Casey	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Chambliss	Kaine	Shaheen
Chiesa	King	Shelby
Coats	Kirk	Stabenow
Coburn	Klobuchar	Tester
Cochran	Leahy	Thune
Collins	Lee	Toomey
Coons	Levin	Udall (CO)
Corker	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Cornyn	Markey	Vitter
Crapo	McCaskill	Warner
Cruz	McConnell	Warren
Donnelly	Menendez	Whitehouse
Durbin	Merkley	Wicker
Enzi	Mikulski	Wyden
Feinstein	Moran	
Fischer	Murkowski	

NOT VOTING—3

Inhofe	Landrieu	McCain

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is 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 now resume legislative session.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 10 minutes for debate only, with the Senator from Maine Ms. COLLINS controlling 8 minutes and with 2 minutes equally divided in the usual form prior to a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on S. 1243.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, the Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is not in order.

The Senate will be in order.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, have Senators sit down and shut up. OK. It is unfair. Senator MURRAY has something to say. Senator COLLINS has something to say. It is just not polite.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. Senators will take their conversations from the well. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, the Senate will shortly decide whether to invoke cloture on the fiscal year 2014 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill. We have spent nearly 2 weeks debating this bill and working through approximately 85 amendments.

We were making progress. We even had a vote on a nongermane amendment, which clearly would have fallen to a point of order had one been raised. So no one has been shut out of this process.

Chairman MURRAY and I have repeatedly encouraged Senators to come to the floor, file, and debate their amendments to improve the bill we reported.

It has been an open and transparent debate thus far, a return to regular order—something I have heard virtually everyone here urge us to do.

Nevertheless, some Senators are intent on preventing this legislation from moving forward, despite the fact that this bill is not the final version of the transportation and housing appropriations bill. It is only one step in the process but an essential step—one that will allow the Senate to move forward and eventually negotiate with the House of Representatives to decide on a top line and to further improve the bill.

A considerable number of my colleagues have advocated for the House funding level of $44 billion and have opposed the Senate bill. But I would like to point out that not one of my colleagues has offered a specific amendment, account by account, to reduce the funding levels, program by program, in this bill to meet the $44 billion level in the House bill.

I personally offered an amendment that said that in October, if we find we have breached the top line of the Budget Control Act, we would go back to the appropriations process and redo the bill to meet that top line.

I would also point out that yesterday the House leadership was forced to pull its THUD bill from the floor due to lack of support. Some Republican Members thought the spending levels were too high. But it is surely significant that a substantial number of Republicans felt the bill, as written, was far too low and would hurt our homeless veterans, would delay repair of our crumbling infrastructure, and would slash the Community Development Block Grant Program to the lowest level in history, to below the 1975 level when it was first created by President Ford.

Let me point out that the numbers in the House bill were not realistic. That is one of the reasons it failed. The numbers in our bill are not unrealistic. They are too high. They would come down in conference. The President's request was artificially low due to several budget gimmicks and scoring differences. We took care of those gimmicks. We have an honest bill that is before our Members. Let me give you just one example of a gimmick that was in the President's budget. His request for the section 8 project-based rental assistance is insufficient to fully fund the 12-month renewal contracts with private owners.

We are not going to be throwing people out of those subsidized apartments after 10 months in the year. So Senator MURRAY and I added funding to more accurately reflect what was needed. That was over $1 billion of the difference. There was the difference in the scoring by CBO and OMB. We have to go by CBO. That accounted for $1.8 billion.

It is disappointing to me that we have not gone to conference on the budget because we would not be in this dilemma. We would have agreed-upon allocations that would guide the appropriations process. But in the absence of that, what is wrong with proceeding with this bill with cutting spending in it? If Members have amendments they wish to offer to cut spending—and there are a few that have been offered, but as I said, none that bring it down to the House's level in an account-by-account manner.

I am still hopeful we will be able to pass this bill and start bringing other appropriations bills to the floor before the end of the fiscal year because forcing the government to operate under continuing resolutions is irresponsible. It ends up costing more money in the long run. It is wasteful because we continue to fund programs that are no longer needed because we are just continuing current law.

So I urge my colleagues to think very carefully about this vote. It would be so unfortunate if we go home to our constituents in August and are forced to tell them we are unable to do our job. We should continue working on this bill. We should invoke cloture. This bill undoubtedly would have been reduced in conference had we been allowed to go forward.

I do wish to thank many of my colleagues for working with us as we tried so hard to advance this important legislation. I am particularly grateful to Chairman MURRAY for her bipartisan approach and collaboration and for working so closely with me throughout the process.

Finally, I would be remiss if I did not thank our staffs on both sides of the aisle for their hard work. They have worked night and day on this bill. I will put all of their names in the RECORD. I know my time is expiring.

Let's do the right thing. Let's proceed to end the debate on this bill, take

care of the rest of the germane amendments and proceed to final passage and ultimately to conference with the House. Let's show that we mean it when we say we are committed to full and open debate and returning to the process that used to serve us well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I wish to echo what my good friend and partner on this bill Senator COLLINS just said. Similar to all of us, when I go home to my State of Washington, I do not hear a lot from my constituents about partisan politics. They do not ask me which party is up or which party is down. They do not care about the political games and certainly not who is winning or losing them.

The vast majority of people I talk to when I go home ask me what we are doing in Congress to create jobs and get this economy going again. They ask me what we are doing to break through this gridlock and the constant manufactured crises and make sure this country, this economy, is working for them and their families.

They tell me they want Democrats and Republicans working together. They want us to get into a room and put politics aside and put our country first and find some common ground and get something done. That kind of work is far too rare these days, though many of us are fighting to change that. I am very proud the Transportation bill we are about to vote on does just that.

The bill is not exactly what I would have written had I done it on our own or what Senator COLLINS would have done on her own.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent for 30 additional seconds.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. This is a bill that is a compromise that reflect the deep cuts we have set in the spending levels of the Budget Control Act. It reflects the best ideas of both sides. So I urge my colleagues to move past the obstruction, get over the gridlock. Let's show the American people we can work for them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I wish to commend the Senior Senator from Maine for the extraordinary amount of work she and her staff have put into this bill. But regretfully, where we are is cloture on this Transportation bill will be viewed as a question of whether we intend to keep the commitment we made to the American people 2 years ago this month to reduce $2.1 trillion in spending over the next 10 years.

The House of Representatives is marking to a $91 billion-a-year lower figure which reflects the law. I believe that if we invoke cloture on this bill and move forward, it will be widely viewed throughout the country that we are walking away from the commitment we made, on a bipartisan basis, that the President signed just 2 years ago, that we would reduce spending by this amount of money, $2.1 trillion over the next 10 years.

Regretfully, I would strongly urge my colleagues to keep the bipartisan commitment we made 2 years ago and to vote no on cloture on this bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The 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 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 K. Hirono, 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 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 shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 199 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Baldwin	Hagan	Murray
Baucus	Harkin	Nelson
Begich	Heinrich	Pryor
Bennet	Heitkamp	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reid
Boxer	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Brown	Kaine	Sanders
Cantwell	King	Schatz
Cardin	Klobuchar	Schumer
Carper	Leahy	Shaheen
Casey	Levin	Stabenow
Collins	Manchin	Tester
Coons	Markey	Udall (CO)
Donnelly	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Durbin	Menendez	Warner
Feinstein	Merkley	Warren
Franken	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murphy	Wyden

NAYS—43

Alexander	Enzi	Murkowski
Ayotte	Fischer	Paul
Barrasso	Flake	Portman
Blunt	Graham	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Rubio
Chambliss	Heller	Scott
Chiesa	Hoeven	Sessions
Coats	Isakson	Shelby
Coburn	Johanns	Thune
Cochran	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Corker	Kirk	Vitter
Cornyn	Lee	Wicker
Crapo	McConnell	
Cruz	Moran	

NOT VOTING—3

Inhofe	Landrieu	McCain

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 54, the nays 43. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

HIGH SPEED RAIL PERMITTING

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, Chairman MURRAY, and Senator BOXER, I rise to discuss with you the importance of funding for the Surface Transportation Board in this legislation, as well as the funding that Chairman MURRAY has provided to the Federal Railroad Administration to continue to administer its grant awards.

As you know, opponents of California's high-speed rail project are attempting to use the Federal permitting process in order to prevent the Nation's first high-speed rail project from moving forward and succeeding.

The Surface Transportation Board funding will provide the resources necessary to continue the Board's efforts to permit the growth of passenger rail projects in the United States. The funding in the bill for the Federal Railroad Administration will ensure that this agency is able to monitor and administer the grants it already awarded.

Mrs. MURRAY. I am pleased to fund the Surface Transportation Board. I agree with my colleague from California that this agency needs funding in order to comply with its governing statute, which directs the Board to support the growth of rail in the United States.

I share your concern that some opponents of a single project in California are trying to limit the ability of the Surface Transportation Board to operate under its statute. The appropriations bill before us provides the Surface Transportation Board with the resources necessary to facilitate California high-speed rail, not stand in its way.

This bill in no way limits the ability of the Board to oversee projects under its jurisdiction and facilitate their construction.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I agree that this bill in no way limits the ability of the Board to oversee projects under its jurisdiction and facilitate their construction.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you, Chairman MURRAY and Chairman MIKULSKI, for explaining that this legislation will

allow California high-speed rail to move forward.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I also would like to thank Chairman MURRAY and Chairman MIKULSKI for your explanation.

I am deeply alarmed by attempts in the other body of Congress to prohibit the Department of Transportation and the Surface Transportation Board from completing their permitting and oversight responsibly.

These attempts violate the spirit of federalism. The California high-speed rail project was approved by California's voters on the ballot, the legislature has enacted enabling legislation, and the Governor supports it.

While some may not like this type of transportation investment, it is the choice that my State has made for their future, and the Federal Government should respect those decisions.

Furthermore, I strongly believe the Federal permitting process should not be used as a tool to obstruct and delay major infrastructure investments of our States.

Permitting infrastructure in California is a notoriously thorough, long, and comprehensive process. In the years California has analyzed this one project, China has built thousands of miles of high-speed rail.

But this year, in an attempt to stymie the project, opponents of California's plan forced the Surface Transportation Board—an agency dedicated to protecting fair competition in freight rail—to assert Federal jurisdiction over California's high-speed rail project.

This new layer of Federal permitting is duplicative of the thorough 5-year-long review performed by the Federal Railroad Administration. Nonetheless, State and Federal entities complied with this extraneous requirement. However, now opponents are working vigorously to stall the actions at the Surface Transportation Board that will allow construction to finally begin in earnest.

Fortunately, the Surface Transportation Board exists to facilitate the growth of rail in the United States—not to impede it. As long as the Board acts quickly within its statutory authority, it will not impede California's decisions.

Mrs. BOXER. I also share the concerns expressed by Senator FEINSTEIN, and I would also like to reiterate that the people of California voted to fund this project. The California State Legislature voted to fund this project, and the Department of Transportation, after weighing a number of applications for high-speed rail across the Nation, decided to fund this project. I find it troubling that opponents have attempted to hinder the advancement of this project by curtailing an independent agency's mission and responsibilities, as well as trying to prohibit the transmission of appropriated funds to its rightful destination.

I am pleased that this legislation will allow the Surface Transportation Board to act within its statutory authority. I also see that the legislation will allow the Federal Railroad Administration to administer its previously awarded grants to California, and I thank Chairman MURRAY for advancing this legislation.

I would also like to note that this project is incredibly important to the future of California. California's 170,000 miles of roadway are the busiest in the Nation, with automobile congestion draining $18.7 billion in lost time and wasted fuel from the State's economy every year.

Additionally, flights between Los Angeles and the Bay area, which is the busiest short-haul market in the United States with 5 million passengers annually, are the most delayed in the country, with approximately one in every four flights late by an hour or more.

California's high-speed rail system will not only increase mobility and save lost time and money over the coming decades, it will also create near-and long-term employment opportunities, enhance environmental and energy goals, and spur economic development.

Mrs. MURRAY. As my colleagues know, California has a grant agreement with the Department of Transportation, and California has spent funds consistent with that agreement. I was extremely careful to draft the Senate bill to ensure that California will be able to be reimbursed for their expenses.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Thank you, Chairman MURRAY, for ensuring that California will not be left holding the bag, which is not a fair way for the Federal Government to treat the States. Were an appropriations bill to prevent the Federal Government from honoring its grant commitments, it would set a dangerous precedent. I am concerned that it would undermine the competitive process.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:57 p.m., recessed until 2 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. COONS).

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF SAMANTHA POWER TO BE THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS

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 the nomination of Samantha Power, of Massachusetts, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 hours of debate equally divided between the proponents and the opponents.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am pleased to strongly support the nomination of Samantha Power to be the next United States Ambassador to the United Nations, and I commend President Obama for selecting her for this extremely important position.

Born of Irish parents and raised in Ireland until she was 9, Samantha and her parents emigrated to Pennsylvania and Georgia, and she attended Yale and Harvard.

She is well known for her accomplishments as a journalist during the conflicts in the former Yugoslavia, her Pulitzer Prize-winning book, ''A Problem from Hell,'' her leadership of the Carr Center for Human Rights, and her work as the senior director for Multilateral Affairs and Human Rights at the National Security Council.

Samantha is a person of extraordinary intellect, exceptional integrity, and a strong moral compass. She is willing to challenge conventional wisdom and fight for things she feels passionately about, irrespective of the forces aligned against her.

Samantha is an internationalist. She believes in the indispensable role that multilateral organizations play in addressing global problems no country can solve alone—from genocide to global warming to international terrorism.

At the National Security Council she also brought much-needed attention to human trafficking, protection for refugees, gay rights, and gender-based violence. But what some people may be less aware of is the depth of Samantha's devotion to the principles on which this country was founded, and which I believe is one of the key reasons the President nominated her.

Samantha is an American patriot. She will not only strive to ensure that the United States leads by example at the United Nations, but that we do so in a manner that honors the Constitution and the idealism of those who wrote it, which continue to inspire people around the world. That is what people expect of the United States, and I know of no one better suited to turn that expectation into reality.

At a time when the United States faces emerging threats and intensifying competition for natural resources, human rights are under assault in many countries, and millions of people live in squalor or have fled their homes due to armed conflict, natural disasters, or the effects of overpopulation and climate change on the availability of land, water and food, how effectively we use our influence globally will determine the kind of world our children and grandchildren inherit.

Now is the time for the United States to embrace these challenges, and I am confident that Samantha Power will do so with every bit of conviction and energy that she has.

To those Senators of either party who have at times differed with this administration over foreign policy or who may doubt the importance of U.S. support for the United Nations, I encourage those Senators to speak to Samantha directly. There is no one better informed, no one more willing to listen to other points of view, and no one more persuasive, than Samantha Power.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. RISCH. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. RISCH pertaining to the introduction of S. 1430 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I rise to promote and suggest to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that we support the nomination of Samantha Power to be the next Ambassador to the United Nations.

This is a very complex world we live in today. Certainly the forum of the United Nations, in spite of some issues that all of us had with that body over the years, remains the one forum where the United States, No. 1, gets to exhibit strong leadership with our friends, our allies, our adversaries, and a strong voice in the United Nations is imperative.

Samantha Power is an individual who possesses the type of character, the type of strong background, and the person who possesses the intellect and the right kind of ability to communicate to represent us today in this complex world at the United Nations.

Samantha was born in Ireland but moved to the United States shortly thereafter. She was educated in the public schools in Atlanta, Yale, and Harvard. Obviously, she has the intellect, from a background standpoint, to represent our country at the U.N.

Between her stints at Harvard and Yale, she did reporting as a journalist on the ground, reporting on the Yugoslav wars. She was hands-on dodging bullets and being involved from the standpoint of making reports to various journals and other publications about what was happening in those Yugoslav wars.

Samantha is an individual who developed a passion for human rights. She is not bashful about sharing that passion. It is a commendable passion that she has for human rights.

From 2005 forward, Samantha has been involved almost exclusively in the arena of foreign policy, first as a staffer for then-Senator Obama, later involved in his campaign, and most recently as a member of the National Security staff.

Samantha is not only knowledgeable, she is knowledgeable in the right way when it comes to foreign policy. She is not only smart, but she is worldly. She has the charisma, in her own way, No. 1, to express herself in a way that right now the United States needs to be expressing itself.

This is why I am so excited about the opportunity to see her on the ground at the United Nations representing our great country. She can be tough when she needs to be tough. She can be charismatic, and she can also be sharp-tongued.

With the adversaries she is going to have to be dealing with at the United Nations, all of those assets are going to come into play. Samantha is going to do a great job as our next U.N. Ambassador. I applaud her for her willingness to engage in public service. I would encourage all of my colleagues to support her nomination to be the next Ambassador to the United Nations.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I understand we have 1 hour available in opposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I wish to speak in opposition to the pending nomination. I would like to take a few minutes to discuss the nomination of Ms. Samantha Power to be the next U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.

Let me begin by saying that Ms. Power is an impressive person. She has an inspiring personal story, she is clearly very intelligent, and she has already accomplished much in her career. However, I do have three concerns I want to take a moment to highlight today.

The first has to do with a concern I have about her unwillingness to directly answer questions I personally posed to her during her confirmation hearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I asked her about statements attributed to her in the past alleging that the United States had committed ''crimes'' that it needed to reckon with. I raised the question not to embarrass her but to give her the opportunity to clarify by either pointing out examples of these crimes or to clarify what she meant by those comments. Instead, she kept avoiding directly addressing my question. She kept saying that America was the greatest country in the world and that she wouldn't apologize for America.

I don't think it is unreasonable to be concerned about those statements, and I do not think it is unfair to be concerned about the fact that we are sending someone to represent us at the most important international forum in the world who thinks the United States has committed crimes that it needs to reckon with.

I believe I and members of the committee deserved an answer to the question. Instead, what we got in response was a rehearsed line. I believe it was a missed opportunity for her and for all of us. To me, these statements she made in the past and her inability to answer or address them raise questions about her judgment, although—let me be clear—I certainly do not question her patriotism.

Secondly, I have an even greater concern that she is being appointed by a President whose foreign policy is fast becoming an utter and absolute failure. From crises in the Middle East, to strategic uncertainty in Asia, to a country we were told was a partner but is now harboring a fugitive and traitor who has done great damage to U.S. national security, I believe the world is now more dangerous and more uncertain than when President Obama took office. It is increasingly apparent that our foes are more willing than ever to challenge us. Even more troubling is that those who seek to emulate us, who desire the freedom we all, as Americans, enjoy, are often left to fend for themselves with little American support.

A strong, engaged America has been good for the world and for the American people. When America fails to lead, the result, as we see in Syria today, is chaos—a chaos that allows others with goals other than our own to fill the void we leave behind.

History taught us twice in the last century that even if we put our heads in the sand and try to ignore the world's problems, those problems will not ignore us. I realize the American people are weary of war. We have paid a tremendous price in lives and money in the war on radical Islamic terrorism. But to follow the advice of those—including some in the Republican Party—who advocate disengagement from the world would be a terrible mistake. If we follow their advice, we will only pay a higher price in the long term.

Let me be clear. That does not mean America can solve every problem or get engaged in every civil war on the planet. I would confess that we also have voices here that are too eager to engage America in every conflict on the planet. We need to be careful about when, where, and how we engage American forces overseas. But isolationism on the one hand and hyperintervention on the other are not our only two options. Between these two choices we have a third option, and it is this—one based on the idea that while the United States cannot solve every problem in the world, there are very few problems in the world that can be solved without the United States.

If a problem can be solved by using an international forum such as the United Nations, that is fine, but more often than not the United Nations can not and will not confront the problem. In the end, the truth is that America is still the only Nation in the world able to form and lead coalitions to confront evil and solve problems. It is still the

only Nation on Earth able to keep the seas open for trade. It is still the only Nation capable of maintaining the safe balance of power in Asia and Europe and around the world. It is still the only Nation on Earth capable of preventing rogue nations from becoming nuclear powers. And it is still the only Nation on Earth capable of targeting and diminishing radical terrorist organizations that plot to attack and kill Americans here at home and around the world.

We should be careful when we get involved. Foreign aid is not a one-way street and should always be conditioned and based on our national interests. Military power should be employed judiciously and only where it can make a difference in defending our long-term goals. But we cannot pretend that if we ignore our enemies, they will ignore us. We must be involved, and when we get involved we must make sure not just that we are doing it the right way, we must make sure we are doing it at the right time because sometimes acting too late is worse than not acting at all. When we do get involved, it is OK to be motivated by humanitarian concerns, but the primary objective of our foreign policy must always be to protect our people from those who do or may one day want to harm us.

This is the kind of clear strategic view of America's role and of our interests that should guide our foreign policy. It is the kind of clear strategic thinking this President has failed to lay out. As a result, what we see all around us is failure.

The President dithered on Syria. We should have tried to identify secular rebels early in the conflict, and we should have made sure they were the best armed and the best trained group on the ground. Instead, the President decided to lead from behind and allow others to decide whom to arm, and the result is that today it is rebel groups linked to Al Qaeda—foreign fighters, not even Syrians—who are the best armed and best equipped groups within Syria. Now I fear Syria may be headed toward becoming another Afghanistan before 9/11, toward becoming the premier operational area in the world for global jihadists.

The President entered office with the naive belief that we could convince Iran to become a responsible nation by, quite frankly, being nicer to them. He wasted valuable early years in his Presidency not giving the Iranian threat priority, and now the Ayatollahs continue the march toward acquiring both nuclear weapons and long-range missiles that can one day threaten the United States.

I would be remiss if I did not point out that in 2009 he missed an opportunity to clearly stand on the side of those protesting a stolen election and instead chose not to because he didn't want to interfere in the ''sovereignty'' of another nation.

The President also wasted time thinking the cause of radical Islamic terrorism was partially because George W. Bush was hated in the Muslim world. But despite his speech in Cairo, despite his efforts to close Guantanamo, despite his elimination of the use of the term ''war on terror,'' Al Qaeda continues to hate America, and even as I speak here today they continue to plan attacks against America here and around the world.

The President is not alone in failing to confront these threats. I am afraid that because of the success we have had in preventing another attack on the scale of 9/11, some of our leaders in both parties have been lulled into a sense of false security. I certainly support the privacy rights and expectations of all Americans, but, my colleagues, I also know for a fact that the surveillance programs our government uses have prevented attacks and saved American lives.

I think it is a mistake to dismiss privacy concerns as crazy. After all, we have a government whose tax-collecting agency has targeted Americans because of their political views. But it is also a mistake to exaggerate them. After all, if a known terrorist is emailing or calling someone in the United States, we had better be able to know who and where that person is.

If Osama bin Laden had been calling someone in the United States on their cell phone, I promise you it wasn't a stockbroker. We had better know because these people are still plotting against us, and not if but when they strike again the American people are going to turn to us and ask: What has the Federal Government been doing to prevent this, we had better have a good answer.

We live in a very dangerous world, one, by the way, where our enemies aren't just other countries anymore. Our enemies are also rogue states, well-armed militias, and radical clerics. This kind of danger calls for a clear strategic vision on foreign policy, and this President, sadly, does not have one, which brings me to my third and primary concern about Ms. Power's nomination, and it is one that is related to the United Nations itself.

We need an advocate in New York who makes it their primary focus to ensure that the United Nations is more accountable, that it is more effective, and that it serves U.S. interests and is not just some multilateral ideal in which we invest all of our hopes.

If she is confirmed today, I hope Ms. Power does indeed become that type of Ambassador. But I have not been satisfied by the evidence thus far of this administration's willingness to be serious about tackling these issues over the last 4½ years that ensure that every American dollar going to the United Nations actually advances America's interests. I think Congress needs to play a more active role in forcing this very much needed change to occur.

What I would like to do in closing is spend a few minutes highlighting legislation that I recently introduced to this effect. I am pleased to have as cosponsors Senators CORNYN, RISCH, and FLAKE, and I hope more of my colleagues will join this effort.

I am not the first person to raise concerns about the effectiveness and utility of the United Nations. Former Senator John Danforth, who was serving as our Ambassador to the United Nations in 2004, when the U.N. General Assembly couldn't even pass a resolution condemning human rights violations in Sudan, said at the time:

> One wonders about the utility of the General Assembly on days like this. One wonders if there can't be a clear and direct statement on matters of basic principle, why have this building? What is it all about?

Anyone who has followed the United Nations closely, especially in recent years as the Security Council has failed to respond to the crisis in Syria as more than 100,000 Syrians have died and hundreds of thousands more have been forced out of their homes, across borders, straining all of Syria's neighbors, leaving behind a failing state that is becoming a safe haven for global jihadists—all of the people who have shared these concerns and have seen this happen should be rightly asking the same question Senator Danforth asked back then.

In the midst of this horrific crisis, the United Nations has even been unable to achieve consensus on the issue of whether to allow international humanitarian organizations to provide cross-border support to tens of thousands of Syrians stuck in camps facing frequent shelling and attacks from the Assad regime.

Just as we are troubled by this inability to tackle the world's toughest problems, we should also be angry about the fact that for decades more human rights criticism at the United Nations has been directed against Israel than against actual human rights violators and that U.N. agencies and organizations have employed blatant anti-Semites; or that for decades recipients of U.S. foreign aid have only voted with the United States at the United Nations less than one-third of the time and such support, by the way, doesn't even currently factor into U.S. decisions about who receives our foreign aid; or the fact that the world's most notorious tyrants and human rights violators are allowed to serve on the Human Rights Council rather than being condemned by it; or by the fraud and the mismanagement that has pervaded the U.N.'s peacekeeping operations, including abuses and exploitation of the very people that those peacekeepers were sent to protect; or by the Security Council resolutions on Iran and North Korea that members of the U.N. willfully violate, as we recently saw with the Panamanian capture of a ship transferring weapons from Cuba, one rogue state, to North Korea, another one; or by the proliferation of mandates that have clouded the organization's mission and effectiveness.

The list goes on and on. But let me be clear. I am not here to argue that we don't need the United Nations. Ideally, we would have a United Nations where the nations of the world would come together and seriously deal with North Korea, Iran, radical Islam, and human rights. But the United Nations we have right now isn't capable of any of this. It has basically become a forum for nations whose interests are directly opposed to ours, to block our efforts using the United Nations as cover.

That is how North Korea and Iran continue to evade sanctions. That is how Israel's enemies continue their efforts to delegitimize the Jewish State. That is how Assad continues to massacre his own people with weapons built in and supplied by the Russians.

More than six decades after its creation, we still hope for a United Nations with resolve, a United Nations that acts with effectiveness and purpose. Sadly, the United Nations' persistent ethics and accountability problems are limiting its role. Until the organization addresses these important issues, it will continue to be ineffective and often irrelevant.

Americans should care about this more than any other people because we shoulder the primary fiscal burden of the United Nations' budget, and our patience is not limitless. We don't believe in continuing to throw money at programs and projects that fail to accomplish their objectives.

So my hope with the legislation I filed is to provide an incentive for the United Nations and the President and our Ambassador in New York to modernize that international body along a spirit of transparency, respect for basic human freedoms, and effective nonproliferation. This legislation would also attempt to address the anti-Semitic attitudes that have become so prevalent in certain corners of the United Nations and seriously diminish the effectiveness and credibility of the entire U.N. system.

At the core of these reforms that I proposed is an effort to instill a sense of transparency and competition at the United Nations by its adoption of a budgetary model that relies mostly on voluntary contributions. This legislation would also strengthen the international standing of human rights by reforming the U.N. Human Rights Council in a way that would deny membership to nations under U.N. sanctions, designated by our Department of State as state sponsors of terrorism or failing to take measures to combat and end the despicable practice of human trafficking. Other provisions of the bill seek meaningful reforms at the U.N. Relief and Work Agency that provides assistance to Palestinian refugees of the 1948 Arab-Israli conflict.

This legislation is needed because the structure and bureaucratic culture of the organization often makes it impossible or, at best, downright difficult to achieve meaningful reforms.

In closing, for more than six decades now the United Nations has served as an important multilateral forum to address peace and security issues throughout the world. But it has never been, and it is not now, a substitute for strong American leadership. When America fails to lead, the world becomes more dangerous.

The United Nations is badly broken. I hope we will work to force meaningful transparency and accountability reforms for the United Nations. But so far this administration does not seem very interested in doing so and, unfortunately, at least based on our conversations, neither does the nominee before us. Therefore, until we begin to take some positive steps in that direction, I will not be able to support Obama administration nominees who have not committed to significant reform of the United Nations.

Ms. Power has failed to make such a commitment. Therefore, that is why I am voting against her nomination to be our next Ambassador to the United Nations.

● Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I wish to express my opposition to the nomination of Samantha Power to be U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.

As you know, I am very interested in the ability of our American oil and gas industry to compete for business in the country of Myanmar as soon as possible. By virtually every international standard, the U.S. oil and gas industry is the world leader in technical innovation. It is my understanding, however, that Ms. Power, as one of the Obama administration's point persons in pursuing a liberal international agenda attempted to 'carve out' the American petroleum industry from doing business in Myanmar when the United States suspended economic sanctions against this country last year. Fortunately, wiser powers within the executive branch prevented such a carve out from occurring, and now the American petroleum industry can compete with those companies from the European Union, China and Russia, which are already there. Clearly, this carve out strategy would have been a strategic mistake, and it has led me to question seriously Samantha Power's ability to represent adequately U.S. national interests and security needs at the United Nations. I believe that American companies, and especially our oil and gas companies, can play positive roles in the democratic transition in Myanmar by demonstrating high standards of responsible business conduct and transparency, including respect for labor and human rights. Ms. Power's inability to recognize this fact is very troubling.

In addition, I find her position on Israeli-Palestinian relations of great concern. Israel is our friend and the sole democracy in the Middle East. It is a nation that we should support and promote in a region that is torn by violence and conflict. Samantha Power does not see it this way. Rather, she believes that Israel should give up its historical right to its land, and that the U.S. should impose a peace plan upon Israel with the Palestinian Authority. She has also repeatedly accused our friend Israel of human rights abuses. This certainly does not represent the views of the people or that of the leadership of the United States.

Lastly, in addition to her lack of diplomatic skills, Ms. Power has no management experience, causing me to question her ability to lead at the United Nations. The U.S. Mission to the U.N. is constantly facing management issues, and I had hoped that President Obama would have nominated someone who could effectively promote U.S. initiatives there. Unfortunately, Ms. Power is not such a nominee.

It is for these reasons that I oppose Samantha Power's nomination as the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.●

Mr. RUBIO. I yield back the balance of the time available to the opposition.

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

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise to speak on behalf of Samantha Power's nomination to be the Ambassador to the United Nations.

As I said in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which I chaired, on Ms. Power, her appointment as Ambassador to the United Nations has come with much fanfare and with some criticism—which, at the end of the day, means she must be doing something right. In that regard, as I listen to my colleague member of the committee express his reservations and his opposition to Ms. Power, I think we have to have some context.

When she responded: The United States is the greatest country in the world and I will not apologize for it, it was her way of rejecting any characterization of statements that she made in the past. It was very clear to me. I want a U.N. ambassador sitting in front of the world who considers the United States the greatest country in the world and who will not apologize for the United States before that world body. She made it very clear that is exactly what she intends to do.

On accountability, we cannot achieve accountability at the United Nations if we do not have a U.N. Ambassador there to lead the effort on accountability. On those questions where she was asked by several members: Are you committed to making the United Nations a more accountable organization, not only did she say yes several times, in the affirmative, but she gave examples of how that accountability can be achieved. We need an Ambassador to pursue accountability at the United Nations.

Finally, I agree with my colleague that when America fails to lead in some critical times, we leave a void in the world. But we cannot lead if we do not have a U.N. Ambassador raising

their voice and their vote on our behalf on some of the critical issues of the day.

So this nomination is critical to pursuing the national interests and security of the United States. Whatever my colleagues might think about her nomination, I don't believe anyone can question her considerable credentials or her years of service. Certainly, no one can question her willingness to speak her mind, especially her willingness to speak out on human rights issues around the world.

As a war correspondent in Bosnia, in the former Yugoslavia, Rwanda, and Sudan, she has, as she said in her Pulitzer Prize-winning book, seen ''evil at its worst.''

Ms. Power has built a career and a reputation as one of the Nation's most principled voices against all human rights violations and crimes against humanity. I know that voice will be heard around the world should we confirm her.

While some of us may not agree with everything she has written and said during her extensive career as a journalist and foreign policy professional, she has been a tireless defender of human rights, and she has seen the tragedy of human suffering from the frontlines firsthand, and it has given her a unique perspective.

In her role at the National Security Council, she was clearly involved with U.S. policy toward the United Nations. She knows the United Nation's strengths, its weaknesses, and how it operates. At the end of the day the United States needs a representative at the United Nations who will uphold American values, promote human rights, secure our interests and the interests of our national security. I have every confidence in Samantha Power's ability to do exactly that, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting her nomination.

Personally, I am incredibly appreciative of the principled positions she has taken on the Armenian genocide, her belief that we should use the lessons of what clearly was an atrocity of historic proportions to prevent future crimes against humanity is a view consistent with my own and which is supported by her role in the President's Atrocities Prevention Board. I agree we must acknowledge the past, study how and why atrocities happen, if we are ever to give true meaning to the phrase ''Never again.''

As the son of immigrants from Cuba, I personally appreciate her commitment to exposing Cuba's total disregard for human and civil rights, and I respect her for not idealizing the harsh realities of communism in Cuba. I know from the conversation we had in my office, she appreciates the suffering of the Cuban people—the torture, abuse, detention, and abridgement of the civil and human rights of those who voice their dissent under the Castro regime. I welcome her commitment to reach out to Rosa Maria Paya, daughter of the longtime dissident and Cuban activist, Oswaldo Paya who died under mysterious circumstances last year in Cuba as his car was bumped off the road, and I look forward to her fulfillment of that commitment.

At the end of day, it is fitting that someone with Ms. Power's background represent American interests and American values at the United Nations. In the words of the U.N. Preamble, it was created ''to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small. . . .''

Who better than Samantha Power, a recognized advocate for the fundamental rights of every human being, to be our ambassador to the United Nations? If confirmed, her focus will, of course, be on the crisis du jour: the Middle East, Syria, Iran, North Korea, Afghanistan, Pakistan, and others, and the nature of nations that emerge from the Arab spring. But I know while she is meeting those challenges, she will also be engaged on human rights around the world: on freedom of expression in Latin America; on fighting HIV-AIDS, malaria, and polio in Africa; on the status of talks to resolve the 66-year-old question of Cyprus; on women's rights in Pakistan and labor rights in Bangladesh and human rights in Sri Lanka.

Ms. Power, during her nomination process, has repeatedly expressed steadfast support for the State of Israel during her hearing, in her testimony, and individually to several members of the committee, including myself as chair. She has promised to stand up for Israel at the United Nations, and I know she will.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter to the committee in support of Ms. Power from six bipartisan former Ambassadors to the United Nations be printed in the RECORD, calling on the Senate to confirm her as soon as possible in this time of opportunity, to have a U.S. representative in New York advocating for American interests. I urge my colleagues to support this qualified, experienced nominee. I know she will serve the Nation well.

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

Hon. ROBERT MENENDEZ,

Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As former U.S. ambassadors to the United Nations in New York, we are writing in support of Samantha Power's nomination as U.S. ambassador and representative to the United Nations. We believe she is eminently qualified for the role and if confirmed she will effectively promote U.S. values and interests.

She has long been a champion of human rights and an advocate for American leadership around the world. As a Pulitzer Prize winner, university teacher, senior member of the National Security staff at the White House, and journalist, she has the knowledge base effectively and efficiently to promote U.S. interests at the U.N.

She has a record of support for Israel and she will continue her advocacy as U.N. ambassador for our important ally in the Middle East while bringing to the task the balance and judgment required to advise the President and the Secretary of State on the perspective from the United Nations on the important issues of Arab-Israeli peace as well as the host of other issues which are constantly part of United State's policy in dealing with the world community through and with the United Nations.

The administration will benefit from her perspective; if confirmed, her experience will allow her to be an effective leader beginning on her first day.

We believe that the Senate should confirm Samantha Power as soon as possible because in this time of opportunity and challenge we need to have the position of US representative at the UN in New York filled and operating—advocating for US interests—at the earliest possible time.

We would be most grateful if you would ask your staff to insure that this letter is made available to all the members of the Committee of Foreign Relations.

With warm regards and respect,

MADELEINE ALBRIGHT.
JOHN DANFORTH.
DONALD MCHENRY.
EDWARD PERKINS.
THOMAS R. PICKERING.
BILL RICHARDSON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I also rise to support the nomination of Samantha Power to be our Ambassador at the United Nations. Within the last month I had a unique opportunity as the junior member of the committee that my friend Chairman MENENDEZ chairs, as the head of Foreign Relations, to spend the day at the United Nations and learn about it from then-Ambassador Rice. I left that day with a couple of reactions: first, very proud to be an American, and, second, concerned about the challenges the institution faces.

First, on the proud to be American, I think it is important for us to realize, for whatever its flaws, the United Nations would not exist if it were not for this country. It is a quintessential American idea to pull together an institution that tries to build peace, that tries to solve hunger, that tries to solve global health needs. The idea first gained force through the efforts of American President and Virginian Woodrow Wilson who won the Nobel prize for trying to get the League of Nations going at the end of World War 1. That league lasted for 20 years and collapsed, for many reasons, including the lack of participation in the United States in the global effort. But the idea did not die. The American idea stayed alive, and in 1939 the State Department, within 2 years after the collapse of the league, started to work on the next version. FDR worked on it during his entire Presidency and was scheduled to have the first conference on the United Nations 2 weeks after his untimely death in 1945.

The second decision made by President Truman in 1945—the first was to keep FDR's Cabinet—was he was posed with this: After FDR's death, we can

postpone the meeting in San Francisco about the formation of the United Nations. But Truman said: No, we are going to go ahead because this is something the world needs and America is uniquely positioned to lead.

Ever since its start, in funding and support, through good times and bad, through controversies Senator RUBIO described on the floor, this United Nations has worked hard to do good, worked hard to achieve an ideal that may be impossible to achieve. It is a tribute to the U.S. role as a global leader that the United Nations exists today.

I was also struck again by many of the challenges—the challenges of a tough globe, the challenges of U.N. problems in the ethics and finance area, the challenges that confuse many Americans as we look at the U.N., principally those referred to by my colleague Senator MENENDEZ, a history of anti-Semitism at the U.N. that confuses us as we watch it.

What are we to do with this institution that we birthed, more than any other nation, that still offers great hope and service every day, yet still needs significant change? I think what we should do is put a strong person in to be U.S. Ambassador, and Samantha Power is that individual. She has the strength to tackle the challenges that need tackling at the U.N. She has had the career, as described by earlier speakers, as a war correspondent, a writer, somebody who snuck across borders to take photos of atrocities in Darfur and then bring them to the attention of the world. Her writings and her activism have inspired generations of activists around the world to take up the cause of human rights.

She has been the President's senior adviser on matters in the United Nations in the last 4 years. To focus on this issue, here is what Samantha Power has done in that role to help deal with this issue of anti-Semitism at the U.N. and the double standard in the treatment of Israel. She worked to ensure the closest possible cooperation between the United States and Israel at the U.N., where she championed efforts to stand up against attempts to delegitimize Israel. She was key to the decision of the United States to boycott the deeply flawed ''Durban II'' conference in 2009, which turned into an event to criticize Israel. She helped mobilize efforts for the U.N. sanctions against Iran. She has challenged unfair treatment of Israel by U.N. bodies, including the one-sided Goldstone Report, and efforts to single out Israel in the Security Council after the Turkish flotilla incident, and she opposed the unilateral moves in the U.N. by the Palestinians that could undermine prospects for a negotiated peace agreement between Palestine and Israel, and how hopeful we are at the events this week, and we pray it goes forward and finds positive possibility. This is the activity she has had helping the U.N. while she was not the U.N. Ambassador. I want her in that seat so she can carry forward on those initiatives and others.

She will champion efforts to protect persecuted Christians and other religious minorities in the Middle East and beyond, and she helped spearhead the creation of new tools for genocide prevention and she led the administration's efforts to combat human trafficking, all values of which we can be proud if they would be on display at the United Nations.

I said during her hearing the one thing that made me scratch my head a bit about her when I heard she was nominated is I think of her primarily as a very blunt and outspoken person, and blunt and outspoken is not always the best job description of a diplomat. But in the case of the United Nations, with the challenges there, the challenges in the needed financial reform, the challenges in the need to push back against some instances of anti-Semitism, the challenges of ethics and other issues, we need blunt and outspoken at the United Nation. We don't need vague and ambiguous. We need the kind of strong leadership that Samantha Power would provide.

I think of many United Nations Ambassadors. It has been an ''A'' list of people from Henry Cabot Lodge to President George H.W. Bush before he was President to Bill Richardson and Andrew Young. We can think of many. But the two I think of most—I guess I think of them because they are Irish Americans—when I think of Samantha Power is Daniel Moynihan and Jeane Kirkpatrick, strong United Nations Ambassadors who stood proudly for the values of this country, who gave no quarter, who were good diplomats but did not hesitate to call the truth whenever and wherever they saw it. I think Samantha Power will do the same, and that I is why I support her nomination.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Virginia. He is a very thoughtful member of the committee. I appreciate his remarks on behalf of Ms. Power.

With that, I yield all remaining time. I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

There is a sufficient second.

The question is, Shall the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Samantha Power, of Massachusetts, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations?

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 87, nays 10, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 200 Ex.]

YEAS—87

Alexander	Fischer	Mikulski
Ayotte	Flake	Moran
Baldwin	Franken	Murkowski
Baucus	Gillibrand	Murphy
Begich	Graham	Murray
Bennet	Grassley	Nelson
Blumenthal	Hagan	Portman
Blunt	Harkin	Pryor
Boozman	Hatch	Reed
Boxer	Heinrich	Reid
Brown	Heitkamp	Risch
Burr	Hirono	Roberts
Cantwell	Hoeven	Rockefeller
Cardin	Isakson	Sanders
Carper	Johanns	Schatz
Casey	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Chambliss	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Chiesa	Kaine	Shaheen
Coats	King	Stabenow
Coburn	Kirk	Tester
Cochran	Klobuchar	Thune
Collins	Leahy	Toomey
Coons	Levin	Udall (CO)
Corker	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Cornyn	Markey	Warner
Crapo	McCaskill	Warren
Donnelly	McConnell	Whitehouse
Durbin	Menendez	Wicker
Feinstein	Merkley	Wyden

NAYS—10

Barrasso	Lee	Shelby
Cruz	Paul	Vitter
Enzi	Rubio	
Heller	Scott	

NOT VOTING—3

Inhofe	Landrieu	McCain

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table.

The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

PROMOTING ENERGY SAVINGS IN RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS AND INDUSTRY—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 154, S. 1392.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 154 (S. 1392), a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. I note 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. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

PROVIDING FOR A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE SENATE AND ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to S. Con. Res. 22.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 22) providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and an adjournment of the House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to 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 concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 22) was agreed to, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 22

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Thursday, August 1, 2013, through Sunday, August 11, 2013, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until 12:00 noon on Monday, August 12, 2013, or such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns on Monday, August 12, 2013, it stand adjourned until 12:00 noon on Monday, September 9, 2013, or such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House adjourns on any legislative day from Friday, August 2, 2013, through Friday, September 6, 2013, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Monday, September 9, 2013, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the Senate and House, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate if, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

PROMOTING ENERGY SAVINGS IN RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS AND INDUSTRY—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

EXPRESSING GRATITUDE FOR COOPERATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, for this session, this work period, we have done a lot of work, and it has turned out quite well. None of us got what we wanted, but we all got something. I appreciate the cooperation of Democrats and Republicans this afternoon. It is always during the last few hours before a recess that problems come up, and this is an adjournment, so it is even more difficult. So I am grateful to everyone for their participation and their cooperation.

As for Senator GRASSLEY, he has left the floor, but I wish to express my appreciation to him. He had an issue that took us a while to work through, and it all worked out for the better for not only he and Senator LEAHY but, most importantly, for our staff.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to enter into a colloquy with Senator STABENOW.

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

THE FARM BILL

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, as the two Chambers prepare to go to conference on the farm bill, I rise to request a commitment from the distinguished chairwoman of the Senate Agriculture Committee to protect the Senate farm bill's vital provision to end direct payments outright.

While I commend the chairwoman for her leadership in facilitating the full and immediate elimination of direct payments in the Senate-passed farm bill, many of my colleagues may be surprised to learn that section 1101 of the House-passed farm bill contains a carve-out that would actually continue direct payments to cotton farmers at a rate of 70 percent in 2014 and a rate of 60 percent in 2015.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, this House-passed extension of direct payments would cost taxpayers an estimated $823 million.

Already a poster child for Federal largesse, direct payments have more recently become synonymous with waste, fraud, and abuse. As the Washington Post put it, recent analyses of the program have found that it subsidizes people who aren't really farming: the idle, the urban, and, occasionally, the dead.

Investigations have uncovered taxpayer-backed direct payments being paid to billionaires, to New York City condo dwellers, and to nonfarming homeowners who happen to live on former farmlands.

Direct payments have also been the target of a series of scathing reports published by the GAO, the most recent of which went so far as to question the purpose and need for direct payments, stating that they did not ''align with principles significant to integrity, effectiveness, and efficiency in farm bill programs.'' The report went on to recommend that Congress consider eliminating direct payments outright.

I ask the distinguished chairwoman, was the unsustainable cost and the pattern of waste, fraud, and abuse associated with direct payments the impetus for the chairwoman to ensure that this subsidy was fully and immediately eliminated in the most recent Senate-passed farm bill?

Ms. STABENOW. I thank my colleague from Arizona for his passion on this issue.

Yes, it has been my goal from the beginning of this farm bill process to end unnecessary subsidies and to clean up areas of waste, fraud, and abuse starting with the direct payment program. The program is indefensible in this current budget climate. It makes absolutely no sense to pay farmers when they don't suffer a loss and to pay people who aren't even farming.

That is also why we included the strongest reforms to the commodity programs in the history of the farm bill, eliminating payments to people who are not farming and tightening the AGI requirements and the amount any single farmer can receive.

We even have reformed the crop insurance program. The No. 1 thing we have heard from listening to farmers all across this country is that they need market-based risk management tools.

Farming is an extremely risky business. Farmers plant seeds in the spring and hope that by the time the harvest rolls around there will have been enough rain and the right temperatures to give them a good crop. That is why we strengthened crop insurance and made that available to farmers growing different kinds of crops—because we want farmers to have skin in the game. As I have always said, that is about farmers paying a bill for crop insurance, not getting a check from the direct payment program.

Mr. FLAKE. To the chairwoman's credit, the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry has maintained a sustained effort to eliminate direct payments. In fact, between the 2012 and 2013 Senate farm bills and the majority's sequester replacement legislation, 76 current Members of the Senate—76 current Members of the Senate—have voted for the full and immediate elimination of direct payments.

Does the chairwoman agree that even the limited $823 million extension of direct payments found in the House-passed bill would be at odds with the recorded votes of a supermajority of the Senate?

Ms. STABENOW. My friend from Arizona is correct. The Senate has repeatedly voted to end direct payments.

Mr. FLAKE. To that end, I respectfully request that the distinguished chairwoman make a commitment that she will protect the Senate's vital provision and work to ensure that any conference report brought before the Senate achieves a full and immediate elimination of direct payments.

Ms. STABENOW. Yes, that is my intension. I strongly agree we should not be spending taxpayer dollars to fund these direct payment subsidies, and I will do everything I can to make sure the conference committee adopts the Senate version on this issue.

I would also say to my friend from Arizona that if we do not get the farm bill signed into law by September 30, then direct payments are scheduled to continue. So I hope we can count on the Senator's support to make sure we can pass the farm bill in time and eliminate direct payments.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the chairwoman for her commitment. To be frank, I believe the Senate farm bill leaves much to be desired. In fact, to gain my support, the farm bill will need to undergo dramatic changes to reduce the taxpayer cost of Federal crop insurance, remove market-distorting price supports, and limit the scope of the Federal Government in U.S. agriculture.

That said, the chairwoman is right to point out that as uncertainty continues to surround the farm bill, Congress appears poised to pass yet another extension of the 2008 farm bill and, in turn, continue direct payments.

With regard to direct payments, such an outcome would be a costly regression in light of the Senate's bipartisan efforts to eliminate this multibillion-dollar subsidy.

After 17 years, three extensions, and more than $92 billion paid out, it is time for direct payments to come to a full and immediate end. On this point, the chairwoman and I are in full agreement.

To that end, the chairwoman has my commitment to do everything I can to ensure that any legislation that should come before the Senate containing an extension of direct payments will be met with my fierce opposition.

I thank the chairwoman again for her commitment and for her attention to these concerns.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues who have been patiently waiting. I know there are many Members who wish to speak.

I thank my colleague from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank my colleague as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H. CON. RES. 25

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 33, H. Con. Res. 25; that the amendment which is at the desk, the text of S. Con. Res. 8, the budget resolution passed by the Senate, be inserted in lieu thereof; that H. Con. Res. 25, as amended, be agreed to; the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses; and the chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate; that following the authorization, two motions to instruct conferees be in order from each side: motion to instruct relative to the debt limit and motion to instruct relative to taxes/revenue; that there be 2 hours of debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees prior to votes in relation to the motions; further, that no amendments be in order to either of the motions prior to the votes; all of the above occurring with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I would ask the Senator from Illinois if he would consent to a modification of his request that it not be in order for the Senate to consider a conference report that includes reconciliation instructions to raise the debt limit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator so modify his request?

Mr. DURBIN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection to the modification has been heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. RUBIO. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I am sorry we are ending this session and going home for August with this. This is an attempt to go to a conference committee with the House of Representatives to agree on how much money we as a government will spend next year.

Each Chamber has passed a budget resolution. The Senate passed one. The House passed one. The basic constitutional approach to this is to bring the two together, work out our differences. This is, in fact, the 18th time we have asked the Republicans for their consent to go to this conference committee to resolve the differences between the House and the Senate and the 18th time that a Republican Senator has stood and objected.

We have heard speech after speech about how bad it was that the Senate never passed a budget resolution. I bet you heard it too. So we passed one. We did not get any help from the Republicans in passing it, but we passed it. Then, when it came time to try to work out our differences with the House of Representatives, Republican Senator after Republican Senator stood and said: No, we do not want to meet with the House of Representatives, even though it has a Republican majority.

Well, what difference does it make if we agree on this number? Can life go on? It makes a big difference. You see, earlier this afternoon we had this bill on the floor, S. 1243. It is a bill for the Departments of Transportation and Housing and Urban Development. Senator PATTY MURRAY of Washington chairs that appropriations subcommittee. Senator SUSAN COLLINS of Maine is her vice chairman on the Republican side. They worked long and hard on this bill.

It is a $54 billion bill. It pays for the basics when it comes to transportation in America; TIGER grants so that communities can build the roads they need; money to rebuild bridges that are falling down; airports in Massachusetts, Illinois, and Florida. It has the Housing and Urban Development Program in it as well, housing for poor people, housing for veterans.

Well, it came to a procedural vote today on the floor. It was a dramatic moment. The Senator from Maine, the Republican Senator who has worked on this for so long, stood and begged her colleagues on the Republican side to join her in moving this bill forward. She put in a lot of work, and she went through this long list of 85 different amendments that have been considered on this bill, how everybody has had their chance if they wanted to change it. Senator MURRAY of Washington said the same thing.

Then the Republican leader Senator MCCONNELL came to the floor and said: I am asking all the Republicans to vote no. Vote no because we have not reached an agreement on the budget resolution; we have not reached an agreement on the total amount of money we will spend next year.

So they all voted no—all except Senator COLLINS. Every one of them voted no because we did not have an agreement on the budget resolution.

So I just came to the floor and said: Why don't we sit down and try to reach an agreement on the budget resolution? And a Republican Senator said: No, I object to that.

Where does that leave us? They will not pass the bills—appropriations bills—for something as basic as transportation and infrastructure because we do not have an agreement on a budget resolution, and they will not give their consent for us to sit down and agree on a budget resolution.

The games politicians play. When we had this press conference outside, there were people from the construction industry—iron workers, transportation workers, some of them in hard hats—and one of them got up to the microphone and said: I don't know what is going on inside those rooms with all that wrestling, but we need more jobs in America. Why can't you pass a bill to create more jobs in America?

I think most Americans, wherever they live, would agree with that ironworker. Most of them would not understand what just happened today—how the Republicans, except for one, all voted against that bill for transportation, saying we had not reached an agreement on how much we were going to spend, and then they turned around and objected when we came forward and said: Then let's try to reach an agreement. They objected. You just heard it on the floor.

I respect my colleague from Florida. And do you know the reason for the objection? He is afraid we may resolve the issue about our debt ceiling. Do you know what the debt ceiling is? The debt ceiling is America's mortgage. When we vote for spending bills, we

have to borrow some money to cover what we are voting for.

Many on the Republican side say: We want to vote for spending bills, but we do not want to be held responsible for the money you have to borrow to pay for it.

If we fail to enact a debt ceiling at the end of this year, America will default on its debt for the first time in history. The economic recovery we are seeing now will disappear. Jobs will be lost. Businesses are going to contract, some will fail. It is totally irresponsible to say: I just hope we never extend that debt ceiling.

We need to do that. We did it 16 times under President Ronald Reagan—16 different times under President Reagan. This is not a Democratic or Republican issue. It is an issue of responsibility and fiscal responsibility.

I am saddened that we had such a good run for 2 weeks where we were working together and we end on such a sour note. I am saddened we could not pass this good, basic bill—a bill which had bipartisan support coming out of the committee. I am saddened that the Senator from Maine was the only Republican Senator who would vote for this bill today. And I am saddened that we will end this session with an objection to the House and Senate trying to sit down together and work out their differences.

If you wonder why the approval rating of Congress is at rock bottom, I am afraid we have seen today in the proceedings of the Senate exactly why that is the case.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to discuss the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act, which is also known as Shaheen-Portman. I am very pleased to be here with my cosponsor Senator ROB PORTMAN. He has been a partner in developing this legislation. I thank him for being such a great partner and because he has to go catch a flight, I am going to defer, yield to him for his remarks, if I could. I will yield to him for a question so he can speak to this bill and get to his flight on time.

Mr. PORTMAN. I thank the Senator for yielding. I appreciate that and I will yield back to her in a moment.

First, I want to say that I appreciate her working with me over the last couple years on this legislation. This is the kind of legislation we ought to be doing around here because it has a lot of benefits. It reduces our trade deficit. It helps encourage job creation. It actually makes our environment cleaner. I think it can be helpful in a renaissance to our manufacturing in America. It is called the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act.

I also want to thank the ranking member and chair of the Senate Energy Committee—that is Senator WYDEN and Senator MURKOWSKI—for their consistent support of this legislation. We got it through the committee with a strong vote, and we need to get it to the floor when we come back in September with a strong vote.

I am told this is going to be the first substantive Energy bill on the floor since 2007. It is about time. I hope it will have support from both sides of the aisle, and I know it has support on both sides of the Capitol. It is going to help job creators all over the country. It is the right thing to do.

On this side of the aisle, we focused a lot on an ''all of the above'' energy strategy. We believe we ought to be producing more energy, particularly domestic sources of energy in the ground in America, and I support that strongly. We also, though, talk about embracing smart, economically viable policies that let us use less energy. So it is producing more and using less. There is a lot of focus on producing more but less on this part about using less, and that is what this bill does.

It is supported by more than 250 businesses, trade associations, advocacy groups—the National Association of Manufacturers, the Sierra Club, the Alliance to Save Energy, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—so it is a group that does not normally come together to support legislation. They like this bill because, again, it has these benefits for the environment, but also benefits for the economy and for our energy policy in this country.

It passed the Energy Committee with a strong bipartisan vote of 19 to 3. Simply put, Senator SHAHEEN and I have a bill that I think makes good environmental sense. It makes good economic sense, and it makes good energy sense.

I have visited with businesses and job creators all over Ohio, and they tell me pretty much the same thing. They are competing in a global marketplace. They are competing with companies in Indiana but also in India, and their ability to compete depends on their costs. They go up against companies and countries where the cost to produce goods tends to be lower. We are never going to compete on wages in developing countries, nor should we. We are not going to be able to reduce the quality of our goods, nor should we. We want to be sure we are not cutting corners.

One thing we can do is reduce the costs to our manufacturers on energy because it is a big input, particularly with heavy manufacturing. This enables us to do that through energy efficiency technologies.

What we can do as the Federal Government—through research, through disseminating best practices, through supporting skills training—is help the private sector develop the energy efficiency techniques of the future. We can make it easier for them to use efficiency tools to reduce their costs, which enables them to put those savings toward expanding their companies and hiring more people.

The proposals contained in the bill are commonsense reforms we have needed for a long time. The bill has no mandates on anyone in the private sector. In fact, many of our proposals come as a direct result of our conversations we have had with people in the private sector about how the Federal Government can best help them to become more energy efficient, save money, and create more jobs by reinvesting in their businesses and communities.

Here is a brief overview of what the legislation does.

First, it helps manufacturers by reforming what is called the Advanced Manufacturing Office. This is an office at the Department of Energy. We need to provide clear guidance to this office that its responsibilities ought to include and ought to be prioritized to help manufacturers develop energy-saving technology for their businesses. Frankly, they have gotten a little bit off track and have focused more on helping manufacturers of clean energy, which other Departments and agencies do, including at DOE. This office ought to be focused on energy-saving technology.

It also requires the Department of Energy to assist with on-site efficiency assessments for manufacturers. It facilitates the already existing efforts of companies around the country to implement cost-saving energy efficiency policies by streamlining the way the government agencies in this area work together.

It increases partnerships with National Labs—the National Laboratories, which are a great source of research and technology—and energy service and technology providers together to leverage private sector expertise toward energy efficiency goals.

The legislation also strengthens model building codes, so that builders in States that choose to adopt them will have the most up-to-date energy-efficient building codes that are available—again, no mandates, but best practices.

It also establishes university-based building training and assessment centers, building on existing industrial assessment centers located around the country. We have one in Dayton, OH, that does a great job. We want to make sure they can also do energy efficiency work.

These centers will help train the next generation of workers in energy-efficient commercial design and operations through this legislation. Not only will these programs save energy but they also help provide our students and unemployed workers with the skills they need to compete in what can be a growing field, which is the energy efficiency field.

Again, this bill is not about forcing companies to become more energy efficient or imposing mandates, it is about giving these companies the help they are asking for. We can do that at no additional expense to the taxpayer because the cost of this legislation under our bill is fully offset.

In fact, I believe this bill will save the American people a bunch of money. Why? Because the legislation takes on the largest user of energy in the world. That is the U.S. Government. The Federal Government needs to practice what it preaches. By requiring it in this bill to adopt energy-saving techniques that make its operations more efficient and less wasteful, we are doing just that.

The bill directs DOE to issue recommendations that employ energy efficiency on everything from computer hardware to operation and maintenance processes, energy efficiency software, power management tools. It also takes commonsense steps toward allowing the General Services Administration to update building designs that are out. Some of them have been out there for years. They have developed these designs over time. They are going to be permitted finally to update these efficiency standards, again with the latest energy efficiency technology. The government has been looking for places to tighten its belt. This is certainly one. Energy efficiency is a darn good place to start.

All this adds up to a piece of legislation that Americans across the spectrum can support. It is fully offset, contains no mandates on the private sector, and requires the Federal Government to become more efficient.

According to a recent study of our legislation and its impact, by 2020, using the tools of Shaheen-Portman, the private sector can create 80,000 new jobs, lower CO_2 emissions by the equivalent of taking 5 million cars off the road, and save consumers $4 billion a year in reduced energy costs. A vote on the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act is one more step toward achieving the goal of a true ''all of the above'' energy policy that produces more energy at home while using less. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Again, I commend my colleague from New Hampshire for working with us. I yield to her after having answered her.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I assume the question is, will this bill pass the Senate?

Mr. PORTMAN. Will this bill pass the Senate is a question that I pose to my colleague from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I would say absolutely it will pass the Senate. It will do that because it represents almost 3 years of meetings, negotiations, and broad stakeholder outreach in an effort to craft the most effective piece of legislation with the greatest chance of passing not only the Senate but the House as well so it can be signed into law.

This bill, as has been explained so well, is a bipartisan effort that is designed to boost the use of energy efficienct technologies. It will help create private sector jobs. It will save businesses and consumers money. It will reduce pollution. It will make our country more energy independent.

This legislation will have a swift and measurable benefit to our economy and our environment. As Senator PORTMAN said, a study by experts at the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy found that last year's version would have saved consumers $4 billion. This may be a little hard to read on the chart, but you can see it reduces energy costs. In doing so, it saves consumers $4 billion a year. It would create about 80,000 jobs, if it were passed, by 2020. It would also be the equivalent of taking 5 million cars off the road.

The United States needs a comprehensive national energy policy. We are too dependent on foreign oil. We are overly reliant on an outdated energy infrastructure. We need to utilize a wide range of energy sources, including natural gas, oil, nuclear, and renewable such as wind, biomass, and solar.

But we cannot just focus on the supply side. We also need to think about how we consume the energy once we have it. Efficiency is the cheapest, fastest way to reduce our energy use. Energy-saving techniques and technologies lower costs, they free up capital that allows businesses to expand and create jobs and allows our economy to grow. We can start by improving our efficiency now by installing ready and proven technologies, things such as modern heating and cooling systems, smart meters, computer-controlled thermostats, and lower energy lighting, to name a few.

There are substantial opportunities that exist across all sectors of our economy to conserve energy, to create good-paying private sector jobs. In fact, there are countless examples of energy efficiency success stories in the private sector that I have had the good fortune to see as I have traveled around New Hampshire.

I visited small retail businesses, manufacturing companies, ski areas, apartment complexes, and municipal buildings throughout New Hampshire. They are all using energy-efficient technologies to lower costs, to improve working conditions and, most important, to stay competitive.

Not long ago I had the opportunity to visit a company on the seacoast in New Hampshire called High Liner Foods. It is a seafood processing plant. It requires a lot of energy to operate. In fact, at one point the 180,000-square-foot facility consumed roughly 2 megawatts of power at any given time during normal operations. So next to the core costs of personnel and fish, because it is a fish processing plant, energy was their biggest expense. But by installing efficient lighting, new boilers, various demand-response techniques such as adjusting its lighting to dim when no employees are in the area, establishing HVAC setpoints, High Liner Foods is making great strides in reducing energy consumption. It has allowed them to expand their footprint in the State and to be more cost-effective in their production.

This week I had the opportunity to visit the first LEED-certified auto dealership in New Hampshire. It is the first Toyota auto dealership that is LEED certified in New England, which I know the Presiding Officer will appreciate, being from the neighboring State of Massachusetts. They have implemented a number of effective energy-efficient initiatives to cut their energy cost, including the installation of solar panels, efficient lighting, and an impressive energy dashboard to monitor energy use throughout their entire service. Their customers can come in, they can touch this interactive dashboard, they can see what is going on throughout the physical plant.

I have also visited some great New Hampshire companies that also are producing energy-efficient technology. We have a company in New Hampshire called Warner Power, which has made the first breakthrough in transformers in over 100 years. Studies show that inefficiency in transformers results in a loss of about 5 percent of all electricity generated in the United States. With the wide-scale use of Warner Power's innovation, the Hexaformer, and their control system technology, the company estimates that 1.5 percent of all transformer energy losses could be eliminated. This would save the country 60 terawatts of electricity a year. That is equal to about five times New Hampshire's entire annual electricity consumption. So energy efficiency is an excellent example of a bipartisan and affordable approach that can immediately grow our economy and improve our energy security.

In addition to being affordable, efficiency is widely supported because its benefits are not confined to a certain fuel source or a particular region of the country. It is clearly one of those areas where we can all come to some common agreement, whether we support fossil fuels or whether we support alternatives such as wind and solar. So it is no wonder, as Senator PORTMAN said, that this legislation enjoys such a broad, diverse coalition of support. It has received more than 250 endorsements from businesses, environmental groups, think tanks, and trade associations, from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers to the National Resources Defense Council and the Painters Union. These are the types of nontraditional alliances that have helped us to get this bill to the floor.

The legislation provides a roadmap to create and implement a national strategy to increase the use of energy efficiency technologies in the residential, commercial, and industrial sectors of our economy.

It provides incentives and support, not mandates, for residential and commercial buildings in order to cut energy use. This is very important because buildings consume about 40 percent of all energy in the United States. The bill strengthens voluntary national model building codes—I would emphasize that these are voluntary—to make new homes and commercial

buildings more energy efficient, while working with States and private industry to make the code-writing process more transparent.

It also trains the next generation of workers in energy-efficient commercial building design and operation. The legislation also assists our industrial manufacturing sector, which consumes more energy than any other sector of the U.S. economy. It directs the Department of Energy to work closely with the private sector industrial partners to encourage research, development, and commercialization of innovative energy-efficient technology and processes for industrial applications.

It helps businesses reduce energy costs and become more competitive by incentivizing the use of more energy-efficient electric motors and transformers. It establishes a voluntary program called SupplySTAR, which is modeled on the successful ENERGY STAR Program, to help make company supply chains more efficient.

Finally, the legislation requires the Federal Government, the single largest user of energy in the country, to adopt more efficient building standards and smart metering technology. It requires the Federal Government to adopt energy-saving technologies and operations for computers. It allows Federal agencies to use existing funds to update plans for new Federal buildings using the most current building efficiency standards.

The best part, as Senator PORTMAN said, is the cost of this legislation is fully offset. It reallocates funding that has not been used from existing programs.

I thank Chairman RON WYDEN and his ranking member LISA MURKOWSKI from the Energy and Natural Resources Committee for their great support in getting this bill to the floor. This is a bipartisan, affordable, and widely supported piece of legislation. Most importantly, it is an effective step in addressing our Nation's very real energy needs. I thank Senator PORTMAN, Senator WYDEN, and Senator MURKOWSKI for all of their help with this bill. I look forward to debating the bill on the floor of the Senate, to listening to amendments, and to passing this bill out to the House and finally having it signed into law. I hope my colleagues will join me in this debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

IRS INVESTIGATION

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to talk about the status of the ongoing Finance Committee investigation into the targeting scandal at the Internal Revenue Service.

As you can tell, my voice is a bit hoarse this afternoon. I am feeling a little bit under the weather. With the Senate about to go into recess, I thought it was important that I say a few words about this investigation, particularly with some of the statements we have heard coming from the administration this week.

In May, when the news broke that the IRS had been targeting conservative organizations applying for tax-exempt status with additional scrutiny, President Obama promised his administration would fully cooperate with Congress in its investigations. He also stated he directed Treasury Secretary Lew to follow up on the IRS inspector general audit to get more information as to how this happened, who was responsible, to make sure the public understood all of the facts.

I was encouraged by this initial response. As you recall, I worked to clear the way for Secretary Lew's confirmation in this Senate, even though many of my colleagues had expressed legitimate concerns about his nomination. I did so, in large part, because I believed him when he promised to be fully transparent and cooperative with Congress. When the President said he had ordered the Secretary to get to the bottom of this, I expected him to live up to his promises to do so and to work with us as we tried to do the same.

Imagine my surprise then to hear both the President and Secretary Lew state over the past week, with our investigations into the IRS targeting, Congress was creating a ''phony scandal.''

It started with the President who said:

> With this endless parade of distractions and political posturing and phony scandals, Washington is taking its eye off the ball. And I'm here to say, this needs to stop.

That is what the President said.

That was followed by Secretary Lew stating on last Sunday's shows this past weekend that ''there is no evidence that this went to any political official'' and that congressional investigators' efforts to find evidence is ''creating the kind of sense of a phony scandal.''

In essence, they are saying our efforts to look into this mess are illegitimate and that the American people should simply ignore them. That is a far cry from the position the President and his administration took when this scandal was made public. As I said at that time, they were contrite. Officials were even apologizing for what went on at the IRS.

Today, however, it is a ''phony scandal.'' It is not worthy of the public's attention, they say. I have to wonder what they are basing their dismissal on, certainly not a thorough review of all the relevant documents, that is for sure.

In a letter to congressional leaders on June 4, Danny Werfel, the Acting IRS Commissioner, stated that the IRS had collected some 646 gigabytes of raw, electronically stored information, which is equal to 65 million pages' worth of documents relevant to this investigation.

Let me repeat that. The man in charge, Danny Werfel, stated that the IRS had collected some 646 gigabytes of raw, electronically stored information, which is equal to 65 million pages' worth of documents relevant to this administration. However, to date, only about 21,500 pages have been given to us—21,500 pages of documents. Those are the only documents produced to the Finance Committee to fulfill our comprehensive document request from May 20 of this year. The pace at which documents have been provided to our committee has been slow and often with long delays in between document productions.

Despite their initial pledges to be cooperative and responsive, the Obama administration has been slow-walking the Senate Finance Committee. We aren't the only ones being slow-walked.

Only last week, my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee, chairman DAVE CAMP and ranking member SANDER LEVIN, wrote to Danny Werfel, who is currently the principal Deputy IRS Commissioner, that at the rate the IRS is producing documents, a full and responsive production will take months. It is actually much worse than that.

Let me refer to this pie chart. Look at the documents we received from the IRS, 6,000 pages of, guess what, training materials. Come on, give me a break. There were 500 pages of Steven Miller, Douglas Shulman, and William Wilkins, and 15,000 pages of nonpriority custodians. That is what we have gotten from them since May. It is pathetic.

As that chart illustrates, given the intermittent document production and the very small number of priority documents we have received thus far, it could be 2016 before we ever would be able to draw any conclusions about what happened at the IRS. That is pathetic. I have a feeling that is exactly what this administration wants, and that is what I call slow-walking.

Since the initial report confirming the inappropriate targeting released by the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration, or TIGTA, on May 14, this ''phony scandal'' has evolved from what the IRS first claimed was a couple of rogue employees in Cincinnati to direct IRS involvement from high-level officials in Washington, DC, including, at the very least, individuals in the IRS's Office of Chief Counsel.

I should note that the IRS Chief Counsel is also an Assistant General Counsel in the Treasury Department, and he reports to the Treasury's General Counsel. Clearly, much more needs to be learned about who was involved, why decisions were made, and what motivated these decisions.

This is why the Senate Finance Committee has been conducting a thorough, balanced, and fact-based bipartisan investigation that carefully examines every aspect of this in order to get to the truth.

We are not interested——

Mr. ROBERTS. Would the distinguished ranking member yield for one quick question? I know the Senator has prepared remarks, and I know he is not feeling well, but I am stunned by this. I am a member of the committee, as the Senator well knows.

Mr. HATCH. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTS. You have been promised full cooperation by the Deputy Commissioner, Mr. Werfel. I have been present when he has tried to inform the committee of full cooperation. Now we find out what full cooperation is, more especially as the President has indicated these scandals are so-called phony scandals and repeated by Mr. Lew.

The Senator stated there are 65 million pages that should be available to the committee, which is stunning—stunning—in the job we would have to do. But out of those requested, only 21,500 documents have been presented. Of the 21,500, only 15,000—well, 15,000 pages, but those are nonpriority documents.

Thereby, if you try to figure out when this would be done, it would be in 2016; is that correct?

Mr. HATCH. That is right.

Mr. ROBERTS. I am stunned by this.

Mr. HATCH. It may be beyond that. It may actually go beyond that.

Mr. ROBERTS. I would imagine, if you do the math—and if you know how much time we have to actually do this—but I am stunned. This isn't what we were promised. This wasn't the understanding of the full committee and the bipartisan effort.

I don't know what we are going to have to do. We are going to have to do some drastic action if this is any indication of what we are taking.

The Senator pointed out that we have been thorough, we have been bipartisan, and we have kept absolute integrity with this. The key word was ''painstaking.'' If we have this information, there is a lot of pain, but there is no take.

Mr. HATCH. You got that right.

Mr. ROBERTS. I am extremely upset about it. I thank my colleague for bringing this to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. HATCH. I thank my colleague from Kansas. All I can say is: Look, we were promised full cooperation, and we are not getting it.

I don't blame Mr. Werfel for this, although he is a very close friend of Mr. Lew's. I think he has wanted to be more cooperative. When I chatted with him today again, he indicated the attorneys are going over everything. Let me just say, are we going to get the right papers? Are we going to get the truth?

We are not interested in some perceptions of the truth based on limited documents and limited facts. We wish to know precisely what happened, and we are going to find out.

Today, in addition to the small number of documents we have been able to review, the Finance Committee investigators have interviewed 14 individuals from IRS offices in both Cincinnati and Washington, DC. So far those interviews have yielded more questions than answers. In fact, the list of additional questions keeps growing as the investigation wears on.

After more than 2 months of investigation, here are just a few of the questions I have. I will not take too much of the Senate's time tonight, but I have a lot more questions than this, and I am going to ask these in a bipartisan manner.

Why did IRS Commissioner Shulman visit the White House 157 times? That is the number we have been given. That is unheard of. It has never happened before.

I admit ObamaCare has taken some time, but you can't justify 157 times. It sounds to me as if there is something fishy going on.

Why is it that the unions get tax-exempt status under 501(c)(5)? There was a surge in the 501(c)(5) applications in recent years. Why weren't they subject to some of the scrutiny?

Did the IRS give extra scrutiny to union applications for tax-exempt status? The answer to that is, no, they didn't.

I am not suggesting they should, but they certainly shouldn't have traded preelection of so-called conservative groups the way they treated them.

Everybody knows that is a scandal. Yet they call this not a scandal?

Once Deputy Treasury Secretary Neal Wolin learned from Inspector General Russell George of the TIGTA audit regarding IRS targeting of conservative groups on June 4, 2012, did he tell anyone else at the Treasury Department or the White House about his findings, including then-Treasury Secretary Geithner? Not that I can understand, because we don't know. They are not answering these questions.

When did Assistant General Counsel for Treasury William Wilkins, who also holds the title of IRS Chief Counsel, first find out that the IRS was targeting conservative groups? When did he find that out? Why can't we get a simple answer on that?

Whom did Mr. Wilkins inform about this targeting when he found out about it? What was the extent of the Treasury Department's role regarding Lois Lerner revealing, in response to a planted question, that the IRS had targeted conservative groups applying for tax-exempt status at an American Bar Association conference? When did any employee of the Treasury Department first have involvement regarding the IRS targeting of conservative groups' applications for tax-exempt status?

What was first date that any White House official was informed about the IRS targeting of conservative applicants for tax-exempt status?

It has been reported that ProPublica obtained private information from the IRS about conservative groups that had applied for tax-exempt status. In addition, it has been reported that the National Organization for Marriage alleges that the IRS illegally leaked information about its donors.

What action, if any, has been taken by the IRS and the Department of Justice with respect to any IRS employee who may have illegally disclosed private taxpayer information in either of these cases? These are important questions.

Are there other cases where a conservative group or its members have had their private taxpayer information unlawfully disclosed?

It has been reported that the IRS attempted to impose gift taxes on donors to the conservative group Freedom's Watch. Did the IRS attempt to impose gift taxes on the donors of other tax-exempt groups? Has the IRS targeted individuals for an audit of their personal tax returns based on their membership in or donations to a conservative tax-exempt group?

It has been reported that Lois Lerner communicated with an attorney at the Federal Election Commission regarding a case before the FEC.

Did Lois Lerner violate section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code dealing with the protection of taxpayer privacy in her communications with the Federal Election Commission? She had a right to take the Fifth Amendment, but was that why she took it if she violated section 6103?

These are questions that have to be answered. Why did Sarah Hall-Ingram, who was in charge of the IRS's efforts in implementing ObamaCare, attend a meeting with then-IRS Commissioner Steve Miller in May 2012 regarding the IRS's targeting of conservative groups' applications for tax-exempt status?

It has been reported in the media that Christine O'Donnell had a tax lien put on her property the day she declared her candidacy for the Senate.

There is something wrong here. Anybody who is fair ought to be concerned about what is wrong here—not just this but in all these questions.

As part of the IRS internal investigation the President charged Secretary Lew with conducting, has the IRS examined whether any political candidates were inappropriately targeted?

Much has been made of the employees who have been ''relieved of duty'' and had ''administrative actions'' taken against them, allegedly in direct response to the inappropriate targeting. Once again, the facts do not add up, as the administrative actions discovered thus far were against low-level employees for actions that were not directly tied to the allegations of inappropriate targeting.

So my question is, Who was relieved of duty? Lois Lerner supposedly was after she took the Fifth Amendment and refused to testify. But even she was able to log in to her computer after being allegedly relieved, and she is still being paid her full salary.

Who else has been relieved of duty? What does Lois Lerner know that prompted her to invoke her Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination?

Former IRS Commissioner Steve Miller and Doug Shulman were both aware of the targeting of conservative groups seeking tax-exempt status and the systematic practice of subjecting those

conservative groups to intrusive and unwarranted scrutiny about their activities. Why did they both deceive the Senate by failing to inform us that these practices were going on? Why? I was disappointed in Commissioner Shulman because he came to my office long before this all came up and I was quite impressed. But I think he had an obligation to come clean.

Why did the tea party cases sit for months at the IRS, through the 2010 election cycle without activity? Why? Why did Lois Lerner direct the IRS Chief Counsel's Office—an office that was purportedly slow in its response to requests for assistance from other IRS components—to get involved in reviewing tea party cases? Why did the IRS demand that tea party organizations seeking tax-exempt status provide a list of their donors to the IRS when that was not required? Why?

These types of inappropriate actions, as I said, are just some of the many questions we have about the IRS targeting scam. These questions will simply not go away, and our investigation will not stop until all of them are answered. And we are doing this in a bipartisan way.

Just today we learned President Obama has selected a new nominee to serve as the next Commissioner of the IRS. I have to say I was a bit surprised, although perhaps I really shouldn't be. Given the dark cloud that currently hangs over the IRS, I would have thought the President would have taken the time to consult Congress before choosing the agency's next leader. Yet I am the ranking member of the appropriate committee with sole jurisdiction over the IRS, and today's announcement is the first I have heard of this decision, and it was only after the decision was made. I like the President. I think we are friends. But that was improper, and it was a slight that should not have happened.

I asked Senator BAUCUS if he was informed by the President, and he said: About 3 hours ago. And he sounded a little disgusted himself.

I won't go into the merits of John Koskinen's nomination today. I have no intention of prejudging him. He will be fairly considered by the Finance Committee, and I have the reputation that he will be fairly considered. His record and qualifications will be thoroughly examined. But I want to assure my colleagues that I will demand significant answers from Mr. Koskinen when he comes before the committee, and I think other Republicans will as well.

My purpose will be twofold. First, we need to get to the truth about what happened at the IRS and, perhaps just as important, we need to make sure the Obama administration is fully cooperating with our efforts rather than using phony statements about phony scandals.

So today I want to call on President Obama and Secretary Lew to stop closing the door on this investigation that has just started and hasn't even been given a chance. If this is indeed a phony scandal, the burden is on them to prove it is. And just saying that it is isn't good enough. They should have the IRS produce all the requested documents and let the documents speak for themselves. There is no reason to hide these things, nor is there a reason to have a whole bunch of attorneys determining what can be released and what can't be released. Let them show how their partisan targeting began and why it continued for years. Let them show who was or was not involved and to what level within the IRS or elsewhere in government these activities were discussed and directed. Until then, this is certainly not a phony scandal. It is a legitimate bipartisan investigation being conducted in a fair and balanced way that seeks to let the facts dictate the outcome.

I have a reputation around here for being fair and honest, and I resent the way the Finance Committee is being treated. I can't speak for the chairman, but I believe he feels pretty much the same way because we are being mistreated with regard to our requests for information. This isn't some itty-bitty phony scandal. This is big-time stuff that should get into why the IRS was doing this to begin with.

People in this country are scared to death of the IRS, and with good reason. If they can do this to you, can you imagine what else they can do? And I have listed just a few things here today. I have a lot more I could say. This is an important investigation, and Senator BAUCUS and I intend to do it in a bipartisan way. But when we ask for documents, we want documents, and we don't want some bunch of partisan lawyers in the department stopping us from getting the documents they must provide. It sure looks as though they are deliberately trying to delay this as long as they can so they can say: Well, nobody cares about it. Well, I have to tell you, everybody in this country must care about it. If they can do this to these small, conservative tax-exempt organizations, then they can do it to every other organization when the time comes.

This is an important investigation, and this administration ought to be at the forefront of trying to get to the bottom of it instead of pulling from behind, saying there is nothing here when they know there is a lot here. I would like these questions answered. They are important questions. This is an important investigation. We should not allow the IRS to run rampant like this. That is the beginning of tyranny—except it began before 2010—and we should get to the bottom of it so it never, ever happens again.

I think there are a lot of people at the IRS who would like to see us get to the bottom of it because they are being besmirched by the bad things that have happened. There are a lot of decent, honorable people working at the IRS, and they have to be as concerned as I am about the mistreatment that occurred prior to the last election and after.

Is it going to happen again? Are these agencies of government going to be used by partisan people in the way they has been used up until now? It is enough to scare the daylights out of anybody, and it is enough to think, are we moving toward a totalitarian system where the people in government can get away with anything they want to and especially an agency as powerful and scary as the IRS? I hope we can get the answers to these questions. If we can't, this isn't going to stop until we do. And these are just preliminary questions; I will come back with some more in the coming weeks.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SHAHEEN). The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, I would like to again thank the distinguished ranking member of the Finance Committee for his presentation and asking very pertinent questions with what I thought was going to be not an easy task but at least a task where we would receive cooperation from the IRS and, for that matter, the administration.

Nobody likes to be audited, and surely nobody likes to say they have been audited, as the distinguished ranking member pointed out about all the conservative groups. But let me point out that this has gone on not only with regard to them but to individuals as well. We are getting reports from the senatorial campaign committee indicating that people are hesitant to give, that people who have given in the past significantly to the Republican cause have been audited, and audited for the first time in their lives, to pro-Israel groups—and I can go on and on with a list of the organizations.

This is a very serious situation. This really surprises me, that having said we were going to do this in a painstaking, bipartisan way, that this is simply not the case.

I am going to be joining the distinguished ranking member. I am very interested in the further questions we feel we can boil down that simply have to be answered first, and then obviously there are many more.

AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE ACT

This really goes to the subject I want to talk about. The American people now, as a result of this, do not trust the IRS, and they sure as heck do not trust the IRS to be in charge of their health care. That is the subject I want to touch on, and I will try to make it very brief.

It has been more than 3 years since the Affordable Care Act—referred to by some or most in the press as ''ObamaCare''—was signed into law. At the time, I can recall, after months of markup in both the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions and Finance Committees, I had many concerns. I remember I was very frustrated with my amendments being defeated on partisan votes, most of them having dealt

with rationing. I remember distinctly comparing this rush to government health care to a western or Kansas analogy of riding hell for leather into a box canyon to eventually finding the only alternative would be to turn around and ride back out to a more realistic market-oriented health care reform trade.

As it turned out, we never even saw the bill before we voted on it. I voted no, and so did every other Republican Senator and Member of Congress. And I regret to say to my colleagues that I told you so. Premiums are going up. Taxes are going up. Overall health care costs continue to rise. Burdensome, costly, and, I might add, difficult-to-understand regulations are confusing and confounding health care providers. Many of these folks will not even know about a particular regulation until they are fined by outside contractors. The results have been terribly counterproductive to any economic recovery. Regulations such as these this have a way of dampening anything we are trying to do.

The current and growing problems are so large and complicated with this government takeover of health care that it has been difficult, if not impossible, for the administration to get ObamaCare off the ground. I mentioned what happened 3 years ago at the beginning of my remarks. Let's now talk about what is coming down the pike in just a matter of weeks.

October 1 is the deadline when, according to the Affordable Care Act, according to the law, according to promise, millions of Americans who do not receive insurance through an employer will be forced to purchase health insurance in an exchange overseen by the States and the Federal Government—except for Georgia. Yesterday, Georgia was the first to announce that they will not be ready by the October 1 deadline and have asked for a delay.

I am going to make a prediction that what Georgia did, others will do, including the Federal Government. In fact, as we all know, the administration—in a weekend blog, no less—announced they would delay the employer mandate due to take place January 1, 2014, by a year, to January of 2015. I might add, that just happens to be after the midterm elections. This just means another delay for businesses that complained about the red-tape and costly burdens the mandate placed on their operations. Many are already laying off employees or moving them to part-time status to avoid the costly mandate. And all of this follows the thousands of waivers granted to corporations, unions, and other groups.

Again, my question is, Where is the waiver for the average family in Kansas and around the Nation? Where is the permanent delay for the taxes that will affect individuals?

As we warned, things are starting to crumble and get worse, which is why we need to sunset the exchanges and the individual mandate—literally, a tax on families.

This evening or tomorrow those of us privileged to serve in the Senate will leave Washington for the month of August, and we are going to get an earful regarding all of the problems associated with ObamaCare and the impending deadline. Will exchanges be ready? If they say they are ready, will they really be ready? Many Kansans who will be forced into a Federal exchange or see another last-minute delay—a Federal exchange, by the way, that doesn't exist as of my remarks—will ask how much the new plan will cost. They will say: What will it cover? Will they be able to see their family doctor? Will their personal health information remain private and safe or end up in a six-agency database? Some people call it seven agencies. Will they be losing the health insurance they like? Will the high costs force their employer to make them a part-time employee, change their plan, or just drop their coverage altogether?

Right now Kansans and everyone else in the country cannot answer these questions—and neither can the administration. And when we get back, we will have only 4 weeks until the October 1 deadline. That means, really, if we are going to do something about this, we are only going to have 3 weeks in which something can be done to sunset, delay, defund, or repeal the law and replace it with real health care reform that works and to restore the all-important relationship between patients and doctors.

Well, I do have an answer. Some time ago, when the ObamaCare storm clouds were first forming, I introduced legislation to sunset the exchanges and the individual mandate if they are not, as promised, up and running and ready to enroll by October 1 so that the exchanges can meet the requirements prescribed by law. Simply named the ''Exchange Sunset Act of 2013,'' S. 1272, my bill aims to make sure that if the exchanges are not ready, they go away and so does the mandate.

I realize, as we travel down this road to the October 1 deadline at ever-increasing speed, there will be those who support continued advertising and encouraging thousands to sign up in the exchanges. The question is, Sign up for what? The chances of the exchanges, State and Federal, being ready—and I mean ready and accessible to all that the advertising is trying to bring in—are remote at best. Obviously, there will be some kind of a delay, and once again we will have the administration rewriting laws which they had a direct hand in writing and which were passed exclusively by the Democratic majority. I submit, changing the law by the Executive—the Office of the President—without approval by the Congress is unconstitutional.

Three weeks, three weeks before the ObamaCare train wreck. When this body comes back, let's talk about it, and I urge immediate consideration and hopefully passage of S. 1272, the Exchange Sunset Act of 2013. It is a train wreck, folks, and we have to get America off the track.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

MANIPULATING TAX REFORM

Mr. FLAKE. Madam President, I rise today to discuss the so-called grand bargain referenced yesterday by the President.

On Tuesday President Obama recycled a number of policy ideas that have lingered for months, if not years, and repackaged them as what he called ''a grand bargain.'' This proposal seems to be an attempt by the President to extend an olive branch to the Republican side of the aisle by offering corporate tax reform. In exchange, he is asking for additional stimulus spending.

I am in favor of a grand bargain, but this is not even close to a grand bargain. It is not even a bargain. A grand bargain would involve reform to entitlement programs to make them sustainable over time. A grand bargain would involve a farsighted look at the outyears, not just a shortsighted attempt to score political points for the next election cycle.

The administration has taken the taxpayer down the road of stimulus spending before, with the idea that we can stimulate job growth with so-called shovel-ready projects. Sadly, we have all seen what throwing taxpayer money at supposed shovel-readiness gets you and just how lackluster this economic recovery has been. Wasting hard-earned dollars on so-called investments doesn't create jobs. Businesses and the people who build them is what creates jobs.

I think both sides of the aisle agree that our Tax Code is already far too complicated. In fact, a recent bipartisan letter from the chairman and ranking minority member of the Senate Finance Committee discussed the complexity, inefficiency, and unfairness of our Tax Code, which acts as a brake on our economy. But if we can't bring ourselves to do entitlement reform—or the so-called grand bargain—at least at this stage what we can do is perhaps a small bargain for businesses and the taxpayers just by simplifying both the individual and corporate codes to foster an environment that is hospitable to business expansion, to hiring, and to international competitiveness.

Last week I shared publicly with the leadership of our tax-writing committee my goals and principles for tax reform. Chief among them is lowering the business income taxation for corporations and those businesses that file as individuals.

With 95 percent of U.S. businesses structured as subchapter S corporations, limited partnerships, limited liability corporations, and other pass-through businesses, we can't ignore the fact that many of them pay a top rate of 39.6 percent in addition to several other layers of taxation. In my view,

any substantive tax reform should include a reformed tax system that allows all U.S. businesses, including passthrough businesses, to thrive. Unfortunately, the proposed corporate taxation reforms the President included in his recent announcement will once again have the government picking winners and losers in the Tax Code.

Here in the Senate, there are efforts to work in a bipartisan fashion to reform the Tax Code. This is a good-faith effort that should be encouraged. As I mentioned, it would be a bargain for taxpayers and businesses alike.

If we can make progress on the small bargain, then perhaps some day we can return our attention to the grand bargain—a bargain that would include and involve entitlement reform and substantive tax reform in the same package.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 2668

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 145, H.R. 2668. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, without intervening action or debate, and the motion to reconsider be made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Madam President, very briefly, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. It comes as no surprise that the Republicans are once again trying to repeal the health care act. By one count, the House and Senate Republicans have tried to fight the same fight more than 70 times.

Albert Einstein was not insane. He was very smart. But he described insanity pretty clearly as doing the same thing over and over and expecting different results. That is where we are here. This is insane. It is clear Republicans liked it better when insurance companies could deny coverage when you had a preexisting condition; when insurance companies could cut off your health insurance when you got sick; when insurance companies could raise insurance rates without any review. They would say—I guess when they say what they are saying now, that they want to prevent enforcement of the health care reform, what they are really saying is they want to repeal free mammograms and preventive care, repeal the law that lets kids stay on their parents' health care until they are 26.

Let's not fight the same fight over and over. It is time to stop fighting. It is time to work together.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Texas.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 2009

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate receives from the House H.R. 2009, the Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act, the Senate proceed to its consideration; that the bill be read a third time and passed, without intervening action or debate, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Republican leader.

DELAY THE INDIVIDUAL MANDATE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, let me address the first consent I offered, which was objected to. Last month the administration announced it would delay ObamaCare's employer mandate on business. It is not hard to see why they wanted to do that. We keep reading about why businesses large and small will have little option but to cut employee hours and paychecks as ObamaCare comes on line, about how restaurants such as White Castle, for example, are considering hiring only part-time workers moving forward, about how small businesses are citing ObamaCare as a top worry.

I think there are a lot of Members on this side who would question the legality of what the President did. But with midterm elections on the horizon, it is no mystery why the administration would want to delay the law for businesses, considering how many jobs it is likely to kill, how many paychecks it is likely to slash. Here is the thing, though: Don't families and individuals deserve the same kind of relief? I believe they do. I do not believe it is fair to give a break to business and leave Americans out in the cold.

Recently we learned that Ohioans buying health insurance next year can expect about a 40-percent premium increase. Next door, in Indiana, costs could rise by more than 70 percent. Some Georgians could face a nearly 200-percent premium spike. In my home State of Kentucky, actuaries are predicting cost increases that could exceed 30 percent. Remember, the President said costs would go down, that ObamaCare was the Affordable Care Act.

Millions face the prospect of losing the insurance they like and want to keep, which again is not what the President promised. That is why I have asked the Senate to pass H.R. 2668. This legislation passed the House on a strong bipartisan vote with nearly 2 dozen Democrats supporting it and it would delay some of ObamaCare's most burdensome mandates for everyone.

Shortly after its passage in the House my colleagues and I called on the majority leader to bring it to the floor for a vote. Those calls were unheeded. So I am disappointed to hear that some of our friends on the other side have objected to this vote as well. I do not understand, frankly, why they would want to leave Americans out in the cold. I note that Members on this side are united in our belief that at the very least Americans deserve the same relief as businesses do. So we will all be supporting this commonsense bipartisan bill if we have a chance to vote on it.

You would think this is a principle Members of the body would support unanimously. If it is OK for businesses, why not for individuals? Unfortunately, objection has been heard and we will not get an opportunity to have the same break for the average American citizen as the administration is giving through executive action to businesses. It is a shame, but that is where we are going into the August recess.

I yield the floor.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES PRIVATE FIRST CLASS DUSTIN P. NAPIER

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, it is with sorrow that I rise to pay tribute to a young man from Kentucky who gave his life in service to our country. PFC Dustin P. Napier of London, KY, died on January 8, 2012, in Zabul Province, Afghanistan while in support of Operation Enduring Freedom. The cause of death was injuries sustained from small-arms fire. PFC Napier was 20 years old.

For his service in uniform, PFC Napier received several awards, medals, and decorations, including the Bronze Star Medal, the Army Achievement Medal, the Army Good Conduct Medal, the National Defense Service Medal, the Afghanistan Campaign Medal with Bronze Service Star, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, the Army Service Ribbon, the Overseas Service Ribbon, the NATO Medal, the Combat Infantryman Badge, and the Overseas Service Bar.

Dustin's father Darrell Napier says of his son, ''He was born in an Army hospital, and I'm sure he ended up dying in an Army hospital. He was my hero. Please pray for us.''

Dustin was born in an Army hospital because he followed his father's example of military service. Darrell Napier served in the U.S. Army from 1989 to 1994, and was stationed in Germany and Fort Polk, LA. Dustin, the youngest of Darrell's three sons, knew from an early age he wanted a military career.

''He'd been wanting to do that since he was a little boy, about when he was six years old,'' Darrell recalls. ''I encouraged him to do so. And he was a leader. He'd take the initiative to get things done. I've always raised my boys to do the right thing, no matter if the cause was popular or unpopular.''

By the time he reached high school, Dustin was a top cadet in his Junior ROTC program. ''I remember him as a model student, very quiet and serious. You always knew where he stood,'' says Colonel Mark Jones of the Air Force Junior ROTC program at South Laurel High School, Dustin's alma mater.

Dustin rose to be his Junior ROTC unit's corps commander and the most decorated cadet.

News of PFC Napier's loss shook many who remembered him at South

Laurel High, where Dustin graduated in 2010 and had many friends. ''When I . . . heard he died, my legs almost collapsed. It was unbelievable. He was a good friend, a good mentor, and truly a good person,'' says Devan Burkhart, a South Laurel student.

''I learned from him. He was the one who would tell me, 'Stick with it,' when I got frustrated with the program, and I did stick with it.''

Steven Cheek, one of Dustin's best friends and a high-school classmate, recalls the fun he and Dustin had shooting rifles, going to ball games, watching movies, and listening to music. Dustin's favorite group was the Doors. Other friends remember Dustin loved to play the air guitar.

After graduating from South Laurel High in May 2010, Dustin joined the U.S. Army in July and completed basic training at Fort Benning, GA. In April 2011, he was deployed to Afghanistan with C Company, 1st Battalion, 24th Infantry Regiment, 25th Infantry Division, based out of Fort Wainwright, AK.

Darrell Napier recalls that Dustin would call home from Afghanistan every now and then. ''He did miss home a lot,'' Darrell says. ''He loved to hang out with his friends very much. He missed his friends at Save-A-Lot, where he worked for almost four years. And if there was one meal Dustin really loved from his mother, it was her chicken and dumplings.''

Dustin also found happiness thousands of feet in the air, while on R&R. It was in an airplane that he met Tabitha Sturgill Napier, who he married in October 2011.

Remembering her husband, Tabitha says, ''You are my very best friend and I love you very, very, very much. You are an amazing husband.''

A few days after his death, friends and classmates held a memorial service for Dustin at South Laurel High School. His friends from his old Junior ROTC unit thought it only fitting to hold the service where Dustin had served as such a fine example to past, present, and future cadets. Outside the school, the American flag stood at half-mast.

''Cadet Napier came here with a purpose from start to finish, from the first fall-in to the last fall-out,'' says CMSgt Randy Creech of Junior ROTC.

We are thinking of PFC Napier's loved ones today, including his wife, Tabitha Sturgill Napier; his parents, Darrell and Marianne Napier; his brother, Darrell Dean Napier; his stepbrother, Christopher Bittner; his stepson, Lane Robison; his grandmother, Monika Paul; his grandfather, James Napier; and many other beloved friends and family members.

I know that no words spoken in this chamber can take away the sadness and loss that Dustin's family must feel. But I do want them to know that this Nation, and this United States Senate, are deeply grateful for Private First Class Dustin P. Napier's service and sacrifice. And we are humbled to pay tribute to his life and legacy.

BURMA

Madam President, today I rise to discuss U.S. policy toward the Southeast Asian nation of Burma.

In a little over 2½ half years, the world has witnessed dramatic change in Burma; change that would have been thought unimaginable not long ago. Nobel Peace Prize Laureate Daw Aung San Suu Kyi has been released from house arrest and now sits in parliament. Hundreds of political prisoners have been released from prison. A largely free and fair by-election was held in April 2012. Ceasefires have been signed between the central government and several ethnic minority groups.

Yet, despite these welcome reforms, much work remains to be done. At the heart of Burma's existing problems is the need for constitutional reform. The current flawed constitution is not up to the task of supporting the country's democratic ambitions. Simply put, if Burma is to take the next big step toward economic and political reform and toward fully normalizing its relations with the United States, it needs to revise its constitution.

And there has been some encouraging news on that front. Just last week the Burmese parliament announced it would establish a committee to examine amending the constitution. This provides a great opportunity for the Burmese leadership to follow through on its commitment to full democratization.

As this parliamentary panel begins its efforts, I would highlight four areas of the constitution that are, in my view, in particular need of reform.

The first area of reform is the need to bring the Burmese military, called the Tatmadaw, under civilian control. Civilian control of the military is a fundamental condition of a stable, modern democratic country. Many of the stubborn problems Burma still needs to address stem from the continued outsized role of the military in Burmese political life. For example, Burma continues to maintain military ties with North Korea. Indications are that elements within the Burmese military want to continue enjoying the financial benefits of continued relations with North Korea.

The unfortunate result is that Burma's pro-reform president Thein Sein cannot formally rein in the Tatmadaw since, under the Constitution, the president is not head of the armed forces. A separate military Commander in Chief leads the armed forces and he is independent of the president.

Another example of the problems stemming from the lack of civilian control of the military is the tense state of relations between the armed forces and the Kachin ethnic group. The Kachin in northern Burma share a proud history with the United States stemming from our close cooperation during World War II. Ending the conflict in Kachin state—and all other ethnic conflicts for that matter—is essential to achieving lasting peace, reconciliation and security in Burma after 60 years of civil war.

In Europe recently, President Thein Sein predicted that a national ceasefire was right around the corner. And a peace process led by one of his close ministers has been ongoing. However, military clashes continue in northern Shan state as well as in Kachin state. The Tatmadaw has every right to protect itself, but, without transparency and civilian oversight, questions remain about the extent to which military operations have conformed with the President's guidance and intentions.

Without ending its relationship with Pyongyang and without building peace with the Kachin and other ethnic nationalities, U.S.-Burmese relations will not become fully normalized. Without the military accepting civilian oversight and demonstrating a commitment to peace, our military relationship will likewise be limited. Such a result would be to the detriment of both countries.

Having U.S. diplomats continue to urge Burma to amend its Constitution to bring the military under civilian control is important. But there are other policy tools that I believe can help reform the Tatmadaw. I believe that beginning a modest military-to-military relationship would serve this purpose. Just to be clear. I am not advocating rushing into lethal training of the Burmese military or arms sales. What I am talking about is the U.S. armed forces engaging with the Tatmadaw on compliance with the law of armed conflict, and other issues related to international standards of military professionalism.

What better way is there to show the virtues of civilian control of the military than to have the most highly regarded armed forces in the world—the U.S. military—engaged with the Tatmadaw about respect for human rights, accountability and rule of law? I believe that a modest, targeted military-to-military relationship would work hand in glove with diplomatic efforts to convince the Burmese military that placing themselves under civilian control is good for the nation.

Beginning a military-to-military relationship is common sense. Since before independence, the Burmese military has been a significant political institution in the country. And no lasting reform in Burma can take place without convincing the Tatmadaw that such a step is a positive development for the country.

A second area of needed constitutional reform involves amending the constitution to permit the Burmese people to choose freely whom they want to serve as their leader. This is a fundamental democratic principle. Current restrictions include a requirement that no one in the President's immediate family can be a citizen born to parents who were not born in Burma.

Just think about that. That's a remarkably narrow requirement. Why does the Burmese government have so little faith in the ability of its citizens to freely and responsibly choose their own leaders?

These provisions, if left unamended, would cast a pall over the upcoming 2015 elections. And, those elections are viewed by many observers as the next high-profile step in Burma's reform efforts. If the 2015 elections are viewed as illegitimate, it will lead many to conclude that reform efforts have stalled in Burma and the country's stated commitment to democracy is hollow.

I think having the 2015 elections turn out to be flawed would cloud the reformist legacy of the current national leadership.

A third area of needed reform in this regard is judicial independence. Currently, the Burmese judiciary is not independent of the executive. As we ourselves have learned from experience in America, having judges who are not under the thumb of the other branches is not only a vital check on the other organs of government, but also a bulwark against violations of individual rights.

Finally, there need to be constitutional assurances for ethnic minorities. Burma faces no greater challenge than peacefully integrating its various ethnic groups. These groups have long harbored misstrust of the central government and the Tatmadaw. Building protections for ethnic minorities into the Constitution would, I suspect, go a long way toward making the ethnic groups more receptive to the new government. Such provisions would also be underscored by an independent judiciary to help enforce these protections.

As we know as Americans, amending a Constitution is not easy, nor should it be. But over the years, we in this country have amended our Constitution to make it more democratic and to provide greater protection of individual liberties.

Reforming the Burmese Constitution in areas such as the four I just raised is a necessary next step in Burma's own journey toward democracy and peaceful, national reconciliation.

There is still time for Burma to act ahead of the 2015 election and correct these problems. I urge the country's leadership to seize the moment, to take this vital step and to cement its reformist legacy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

KEEP THE IRS OFF YOUR HEALTH CARE ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, turning to the matter upon which I asked unanimous consent and to which the majority leader objected, and that is to take up legislation that I have sponsored here in the Senate, which has been passed in the House, which is the Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act, with each passing day it seems as though more and more supporters of ObamaCare are having second thoughts. As I mentioned last week, three of America's most powerful labor leaders have declared the President's health care law is ''creating nightmare scenarios'' and threatening to ''hurt millions of Americans.'' Those are some pretty remarkable words from people who were some of the foremost advocates for the Affordable Care Act, otherwise known as ObamaCare.

Meanwhile, the union that represents IRS employees has announced it does not want its members to receive health insurance through ObamaCare exchanges. In fact, earlier today the IRS Commissioner himself said he wants to keep his current health care policy and does not want to sign up for ObamaCare, as millions of other Americans will be required to do.

Speaking of the Internal Revenue Service, the agency's political targeting scandal continues to grow. I listened in my office to Senator HATCH, the ranking Republican on the Senate Finance Committee, the one primarily responsible for Internal Revenue oversight in the Senate, and I hope the questions he posed will be answered by the bipartisan investigation we are conducting. We recently learned the Internal Revenue Service's Chief Counsel's Office, headed by an Obama administration appointee, was aware of the abuses. So much for a couple of rogue agents in Cincinnati, as was originally reported. We have also learned that IRS officials have been improperly targeted, not only conservative organizations but political candidates and donors as well.

To make things worse, the same person who ran the IRS division that targeted conservative groups is now running the agency's ObamaCare office. I can't make this stuff up. Truth is stranger than fiction. Americans might be asking: What does the IRS have to do with ObamaCare?

America's tax collection agency will be responsible for administering several of the law's most important provisions, including the individual and employer mandates, which we have heard so much about, and all of the subsidies. In other words, all of the tax dollars will go to fund the exchanges under ObamaCare. Those will be administered by the Internal Revenue Service under the current law.

It is remarkable that at a time when public trust and the Internal Revenue Service has plummeted and IRS officials are complaining their staffers are overworked and overburdened, the Obama administration wants to use this tax agency to administer a massive new entitlement program affecting one-sixth of our national economy. To me, that sounds like another recipe for disaster.

Back in May I sponsored legislation that would prevent the Internal Revenue Service from a role in implementing ObamaCare. Last week, I introduced it as an amendment to the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill that was pending before this Chamber.

Congressman TOM PRICE of Georgia has introduced a similar bill in the House of Representatives. Unfortunately—and this is pretty amazing—even before the House passed the House bill and before the Senate had a chance to take up the Senate bill, President Obama has already issued a veto threat were we to pass it. It sounds a little defensive to me. I understand ObamaCare is a deeply decisive issue in Washington, and I understand that while many have been compelled to defend the law previously, they are now feeling a little skittish about it 3 years later.

I ask my colleagues: Given all we have learned about corruption and institutional abuse at the Internal Revenue Service, does anyone truly believe we should dramatically expand the agency's power to implement ObamaCare? Does anyone truly believe IRS agents should have access to even more personal financial information—not to mention medical information—about American citizens? If IRS officials conducted a systematic campaign of political targeting against conservative organizations, why should we have any more confidence that the agency will fairly and objectively implement the President's health care law?

Remember, the IRS has already announced it will violate the text of the law and issue health care subsidies through Federal exchanges. Let's recall what happened. Many States said: We will pass on State-based insurance exchanges upon which ObamaCare depends to be implemented in the States. So what the IRS has said is: We are going to paper over the fact that Congress never explicitly authorized tax dollars to subsidize the Federal exchanges, even though the law clearly states that those subsidies can be issued only through State exchanges. That is another example of lawlessness when it comes to ObamaCare.

In other words, the agency has already shown utter contempt for the rule of law when it comes to implementing the President's most cherished legislative accomplishment. They have already shown that contempt, and they don't deserve, nor have they shown themselves worthy of, our confidence when it comes to implementing this health care law.

In my view, the IRS has absolutely no business playing such a huge role in the American health care system. For that matter, I ask my friends on the other side of the aisle one final question: Do you still believe ObamaCare will reduce health care costs? After all, it is estimated that the law will cause a dramatic spike in individual insurance premiums across the country—from Maryland to Florida, to Indiana and Ohio, to Kentucky and Missouri, to Idaho and California.

Earlier this week, for example, the Florida insurance commissioner predicted that because of ObamaCare, the

cost of health insurance in the individual market and Florida will increase by 30 to 40 percent. The reason for that is because the provisions in ObamaCare mandate the guaranteed issuance of health insurance even after a person is sick. Someone compared it to waiting until your house is on fire to buy insurance. It is not insurance anymore, and it drives up the cost, not to mention the fact that young people—such as those sitting in front of me—are going to have to pay the price of subsidizing health care for older Americans. The so-called age-banding requirements don't allow older citizens to pay any more than three times what young people pay for health insurance, even though the cost of their health care, given their age, will be higher.

So this is what distorts the insurance markets, which is causing health insurance premiums to skyrocket across the States because of ObamaCare.

Rather than make our individual health insurance markets even more distorted and more dysfunctional than they are today, we should dismantle ObamaCare and replace it with patient-centered reforms that create a genuine national marketplace for health insurance.

I was just reading a story about an Oklahoma surgical center which publishes the price of common procedures for the public to read and which now has created—what markets always do—greater consumer awareness of what exactly these procedures cost. As we have seen in Medicare Part D, the prescription drug plan Congress passed a few years ago, when a market is created and vendors compete for consumers' business, prices go down and the quality of service goes up. That is what markets do. Ultimately, it benefits the consumer, and it would benefit taxpayers and patients as well.

What do I mean by patient-centered reforms? I am talking about reforms that empower individual Americans by giving them more choices and flexibility in the health care markets—such as the example of the Oklahoma surgical care center—by giving people more transparent information about pricing and quality and by directly assisting people with preexisting conditions.

I heard the majority leader earlier when Senator MCCONNELL offered a unanimous consent to extend the moratorium on the individual mandate just as the President has unilaterally on the employer mandate. He said something to the effect of: Republicans want people to be subjected to preexisting condition exclusions that are not covered. That is simply false. We don't have to embrace 2,700 pages of ObamaCare just to take care of that problem or other problems we have agreement on. We should also work to protect the doctor-patient relationship.

The last thing we ought to do on my list of things to do to reform the health care system is to save Medicare from bankruptcy. It is on an unsustainable path. Yet any time we try to suggest reforms that will strengthen and stabilize Medicare and make sure it is there for future generations, they are met with a ''stiff-arm.''

If we want to reduce health care costs, if we want to expand quality insurance coverage and give Americans more choices and options, we should equalize the tax treatment for health insurance so it is treated the same whether it is provided by your employer or whether an individual buys it. We should let individuals and businesses form risk pools in the individual market, and we should let folks buy health insurance across State lines.

Why shouldn't I be able to buy health insurance in New Hampshire or Alabama or somewhere else if it fits my needs? Right now that is not possible. It would create a market which would create competition, bring down costs, and make it more affordable. We should expand tax-free health savings accounts so people can save their own money and spend it as they see fit on their health care. If they don't spend it there, it is available for their retirement, much like any other individual retirement account.

We should curb frivolous medical malpractice lawsuits. According to one study, the annual cost of defensive medicine is a staggering $210 billion. In my State, we have had a lot of success with medical malpractice reform. It stabilized the cost of medical malpractice insurance that physicians have to buy, and it created a huge surplus of physicians who want to move to Texas and practice their profession. They realize they will not lose everything they have in the litigation lottery. They can buy affordable coverage that will protect their family and their patients should they make mistakes.

We should give each State much more flexibility to design a Medicaid Program that works best for their neediest residents. Medicaid is a wonderful program, but it is broken. This is designed to protect the most vulnerable people in our society and provide for their health care needs. But because of the broken Medicaid Program, only one out of every three doctors in my State will actually see a new Medicaid patient. Medicaid reimburses at about half of what private insurance reimburses, and as a result many doctors can't afford to see a new Medicaid patient. What we have is the appearance of coverage, but there is no real access to the doctor of their choice. So we need to fix Medicaid.

Finally, we should establish greater provider competition in Medicare so the competition I mentioned a moment ago in the Medicare prescription drug program could also apply in other aspects of Medicare and help make it more affordable, shore it up, and guarantee its availability to generations yet to come.

There is no reason why Americans have to accept an unworkable health care law administered by an agency such as the Internal Revenue Service that has grossly abused its power and demonstrated that its current job is way beyond its capacity to perform.

I realize we will not be able to dismantle ObamaCare overnight—not with President Obama still in the White House and with a Democratic majority in the Senate. I realize many of these issues need to be debated further, but I hope we can all agree that the Internal Revenue Service, the IRS, should not be administering a law that affects one-sixth of our national economy and which so dramatically affects the quality of life for 320 million Americans.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SHELBY. Madam President, last week in Illinois President Obama attempted to blame opponents of the ObamaCare for the law's broken promises. He lashed out at what he called ''folks out there who are actively working to make this law fail.'' Those were his words. He further said: ''[A] politically motivated misinformation campaign'' is afoot. He strongly implied that fault rests not with those who conceived the law but those who have not, in his estimation, ''committed themselves to making [it] work.''

Think about it a minute. This flailing, of course, was nothing more than an effort by President Obama to dodge and deflect accountability for the law that bears his name. Let's be real. ObamaCare is not a failure because so many Americans reject it, rather so many Americans reject ObamaCare because it is a failure. I believe we should focus on what truly matters.

Americans are growing increasingly anxious about how the law will affect them and their families. They wonder what it will mean for health insurance and tax bills. They wonder whether they will be able to get the care they need when they need it. They wonder whether the quality of American health care will remain the best in the world and, yes, they wonder how a government reorganization of one-sixth of the economy will impact a weak jobs market. Unfortunately, neither the outset nor the outlook provides consolation.

President Obama has frequently sought to downplay the debacle surrounding the rollout of his health care law. He says ''that glitches and bumps'' are to be expected. But as the Wall Street Journal columnist Kimberly Strassel notes, the Democrats didn't ''count on the hiccups turning into cardiac arrest,'' and that is what happened.

Since the enactment of ObamaCare, a laundry list of unworkable provisions has been repealed or delayed. But recently the administration announced two particularly notable delays.

First, the administration will delay implementation of the law's employer mandate until 2015 because workable

reporting requirements are not yet in place. This provision requires all employers in this country with more than 50 employees to provide adequate health care coverage for full-time employees, defined as those employed at least 30 hours per week or pay a penalty. In anticipation of this mandate many employers are cutting back hours for current workers and holding off on hiring new ones.

I welcome any relief from ObamaCare for anyone in this country, but why should such relief not apply to individuals and families as well as businesses? If the administration hasn't gotten its act together by now, what leads us to believe it ever will? Instead of temporarily delaying part of ObamaCare for some, I believe the best course would be to permanently delay all of it for everyone.

The administration also recently announced postponement of a critical taxpayer protection under ObamaCare. Taxpayers were previously told the government would verify that applicants actually qualify for subsidies before receiving them. Now the administration says it is not ready to do that until 2015, although it will still go ahead with enrollment in the program in 2014. So for the coming year, the Obama administration will trust but not verify anything. The honor system, I believe, is no taxpayer protection.

These are not run-of-the-mill glitches and bumps, as the President would say. These provisions are central to the legislation and may foreshadow major problems to come, as we find out every day. These provisions are unworkable or problematic not because people don't like them but because they were poorly designed. This isn't about a lack of commitment on behalf of those forced to comply with these mandates. Rather, it is about a lack of confidence on behalf of those who conceived and crafted these provisions.

In light of the disastrous rollout of ObamaCare, Americans are also apprehensive about the cost—yes, the cost. How will all of this impact their health insurance premiums? What will be the tax burden? What will a new entitlement program do to our $17 trillion debt, which is growing?

With respect to premiums, President Obama told the American people his health care overhaul ''could save families $2,500 in the coming years.'' Those were his words. But despite this bold claim, health insurance premiums for the average American family have increased over $3,000 since 2008, and this is according to the Kaiser Family Foundation Employer Health Benefit Survey, which is very well respected.

Moreover, a recent Wall Street Journal analysis finds that premiums for healthy consumers could double or even triple under ObamaCare. Can we imagine that?

Although ObamaCare has not decreased premiums, it has certainly increased taxes. According to the Congressional Budget Office—CBO—and the Joint Committee on Taxation, ObamaCare imposes a $1 trillion tax hike on the American economy over just the first 10 years—a $1 trillion tax hike. Their analysis finds 21 tax hikes in ObamaCare due to the law's various mandates and restrictions. Among these, several affect individuals making less than $200,000 and married couples making less than $250,000—a clear violation of President Obama's often repeated campaign promise not to do so.

Despite this massive tax hike, ObamaCare will still add $6.2 trillion—yes, $6.2 trillion—to the debt in the years ahead. This is based on the Government Accountability Office projections. This clearly violates yet another promise by the President that he would ''not sign a plan that adds one dime to our deficit—either now or in the future.'' Goodness.

I believe ObamaCare will not only fail to control costs but will also destroy the best quality health care in the world—ours. Why do I say this? In 2009, Dr. Martin Feldstein, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under President Reagan and a Harvard professor, wrote an op-ed in the Wall Street Journal entitled ''ObamaCare Is All About Rationing.'' He backed up his statement by citing a report issued by President Obama's own Council of Economic Advisers which explained how the President would propose to reduce health spending by eliminating certain treatments—by rationing.

Dr. Feldstein went on to compare the Obama strategy to that of the British national health service. He concluded the existence of such a program in the United States would not only deny lifesaving care but would also cast a pall over medical researchers who would fear that government experts might project their discoveries as ''too expensive.''

Think of the implications of rationing health care. What does it mean for a patient sitting in the doctor's office when they get a life-changing diagnosis? I know that feeling. I have been there. It reassured me to know we have the best health care in the world and that everything possible would be done to save my life. I want others who encounter that situation to have the same reassurance. But will they?

Despite what President Obama may say, it is not just Republicans who have deep concerns about health care. This week, on the same Wall Street Journal opinion pages, Howard Dean, a former Democratic National Committee chairman and Governor, as well as a physician, concurred with Dr. Feldstein. Mr. Dean wrote that ObamaCare's independent payment advisory board—IPAB—''is essentially a health care rationing body.'' By setting doctor reimbursement rates for Medicare and determining which procedures and drugs will be covered and at what price, the IPAB will be able to stop certain treatments its members do not favor by simply setting rates to levels where no doctor or hospital will perform them. That was the plan.

Mr. Dean went on to say, ''These kinds of schemes do not control costs. The medical system simply becomes more bureaucratic.''

We all know now ObamaCare is a bureaucratic nightmare. With more than 20,000 pages of new rules and regulations, the law expands government to an unprecedented level, creating 159 new boards, commissions, and government offices. Think of it.

Adding to these concerns, Deloitte's 2013 Survey of U.S. Physicians finds that due to recent developments in health care, ''the future of the medical profession as we know it may be in jeopardy as it loses clinical autonomy and compensation.'' The survey by Deloitte also found that ''6 in 10 physicians''—6 in 10—''say it is likely that many physicians will retire earlier than planned in the next 1 to 3 years.''

Again, sitting in that doctor's office, I remember breathing a little easier to know we have not only the most advanced treatments but also the most skilled and experienced physicians in the world. We don't want to jeopardize that, do we?

In addition to concerns about the quality of care, the Obama administration has backtracked on still another of the President's promises. In 2009, he stated unambiguously: ''If you like your doctor, you will be able to keep your doctor. Period.'' The President's words.

Despite this pledge, the Department of Health and Human Services, under the Obama administration, recently posted the following on healthcare.gov: ''Depending on the plan you choose in the marketplace, you may be able to keep your current doctor.'' It says ''may'' be able to keep your doctor. That is not what the President told the American people.

A University of Chicago study underscores this finding that more than half of current individual insurance plans do not meet ObamaCare's standard to be sold on the exchanges. So much for that ironclad promise.

But there is another area: ObamaCare is a job killer. How will ObamaCare affect jobs? In President Obama's recent Illinois speech I mentioned earlier, he made the following curious statement about Republicans and job creation: ''They'll bring up ObamaCare despite the fact that our businesses have created nearly twice as many jobs in this recovery as they had at the same point in the last recovery when there was no ObamaCare.''

This is a non sequitur. At a minimum, President Obama implied that ObamaCare has not hurt job creation. At worst, he implied it has helped.

In stark contrast, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce's second quarter 2013 Small Business Survey in America finds that ''71 percent of small businesses—and that is the job creation machine in this country—say the health care law makes it harder to

hire.'' The same survey finds that ''one-half of small businesses say that they will either cut hours to reduce full-time employees or replace full-time employees with part-time workers to avoid the mandate.''

In addition, Gallup finds that ''41 percent of small business owners say they have held off on hiring new employees'' in response to ObamaCare.

The 1-year delay on ObamaCare's employer mandate provides momentary relief. But in light of sustained high unemployment in this country, I find it deeply troubling that perhaps the best thing President Obama has done for American business during his time in office is to provide only a brief reprieve from his own signature achievement.

Notably, labor unions agree with businesses now, that ObamaCare will hurt the economy. Recently, in a scathing letter to Democratic leaders in Congress, the president of the Teamsters Union, the UFCW, and UNITE-HERE, wrote that ''ObamaCare will shatter not only our hard-earned health benefits, but destroy the foundation of the 40-hour workweek that is the backbone of the American middle class.''

This brings me full circle to where I began my remarks. President Obama conveniently blames Republican opposition for the stumbles and failures of ObamaCare, despite the fact that Americans across the political spectrum have spoken up about its many flaws.

President Obama rammed his health care legislation through Congress without a single Republican vote. Why? Because he knew he did not need our votes to put the entire Nation under his health care plan. Yet now he claims that ObamaCare works for those who are ''committed to it.'' Committed to it?

Republicans are committed to finding solutions that actually lower health costs, that do not tax and spend us into oblivion, that preserve the world's highest quality health care, and that foster economic growth. We have said all along that ObamaCare would fail on each of these counts.

I believe opposition to ObamaCare is not responsible for its failures, and commitment to it will not negate its deep flaws. The only way to achieve the goals we all share is to begin by repealing this failed law so we can replace it with a plan that works. I hope we can.

I yield the floor.

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. SESSIONS. 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 ECONOMY AND IMMIGRATION

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I would like to share some remarks about the economic condition of American workers, the immigration bill that passed here recently, and in general about where we are as a Nation and the difficulties we are facing.

I think there is a growing acceptance by most experts that we have, indeed, seen a decline in the wages of the middle-class and working Americans relative to inflation since maybe as long ago as 1999—a steady erosion of their income relative to the price of products they buy. That is not a healthy trend.

President Obama talked about it, our Democratic colleagues talked about it a lot when President Bush was President. But it has continued. I thought maybe it was an aberration, but I do not think so anymore. I think a lot of things are happening with robotics, ObamaCare, other things that are happening, that are making it more difficult for workers to find jobs—unemployment remains exceedingly high—and to have wage increases.

One of the things I noticed this week from the Republican side of the aisle is that Congress received two letters—one from Republican donors, according to some, and another from CEOs—urging that Congress act on immigration. This is primarily to the House Members.

Nearly 100 top Republican donors, they called themselves, and Bush administration officials sent a letter to the House Republicans on Tuesday urging lawmakers to pass a bill that legalizes illegal immigrants. The donor letter came the same day the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and 400 other businesses and umbrella groups fired off another letter to the House leaders of both parties urging them to pass something.

One word was not mentioned in either one of those letters: Wages. Nor was any discussion of jobs and unemployment raised in those letters.

Mr. Karl Rove—a man I know and like and a long-time friend—and these groups would have us believe this legislation is about the providing of amnesty to people who have been here a long time. That certainly is a large part of it. Businesses know that legalizing illegal workers will, indeed, expand the available labor pool for industries with the effect, I suggest, of bringing down wages, particularly in the areas where illegal workers might have previously not had access. So of the 11 million people, perhaps half, we understand, do not have fake documents, are not able to work in the labor force, effectively, and they take marginal jobs. If this bill were to pass, all would immediately be given Social Security Numbers, and they could apply to any job in America.

That is both a good thing and a difficult thing. It is good that they would be able to work. It is not so good if you wanted one of the jobs that would be taken.

But there is a phrase in the letter which has gotten too little attention and which explains what this is all about. Mr. Rove and the donors say, the legislation must ''provide a legal way for U.S.-based companies to hire the workers they need.''

So we are supposed to pass a law that guarantees American companies the right to hire whoever they need, whoever they say they need, whoever they believe is best for them. That means the best worker at the lowest price. That is what free markets are all about. That is what the law of supply and demand is all about. It has not been repealed, by the way, the law of supply and demand.

First and foremost, that cannot be the goal of an immigration policy of the United States of America. It cannot be the overriding policy of our system to provide and to make sure that whatever workers our companies want at whatever price, apparently, they are willing to pay or want to pay—that we allow workers to come in from abroad and take those jobs, regardless of the unemployment rate in America, regardless of the number of people who are on welfare, on unemployment compensation, who have not had a good paycheck in a number of years, perhaps.

Our responsibility and our goal is to serve the people of this country and to try to create a climate, an economic agenda that allows them to prosper and to actually find jobs and actually get pay raises, not pay reductions.

Of course, there is already a legal way for U.S.-based companies to hire workers they need. They can hire the people living here today who are unemployed. Or they can hire some of the million-plus immigrants whom we lawfully admit each year. We have a very generous immigration policy. No one is talking about ending that and not allowing immigration to continue. We allow about 1.1 million immigrants a year come to America lawfully, plus guest workers who come specifically to work. That is very generous. But this bill would double the number of guest workers and increase substantially the number of people who come through immigration to become permanent residents in our country, at a time of high unemployment—much higher unemployment than we had in 2007. That bill would have allowed much fewer people to come into the country, and it was rejected by the American people.

No one is saying these programs cannot and should not exist, and that they should not be improved. But I am afraid the businesses want the choicest pick of labor at the lowest cost they can get it. That is what businesses do. That is what businesses want every day. When they go out and interview people, they want the best person they can get at the least cost. That is what their stockholders demand. So they believe the immigration policy for the entire Nation should exist to create an abundance of low-cost labor. I do not agree with that.

They, in their bubble they live in, think lower wages are good. You hear

about it: There are concerns over rising wages. It might drive up prices, you hear the Wall Street Journal say.

Well, maybe some politicians think that way too. They are not concerned with how the plan impacts workers, the immigrants themselves, public resources, the education system, or taxpayer dollars. They are not focused on the broader economic and social concerns that happen when someone is not able to get a job for years at a decent wage. The focus tends to be on the reduction of the cost of labor.

But America has a larger concern. That concern is unemployment. It is workplace participation. It is wages. And it is the cost of social services to those in need. We all agree we must make America more competitive globally. Workers must be productive and competitive. But how do we close the income gap? How do we deal with that?

The best way to do that is not to reduce our wages and workers' quality of life. The way to do that is with a less burdensome Tax Code, a less intrusive regulatory system, and a tougher, smarter, fair trade policy. These policies would make us more competitive and help wages and working conditions improve.

So when these business voices and establishment figures say the GOP needs to support a comprehensive immigration bill, what they are really saying is the GOP and the Congress of both parties—which in the Senate, of course, a minority of Republicans voted for the bill, and every single Democrat voted for the bill. They would have done the things I am concerned about.

Now they are worried about the Republican House and they are trying to put the pressure on them. What they are saying is, we need to increase low-skill immigration, when we do not have enough jobs now. The Senate bill, based on CBO analysis, would provide legal status to 46 million people—mostly lower skilled immigrants—by 2033—46 million. Here is what the National Review editorialized on the subject:

> By more than doubling the number of so-called guest workers admitted each year, the bill would help create a permanent underclass of foreign workers. The 2007 Bush-Kennedy proposal was rejected in part because it would have added 125,000 new guest workers. The Gang of Eight bill—The one we just passed in the Senate—would add 1.6 million in the first year, and about 600,000 a year after that and that is on top of a 50 percent or more increase in the total level of legal immigration. The creation of a large population of second-class workers is undesirable from the point of view of the American national interest, which should be our guiding force in this matter. The United States is a nation with an economy, not an economy with a nation.

This Nation owes certain things to its citizens, the people who are here now. We have a lot—300 million—and many of them are hurting. We owe them the best opportunity—owe them the best opportunity—to be successful and have a decent job with increasing wages, not declining.

Here is what conservative writer Yuval Levin wrote in a recent op-ed. I am saying this because these are conservative writers.

> The Left's economic policies (and the legacy of decades of right-wing confusion about the difference between being pro-market and being pro-business too) are making the American economy less and less like the vision of capitalism that conservatives should want to defend. They should consider what now would be best for the cause of growth and prosperity—the cause of free markets and free people.
>
> Capitalism is fundamentally democratic, after all—we today might say fundamentally populist and recovering this understanding of conservative economics would help today's Republicans see an enormous public need, and an enormous political opportunity, they tend to miss, and to which conservatism could be very usefully applied. It would point to a conservative agenda to help working families better afford life in the middle class, and to give more Americans a chance to rise.

So this is, I guess, directed—too late now to deal with the Senate. It passed the Senate, but not too late to deal with in the House, which does have a Republican majority. If Members of Congress want to broaden their appeal, the answer lies in speaking to the real and legitimate concerns of millions of hurting Americans whose wages have declined and whose job prospects have diminished.

The New York Times talked about this in 2000. They forgot about all of this now. But in 2000, they editorialized against an amnesty bill, what they called a ''hasty call for amnesty'' and warned that ''between about 1980 and 1995 the gap between wages of high school dropouts and all other workers widened substantially.'' That is what the New York Times said then. It remains true.

Professor George Borjas, himself an immigrant to America as a young man from Cuba, now at Harvard, perhaps the most effective and knowledgeable and respected scholar of wages and immigration in the world, certainly in the United States, estimates—get this—that 40 percent, almost half, of the trend downward in wages today can be traced to immigration from unskilled workers. Businesses do not have to bid up salaries to get good workers if you constantly have a flow of people come in.

That data he reported has been updated. High levels of low-skilled immigration between 1980 and 2000—and those levels would be greatly increased if this bill that passed the Senate were to become law—have already reduced wages of native workers without a high school diploma by 8 percent, according to Professor Borjas. He has analyzed Labor Department statistics, census data, and all kinds of data, according to the highest academic standards.

Professor Borjas said their wages have fallen from 1980 to 2000 by 8 percent in real dollars as a result of the current flow of immigration. So that is about $250 a month. You think that does not make a difference to working Americans and their families, to lose $250 a month?

Oh, we do not want to talk about that. That is not a problem. The immigration bill will increase wages, we are told. Professor Borjas said it has already reduced wages enough to be very painful to people who are trying to take care of their families today. Wages continue to fall.

This is not only an economic problem, but it is a social problem. The idea that dramatically increasing the number of foreign workers to take a limited number of American jobs will reduce unemployment and raise wages is so ridiculous it is hard to think it worth discussing. The very idea of this is beyond my comprehension. Yet we have the President out there today sending out documents claiming just the opposite—the President of the United States. The law of supply and demand has not been eliminated. Wages today are lower than in 1999. Median household income has declined 8 percent in that time. Some 47 million of our residents are on food stamps today, including 1 in 3 households in Detroit. According to the Associated Press, four out of five U.S. adults struggle with joblessness, near poverty, or reliance on welfare.

There is no shortage of labor in the United States. There is a shortage of jobs in the United States. Our goal must be to help our struggling Americans move from dependency to being independent, to help them find steady jobs and rising pay, not declining pay. Our policy cannot be to simply relegate more and more of our citizens to dependence on the government while importing a steady stream of foreign workers to take the available jobs. That is not in the interest of our country or the people of this country.

Some contend our unemployed do not have the needed skills. Well, let's train them. We now spend over $750 billion a year on means-tested welfare-assistance type programs. That is the largest item in the budget, bigger than Social Security, bigger than defense, bigger than Medicare. Of that amount, for every $100 we spend on those programs, we only spend $1 on job training. So we need to wake up here. We need to quit paying people not to work, quit delivering money that creates dependence, and shift our policies in a way that puts people to work and gets them trained to take the jobs that are here today.

As we leave for recess, my message to my colleagues in the House is this: Do the right thing. Make your priority restoring the rule of law, defending working Americans, and helping those struggling, immigrant and native born.

People who immigrate here lawfully want to go to work here and see their wages rise too. Their wages are being pulled down if the flow of immigration is too large. It is amazing to me how the coalition has been put together. Some of the comments about it kind of take my breath away.

Here is what the President said today in his paper, claiming that everything

is going to be great with this huge increase of immigration that was in the bill he wants to see passed in the House. This is their report. The broader leisure and hospitality industry, one of the fastest growing sectors in the U.S. economy, also stands to benefit significantly from commonsense immigration reform.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the leisure and hospitality industry has consistently added jobs over the last 3 years. These sectors remain a source of robust economic activity and continue to exceed expectations. Leaders of these industries have been long-time proponents of legislation that would legalize workers in the United States and facilitate the lawful employment of future foreign-born workers.

The head of the American Hotel and Lodging Association this year applauded the Senate—I bet he did—on behalf of the lodging industry for its bipartisan commitment to immigration reform that ''creates jobs, boosts travel and tourism, preserves hoteliers' access to a strong seasonal workforce, and stimulates economic growth.''

Well, sure. He would rather be able to have a large flow of workers from abroad take the jobs. What happens to the Americans who are not getting jobs? Are they on the food stamp rolls, the assistance rolls? Are they on unemployment compensation? Are they otherwise struggling to get by with government assistance? Would it not be better for our Americans to have those jobs?

I mean, think about it, the President of the United States out here celebrating special interests, hotel magnates, casino magnates who want cheap foreign labor so they do not have to hire American workers who are unemployed. That is what we are talking about. I think it is time for the Republicans to stand up to the Republican 100 donors writing that letter. Give me a break. We need to reject their advice and the premise of their letter that the public policy of the United States should be based on giving U.S. companies a legal basis for hiring all the low-cost foreign workers they say they need.

They are not entitled to demand that. We are supposed to set national policy here. We are supposed to set policy that serves the national interest. We do not work for those donors and special interests. So the national interest is to reduce unemployment, certainly, and to create rising wages. That is our responsibility in this body. Let's get on with it.

I want to say how great it is to see my friend Senator ENZI. I am taking up his time. I hope I have not kept him too late. He works late anyway. But he has been a great principled supporter of immigration reform and is opposed to the bill that came before us. I thank the Senator for his work on so many of these issues but immigration reform is on my mind today. It is great to see the Senator.

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. ENZI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

HEALTH CARE REFORM

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, a lot of Americans are worried right now about their health insurance. They know what is coming. Seniors have been turned down by their doctors for Medicare treatment because the doctors are not adequately compensated. If they have not been turned down, they know someone who has been turned down.

Medicaid is uncertain and a stigma. On the one hand, advances in medical technology and the capabilities and knowledge of our health care providers mean we are living longer and have more tools at hand than ever before to address diseases and illnesses.

However, on the other hand, this increasing life expectancy, coupled with the aging of our population and the steady increases in health care costs, means our health care system is on the verge of becoming completely unsustainable financially.

All across the country health insurance rates are skyrocketing. Families are struggling to cope with the higher costs and less choice. Employees are losing coverage and they are losing working hours. Businesses are not hiring. At the center of this uncertainty is the President's health care law. A number of provisions have already gone into effect, but we will not experience the full force of the law until 2014; that is, January.

The Democrats' ''go it alone'' health care reform plan in 2009 was the first major piece of legislation to pass Congress without a bipartisan vote. Let me repeat that again. The Democratic ''go it alone'' health care reform plan in 2009 was the first major piece of legislation to pass Congress without a bipartisan vote. When you have a partisan bill you get partisan results.

After 20,000 pages of regulations and still a lot more to come, they are a little behind on those, and after over 150 new bureaucratic boards, agencies, and programs, the Federal Government still cannot figure out how to make the law work and has had to delay it, in part.

What I have seen to date is enough to convince me that we need a different path. I opposed the health care law initially and I support full repeal of the law. Fixing our health care system does not have to be divisive or partisan. There are clear differences in the approach to fixing health care from all across the political ideological spectrum. However, the least we have to do is to dismantle the worst parts of the law and replace them with reforms that actually work, reforms that lower cost and expand choice, reforms that do not bankrupt the country and every taxpayer.

The Federal Government needs to support viable solutions when needed and refrain from handcuffing innovative private designs with the excessive regulations for narrowed political interests. We need more competition, not less.

Unless we take concrete steps now, we will soon be unable to switch off the track toward government-run health care. When I first got here, I was warned that there were people who did not care who ran the train of health as long as it wrecked. Then we could have universal single-pay, government-run health care. I am not sure that is not still the goal.

One clear example of how convoluted this law is comes from the definition of who an employee is. I used to work in the shoe business, so I understand the difference between full-time work, which was 40 hours a week, and part-time work, which was under 40 hours a week.

However, under the health care law, there are now full-time employees and full-time equivalents. What this means is the law requires employers, and particularly small businesses, to determine how many of their part-time employees it takes to equal a full-time employee. They don't come under the full force of the law until they hit 50 employees. There are businesses that understand that, and they are trying to avoid getting to the 50th employee. But there are some catches in this law.

First of all, the health care law sets full time at 30 hours, not 40 hours per week but 30 hours. It was news to me. It always was 40 hours.

Second, the law requires these employers to take everyone working 29 hours a week or less, combine all of their time for a week, and then divide by the number 30 to establish how many full-time equivalents these part-time workers represent. I don't think a lot of people planned on that.

If you are still following along at this point, congratulations. You can see how costly the taxes imposed by this law will be.

What if the rule forces you to add all of your employees' hours and divide by 30 hours to determine your full-time employees? What if you have 10 employees who are working 40 hours? That would be 400 hours. If you divided that by 30 and find out that you are paying 10 people, but you actually have 13⅓ employees at the full-time requirement, that could put you over the 50 and put you into a whole different category of costs and penalties.

If you have 10 employees and you watched it so that there are only 29 hours, that comes to 290 hours. If you divided that by 30, you would find out that even though none of these people are full-time employees, you have 9⅔ full-time employees. You can see how they could do a little miscalculation, suddenly be at the 50, and be into a whole new series of penalties.

The Obama administration also had to admit recently that the employer mandate, one of the key pieces of the law, isn't ready.

One of the most economically crushing and burdensome regulations will not be implemented until past 2014, past the 2014 election in 2015. I don't think that was a mistake on their part. I think it was intentional—to come after the election.

There is another little complication that gets thrown in here though. If those employers are not providing the health insurance and not being fined for not providing the health insurance, then the people who work for them have to go on the exchange to get their health insurance. If they go on the exchange to get their health insurance, they can't be subsidized by the businesses they worked for. That is going to be a surprise to a lot of employees too.

The delay will force more people to enroll in health care exchanges or face the tax penalty if they don't. A lot of people don't realize if they do go on the exchange, there is also a surcharge on the cost of their health insurance. They are going to be paying a 3.5 percent tax for buying the insurance. Of course, if they don't buy the insurance, then they get a penalty.

The delay was also made for the businesses without congressional approval, done administratively. The Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation informed Senator HATCH this week that this delay will increase the cost of the new insurance program established by law by $12 billion. It is not as if we had an extra $12 billion laying around here.

In particular, the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation estimated that the Federal Government will be required to pay an additional $3 billion in subsidies for people on the exchanges. A lot of extra costs were just kicked in there. This delay not only increases the costs on hard-working Americans, but it fails the original intent of health care reform, and that is to provide Americans with high quality, affordable health care.

In addition, the law requires the administration to set up health insurance exchanges in a number of States, including Wyoming. We are sparsely populated, low numbers. The numbers wouldn't work out to do our own exchange.

One problem is the administration has yet to tell anyone exactly how they are going to do those exchanges or what even a basic plan is. If you are going to have a range of plans that insurance companies can bid on, that you can look up on the computer, doesn't it seem, before you can even start, that you would have to know what the basic plan is?

How the President can argue that everyone will love the health care law once it goes into effect is beyond me. This administration can't even tell anyone where they can buy their insurance, what plan options will be available, and, most importantly, what the costs will be.

Remember what NANCY PELOSI said before they passed the law? They will have to pass the bill before we get to know what is in it. The administration is shopping its own version of that statement.

As the Senate Finance Committee chairman put it recently: this law is a train wreck waiting to happen. That is the Democratic Senate Finance Committee chairman.

Of course, on top of all of this, the law relies in part on new taxes and tax subsidies to support the coverage expansion.

This means the IRS will be involved in implementation. I have significant concerns with the ability of the IRS, particularly in the wake of the current scandal. The fact that this organization, the IRS—tainted by such political behavior—is involved in implementing the new health care law has increased my belief that the health care law is not something the country wants or needs. Of course, the IRS employees don't want to come under this law either. I don't know of anybody who really wants to come under it.

I will take a close look at proposals to remove the IRS from any implementation activities, but I do think they should be subject to the law too. At the same time, I will continue to work to provide folks with relief from the health care law as a whole.

One of the things they have said if you are going on the exchange is, if you are in certain income categories, then you get a subsidy from the government to help you purchase your insurance. We are told now that will be self-reporting and will not be subject to audit. Doesn't that sound like something that could be fraught with a lot of fraud, where you say you just make enough to get into the biggest subsidies? Everybody wouldn't do that, of course, but I think there are some who would.

How is the government doing on some of the things that they already put into effect? I saw a little article on high-risk pools. When the bill went in, a lot of the States already had high-risk pools, and we worked with States to make those viable, but the Federal Government said we could do it for less. They put in a high-risk pool.

To keep people from jumping from the State ones, which, yes, are more expensive, over into the Federal one, which is less expensive, they said you couldn't make the jump unless you were without insurance for 6 months. People who are in the high-risk pool can't afford to be without insurance for 6 months.

There wasn't a big jump to the high-risk pool. But in spite of the fact that there wasn't a jump to the high-risk pool, the Federal high-risk pool went broke. It ran out of money.

Here is the disturbing part of that article. They said, well, they would just shift that cost over to the States. The States are already doing it, and they are doing the right thing. Now they are going to be asked to pick up the additional costs. How many parts of ObamaCare are going to get shifted over to the States? The States have had a lot of promises. Can any of those promises be met? Will they be met? A lot of decisions are being based on what the Federal Government promised.

Of course, in truth, we are out of money. The new law also tried to address the problem of rising health care costs. I believe the Federal fiscal situation is untenable, and we need to implement significant and far-reaching spending cuts to get our fiscal house in order. We cannot continue on our current path.

The President and his administration will argue that the new law will expand access and lower costs. While the law certainly increases access to insurance, it also moved billions of dollars from the Medicare Program to pay for this new insurance program. That is not exactly saving the government money.

The projections for lower costs also don't add up for the average American either. Insurance premiums and rates are increasing. Small businesses are unable to continue to provide health insurance for their workers.

Businesses in general have delayed hiring or are only hiring people part time—although I hope they listen to the part that I gave about the little part-time catch that is built into the law.

All of these decisions are directly driven by the economic impact of the health care law. My Senate Republican colleagues and I are focused on developing proposals that address the worst aspects of the health care law. The law increases premiums and health care costs, forces employers to stop offering insurance to their employees, and slashes benefits for millions of Medicare beneficiaries.

I support repealing both the cap on health savings accounts, flexible spending accounts, and the prohibition on over-the-counter purchases included in the health care law.

Flexible spending accounts help make consumers more aware and engage in their health care spending.

Health savings accounts are something that young, healthy staffers of the Senate like to do. They can do the math real easy. They can look at the regular program and see how much that would cost or they could take a look at health savings accounts. The difference in the price, in only 3 years they could cover the whole deductible part as long as they were healthy for 3 years. They would be covered for that part until something major happened—and they were covered for catastrophic—so they found that to be a real bargain. But not anymore.

Additionally, a number of other Senators and I have put forward bills to repeal the taxes imposed by the President's health care law. That would be

relief from new taxes on prescription drugs, relief from new taxes on medical devices, and relief from new taxes on health insurance plans. I wish to provide relief to employers from new regulations imposed on them by the law.

These ideas preserve competition in a private market for health care coverage and lower the cost of care for the consumer. All of these steps are commonsense reforms to the health care law that take us off the path toward a national, Federal health care system.

One of the most effective ways Congress can address the rising costs of health care is to focus on the way it is delivered as part of the Nation's current cost-driven and ineffective patient care system. America's broken fee-for-service structure is driving our Nation's health care system further downward.

Today's method of payment encourages providers to see as many patients and prescribe as many treatments as possible, but it does nothing to reward providers who keep patients healthy. Maligned incentives created by the fee-for-service system drive up costs and hurt patient care.

Tackling this issue is a good start to reining in rising health care costs. The health care law championed by President Obama and the majority party in the Senate did little to address these problems because the vast majority of the legislation involved a massive expansion of the government price controls found in the fee-for-service Medicare and Medicaid Programs.

If we wish to address the threat posed by out-of-control entitlement spending, we need to restructure Medicare to better align incentives for providers and beneficiaries. This will not only lower health care costs, it will also improve the quality of care for millions of Americans. It is very important that we protect access to rural health care services too.

There is more that can be done to better align Federal programs to meet the needs of rural and frontier States. The criteria that determine eligibility for Federal funds to support rural health care programs are based on factors that make it difficult to prove the needs of the underserved, rural, and frontier areas.

For example, one provider for 3,500 people in New York City is entirely different than the 3,500 people living in Fremont, Campbell County or, perhaps more so, Niobrara County. I use Niobrara County quite a bit, for example, because Niobrara County is the size of Delaware and has 2,500 people living in it. It is 90 miles tall, 75 miles wide, and near the bottom of the center is a town called Lusk. This is where almost all of the people live. They do have a hospital there.

When they have a doctor or a physician's assistant, the hospital is open. When they do not, they are 104 miles from a trauma center.

You can't apply the same rules to that hospital that you apply to New York City hospitals. In addition, we need to think more creatively about how to use technology services, to improve telemedicine capabilities, particularly for the rural areas so that where a person lives has less impact on the level of care they are able to receive.

The advancement of more powerful, wireless technologies has substantial potential to remotely link individuals across the country to deliver health care in more accessible settings. Our Nation has made great strides in improving the quality of life for all Americans. We need to remember that every major legislative initiative that has helped transform our country has been forged in the spirit of cooperation. These qualities are essential to the success and longevity of crucial programs such as Medicare and Medicaid.

When it comes to health care decisions being made in Washington lately, the only thing the government is doing well is increasing partisanship and legislative gridlock. The President and Democrats need to listen. It is time to admit that this partisan experiment in government-run health care is failing. In order for this to get better, they must acknowledge the problem. Some of the law's authors and biggest supporters admit this law is a mess, and it will only get worse.

However, those in the Democratic leadership continue to support flawed health care laws out of pride, politics, or a belief that the government knows best. It makes no sense to stubbornly cling to a law that is so massive, burdensome, bureaucratic, and confusing that it is collapsing under its own weight.

By focusing on positive changes, Congress can give the failed law's proponents a way out. The key is finding common ground. More often than not, the country hears about what divides Congress instead of what unifies us. We could come together and focus on commonsense solutions with the kinds of step-by-step reforms that would protect Americans. I believe Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle can agree on 80 percent of an issue 100 percent of the time.

I want to be clear that this isn't compromise. When you compromise, each side gives up something they believe in, and in the end they get something no one believes in. I am about agreeing on common ground without compromise, without sacrificing each party's principles, by leaving out parts of the issue to look for a solution later.

Congress also needs to stop dealmaking and start legislating. We need to stop developing comprehensive bills and then marketing them as the only option. To me, comprehensive means incomprehensible. The larger a bill is, the harder it is to agree. And, of course, you can tuck some things in there that people never see. This is especially true when we pass a bill that no one has fully read and then afterwards we find out what is in it.

No party has all the good ideas. By working together, the end result should be something that not only works but moves the country forward in a responsible way.

We still need health care reform, but it has to be the right way, with strong bipartisan support on individual health care issues. What happened to individual choice on a policy? What happened to liability reform? What about the sale of insurance across State lines or pooling through an association so they have leverage against the insurance companies? What happened to adequate compensation for providers? All of these have been left out. Providing Americans with access to affordable health care at a high quality is something Republicans and Democrats should be able to agree upon.

The challenges of the American health care system are not going away. If we improve health care in a practical instead of a political way, we can make its better. Good policy is good politics. Why do I have some hope this is going to happen? Congress is more interested now than they have ever been, and the reason is there was a Republican—yes, there was one Republican provision in the bill that forced Congress to go into the exchanges too. We and our staffs have to live under the law we passed. That is how it should be. But the result is hitting everyone in their offices right now. Every Senator and every Representative is looking at what may happen to their staff on January 1, and their staffs are concerned. It has changed the tenor of some of the hearings we are having. It is pretty hard-hitting on both sides. So with that, I do have hope.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

POSTAL SERVICE REFORM

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, most of our colleagues have finished, a lot of them packed up and are heading back to their home States to begin the August recess. I wish them all well, especially the one who just preceded me on the floor tonight.

I stand between the staff here and the pages who are wrapping up their summer with us—at least a month with us. They will be heading back to their home States across America. We had one of our pages—a page, actually, in the last group, at the beginning of the summer—from Delaware, and we are very proud of her and all the ones who have been here. I have told them they are among the best group we have ever had—even that guy from Arkansas, whose mom used to sit right down here in the row next to MARK PRYOR and me.

I thank the staff for their hard work throughout the course of this year. I think we are in a good place, and the Senate is starting to act more like the Senate of old. We are beginning to govern a little more from the center, and Democrats and Republicans are looking to find new ways to work together on a wide range of issues.

I am especially pleased with the progress we made on the Federal student loan program, again trying to make sure the program is available and at a reasonable interest rate cost to help make sure a lot of students, young and old, if they need help, can sign up for student loans late this summer and fall and then go back to school and complete their education.

Senator ENZI used the numbers 80–20. In the time I have known him, he has talked about the 80–20 rule, of which he may be the architect. The 80–20 rule is something like this: Around here, we agree on about 80 percent of the stuff and may disagree on about 20 percent of the stuff. But in the end, why don't we just focus on the 80 percent we agree on and set aside the 20 percent we don't agree on and then take that up another day?

That is the spirit Senator TOM COBURN, who is the ranking Republican on the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, and I have taken to an issue that needs to be addressed, and that is a path forward in making sure we have a strong postal system in this country, as we have had for over 200 years. We need to have a strong, vibrant, financially strong, and sustainable postal system for a long time, for as long as we are going to be a country.

The nature of our needs and the way we communicate has changed dramatically. I remember finding in my parents' home, oh gosh, about 5 or 6 years ago, when, after my dad had died, my mom was going to move out of her home in Florida up close to my sister in Kentucky, this treasure trove of love letters my parents exchanged during World War II. For others of you whose parents have been in similar situations and whose folks were part of the ''greatest generation,'' you may have uncovered a treasure trove of letters like that as well. They wrote literally every day—just about every day through the war.

I remember that the happiest days I spent in Southeast Asia, in the several tours I served there in the early 1970s, the happiest days for us each week were the days we got the mail. Those were the best days—letters from home, cards, postcards, newspapers, magazines. Those were great days.

Our troops in Afghanistan still get mail. They still get letters and postcards and birthday cards, Father's Day and Mother's Day cards, but it is different because they have Skype and cell phones and a lot of other ways to communicate.

I asked my staff recently to go back 12 years ago to when I first came here and tell me how many e-mails we got for every letter we sent—tell me how many e-mails we got for every letter we sent and received. It turns out for every 1 e-mail we received, we received 10 or 12 letters. That was just like 10 or 12 years ago. Then I asked them to tell me what it is today, and it has flipped. It is just the opposite. For every letter we get, we receive roughly 10 or 12 e-mails. So the way we communicate in this country has changed, and that is just one clear example of it for us here on Capitol Hill.

The Postal Service has struggled much like the U.S. auto industry did in the last decade or two to try to make a go of it. The auto industry found themselves in a situation where they had more plants than they needed, more suppliers than they needed, they had really in some ways more different models than they needed, and they had, sadly, more employees than they needed given their market share, which was about 85 percent when I was in Southeast Asia, and it dropped to about 45 percent 3 or 4 years ago. Fortunately, the auto industry in this country has revived, is vibrant, and is coming back. They are hiring and building cars—award-winning, highly energy efficient cars.

The auto industry was an industry that had to retool itself and right size itself for the 21st century, and they have done that and done it well. The big three in the United States are back and building some of the best cars in the world. We are proud of the work they do, and they are not only hiring people but are paying bonuses to their people, and it has turned out to be a really great success story. These were companies that were literally going into bankruptcy—GM, Chrysler—not that many years ago. They are back, and we are a better country. Thank God we helped them get back. And Ford builds great vehicles.

What do we do about the Postal Service? The Postal Service has about 7 million people working for it or who have jobs that are related or are connected directly or indirectly to the Postal Service—7 million jobs. What do we do about them?

I think what we need to do and are trying to do is contained in the legislation Dr. COBURN and I are introducing tonight, which we have worked on for the last 6 months. I really thank him and his staff, especially Chris Barkley, who is here on the floor with us, who has worked very closely and hard with John Kilvington, who is a member of the majority staff at the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee.

We want to thank a lot of people, Democratic and Republican staff, majority and minority staff, for the terrific work they have done to try to find the middle, to focus on that 80 percent we can agree on, and the 20 percent we can't agree on, we will put off until another day.

The legislation we have written, put simply, addresses how we make possible and ensure that this Postal Service—which was literally spelled out and called for in our Constitution all those years ago—is still relevant today; that it is able to be financially viable today and help meet our communication needs today in a different age, in a digital age. They can do this. They can do this. There is a lot in the legislation that will help make that possible.

We have not written a perfect bill. The ones I have ever written or coauthored or authored, believe it or not, are not perfect. We do our best, and then we introduce the legislation and ask other people who have similar or different views to tell us what they like about our legislation and what they do not like.

In introducing this legislation, we would invite folks from around the country, whether they happen to be residents, consumers, people living in homes, families who rely on the mail, whether they happen to be businesses that use the mail broadly or whether they happen to be folks who send out magazines or catalogs or other nonprofit groups or other folks who work for the Postal Service, the employees, those who are retired, the customers of the Postal Service—we welcome their input as they have a chance to look over what we have written. We ask them to see if they can help us make it better.

Over in the House of Representatives, Congressmen ISSA and CUMMINGS have been working, along with their colleagues, on legislation. It has been reported out of committee over there, I think on a party-line vote.

One of the things that was important to me was to write a bipartisan bill. Dr. COBURN wanted us to write a bipartisan bill. Neither one of us got everything we wanted. The nature of compromise is there are some things that, frankly, you are not all that enamored with, and that is the case here. Our pledge going forward is to continue to work together, to ask Democrats and Republicans to help us improve on this legislation.

The challenge for us is this: In a digital age where people use Skype and Internet and Twitter and all, how do we enable the Postal Service to use what is truly unique—and it is a unique company, if you will; it is a public-private company, although a big company, the second largest employer in the country, and it is a business that goes to every mailbox in this country 5 to 6 days a week—to make a profit, to be financially sustainable, and to meet our communication needs without a huge ongoing reliance from the taxpayer, from the Treasury, to do that? I think they can do it. I think they can do it. I think the legislation we have written will help make that possible.

I want to say a special thanks to a number of folks. I want to thank the Postal Service, led by Pat Donahoe, the Postmaster General; the Board of Governors there, which is part of the Postal Service: the folks who represent hundreds of thousands of postal workers through the union; the businesses across the country that use and rely on the Postal Service; and a lot of customers—regular people who have given us their ideas and shared their ideas with us from towns large and small, cities and States large and small. We

look forward to their input and their criticism—constructive, we hope—to make this legislation even better.

I would again say to our staffs who worked so hard to get us to this point a very special thank you.

To our colleagues on both sides of the aisle, we look forward to working with you to make what we think is a good bill even better. I like to say that everything I do, I know I can do better. If it isn't perfect, make it better. And my last thought on this is that the road to improvement is always under construction.

So we have some more work to do, and we will take what is a good bipartisan bill and hopefully make it a lot better.

Madam President, with that, I will say good night to you. I look forward to seeing you in about 5 or 6 weeks. My best to you and the people you so ably represent in New Hampshire. God bless.

With that, 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. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

THANKING STAFF

Mr. REID. Madam President, I appreciate the Presiding Officer's patience in waiting for us to wrap up things.

Let me say a word very quickly about the staff. I wish everyone a good August. It has been an extremely difficult first 7 months of this congressional period. We got a lot done, and I appreciate very much all the hard work of everyone.

I have said before, but not recently, that we get a lot of things done around here—not nearly as much as we should—but it is the result of all the work that is done by those here and the scores of other people we don't see that are back there doing all kinds of things to make this place work, all the committee staff, the police officers but especially the floor staff.

As we talked earlier today about some departures we have here, one of the good things we have is that in all the time I have been here, as far I am aware—there could have been instances, but I am unaware of any, where there was bitterness expressed publicly and, as far as I know, privately between each other. I haven't seen that. I appreciate very much the good work we do for the Senate. The staff is not partisan in the work for their bosses that they try to get done, and we can only do that through them.

I am so grateful for all they do for the Senate leadership, all the Senators, and the country. Words are not adequate for me to express that, but I truly do appreciate all they do.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S.1392

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at 11 a.m. on Tuesday, September, 10, 2013, the motion to proceed to S. 1392 be agreed to and the Senate proceed to consideration of the legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators allowed to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

INTERCHANGE FEE RULEMAKING

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I rise to speak about a Federal court ruling handed down yesterday that represents a tremendous victory for consumers and Main Street businesses across America.

This ruling has to do with debit card swipe fees. Yesterday, a Federal judge in D.C. called for the Federal Reserve to lower the approximately 24 cent cap it set on debit swipe fees to a level that more closely reflects the actual cost of a debit transaction.

This decision is a major win for Main Street merchants and their customers.

It was urgently needed, because this decision corrects flaws in the Fed's rulemaking that had allowed Visa and MasterCard to triple the swipe fees they impose on many coffeeshops, convenience stores, restaurants and other merchants.

I had filed an amicus brief in this court case, since the case involved a rulemaking based on a law that I had authored. I am very pleased that the court ruled the way it did, and I will take a minute to explain why.

For years, I have been sounding the alarm about swipe fees, also known as interchange fees.

The swipe fee is a hidden fee that is charged on every debit or credit card transaction. It is a fee that a merchant has to pay to a bank when the merchant accepts a credit or debit card that the bank issued. The fee is taken as a cut out of the transaction amount.

These swipe fees are harmful to consumers and to our economy. They are hidden, they are anti-competitive, and they end up raising the price of everything we buy at retail.

It is important to understand how these fees work.

The vast majority of bank fees are set in a transparent and competitive market environment, with each bank setting its own fee rate and competing over them. But that is not the case with swipe fees.

With swipe fees, the big banks decided they would designate the two giant card companies, Visa and MasterCard, to set fees for all of them. That way each bank could get the same high fee on a card transaction without having to worry about competition.

Swipe fees have no transparency. Most customers and most merchants have no idea what kind of swipe fee is being charged when they use a debit or credit card.

The swipe fee system became an enormous money-maker for Visa, MasterCard and the banks. They were collecting an estimated $16 billion in debit swipe fees and $30 billion in credit fees each year.

Those billions are paid by every merchant, charity, school, and government agency that accepts payment by card—and the costs are passed on to American consumers in the form of higher prices.

By 2010, the U.S. swipe fee system was growing out of control with no end in sight. U.S. swipe fee rates had become the highest in the world—far exceeding the actual costs of conducting a debit or credit transaction.

There were no market forces serving to keep fees at a reasonable level. There was no competition and no choice. Merchants and their customers were being forced to subsidize billions in windfall fees to the big banks.

I knew we had to change this situation.

This is an issue of fundamental importance to our economy. Our nation is moving from a currency based on paper cash and checks to a system where American dollars are mostly exchanged through electronic transactions.

We cannot allow Visa, MasterCard and the big banks to dominate the electronic payments system and use it to enrich themselves at consumers' expense. Remember, this is America's currency we are talking about. We have to ensure transparency, competition and fairness when it comes to electronic payments involving U.S. dollars.

So I stepped in and introduced an amendment to the 2010 Wall Street Reform bill that for the first time placed reasonable regulation over debit swipe fees.

My amendment said that if the Nation's biggest banks are going to let Visa and MasterCard fix swipe fee rates for them, then the rates must be reasonable and proportional to the cost of processing a transaction. No more unreasonably high debit swipe fees for big banks.

My amendment passed the Senate with 64 votes and it was signed into law with the rest of Wall Street reform.

The swipe fee reform law that I wrote directed the Federal Reserve to issue regulations to bring down debit swipe fee rates.

In December 2010, the Fed issued a proposed rulemaking that called for debit swipe fees to be capped at 7 to 12 cents per transaction.

This was a significant reduction from what had been a 44 cent average debit swipe fee, though it still allowed banks

to easily cover their debit transaction costs, which the Fed pegged at just a few cents.

However, after the Fed issued the draft rule, the big banks and card network giants turned their lobbyists loose on them. It was a lobbying stampede.

They pressured the Fed to raise the debit swipe fee cap to a level far higher than 12 cents, because they claimed that there were all sorts of additional costs that the Fed forgot to include in its analysis.

The Fed gave in, and in June 2011 issued a final rule that raised the cap level to about 24 cents—much higher than the actual cost of a debit transaction.

Predictably, Visa, MasterCard and the big banks took advantage of this watered-down regulation that they had lobbied for. Visa and MasterCard promptly jacked up any swipe fee rates that were below 24 cents so that this 24 cent ceiling became a floor.

With Visa and MasterCard's rate increases, stores that mainly handle small dollar purchases like coffeeshops, convenience stores, and fast food restaurants are now paying far more in swipe fees than they did before.

These merchants used to be charged debit fees that were a percentage of the purchase amount, and now they are charged around 24 cents no matter how small the purchase. Their customers ultimately pay the price.

This was not a flaw in the law, which required a ''reasonable and proportional'' fee. Instead, it showed the danger of watering down the regulations that implement these laws. The banks and card companies lobbied the Fed for a loophole and when they got one, they ran through it.

After the Fed issued its final rule and Visa and MasterCard promptly raised their swipe fee rates to the cap level wherever they could, a coalition of merchants led by the convenience stores filed a lawsuit in federal court.

They argued that the Fed failed to follow the law in issuing its final regulation. They urged the court to order the Fed to rewrite its regulation in compliance with the statute.

I filed an amicus brief in this case in support of the merchants' position. In my brief, I pointed out that when the Fed doubled its swipe fee cap between the initial rulemaking and the final rulemaking, the Fed cited the need to cover certain costs that the statute explicitly prohibited the Fed from including.

The bottom line, I argued, was that the Fed came far closer to following the statute in its draft rulemaking than after it had bent toward the banks in its final rulemaking.

The court agreed, and yesterday it ordered the Fed to rewrite its rules in compliance with what the law provides.

Here's a key quote from the court's opinion: ''The court concludes that the Board has clearly disregarded Congress's statutory intent by inappropriately inflating all debit card transaction fees by billions of dollars.''

The court also pointed out the problem with Visa and MasterCard's swipe fee increases on small dollar transactions. The Court said:

> By including in the interchange fee standard costs that are expressly prohibited by the statute, the final regulation represents a significant price increase over pre-Durbin Amendment rates for small-ticket debit transactions under the $12 threshold. Congress did not empower the Board to make policy judgments that would result in significantly higher interchange rates.

The court concluded that the Fed must rewrite its regulation to lower the debit fee cap and to halt Visa and MasterCard's fee increases on merchants for small dollar transactions.

Now, this process of rewriting the regulations will take some time, and I suspect there may be more litigation before this issue is over.

But this court ruling marks a tremendous win for Main Street merchants and their customers who deserve the swipe fee relief that the law provided for.

Fortunately for the Fed, there are some clear roadmaps for how it can fix its regulation. I pointed out in my amicus brief that the Fed's initial rulemaking, with its 7 to 12 cent cap, came far closer to reflecting the actual costs that Congress instructed the Fed to look at.

The Fed should look again to its initial rulemaking as it works to rewrite its final rule.

And just last week, the European Commission announced that it would seek to cap debit swipe fee rates throughout the European Union at 0.2 percent of the transaction.

Given that the average debit transaction is about $38, that works out to an average cap of about 7 cents- right where the Fed was in its initial rule.

Congressman PETER WELCH and I sent a letter last week urging the Fed to closely review the European Commission's debit fee cap and to incorporate it in the Fed's debit fee regulation. I believe the Fed will find the Commission's analysis and conclusions to be very helpful in rewriting its final rule.

As we move forward on the path of reasonable swipe fee reform, I should note that Visa, MasterCard and the banking industry are probably not too pleased with this court decision.

I suspect they will be up here on Capitol Hill very soon, screaming bloody murder and arguing that this court decision means the end of the world.

I just want to point out that the banks and card companies have been spreading myths and using scare tactics about swipe fee reform for years. None of them have come true.

They argued that swipe fee reform would devastate small banks. Yet separate studies by the Fed, GAO and the FTC have all found that the exemption I wrote in the law for small banks has worked as intended.

As it turns out, small banks and credit unions have thrived since this law took effect. Why? Because under my amendment, small banks and credit unions can continue to receive the same high interchange rates from Visa and MasterCard they got before far higher than the rates that their big bank competitors now receive.

Also, the big banks argued that they would have to jack up fees on consumers to make up for the lost revenue from swipe fees.

But we haven't seen that happen either, because there is transparency and competition when it comes to bank fees on consumers. In fact, we've gotten more transparency on these fees in the past few years as many banks have adopted a fee disclosure form developed by the Pew Charitable Trusts that I have strongly supported.

As the banks' other scare tactics have faded away, they have resorted to arguing that the problem with swipe reform is that merchants haven't passed along enough swipe fee savings to consumers.

This was a pretty hypocritical argument for them to make, because they knew that Visa and MasterCard had raised many swipe fee rates after reform took effect—a direct result of the higher cap that they had lobbied for.

But even though many merchants have suffered under those swipe fee increases, we have still seen aggressive price competition and discounting by retailers since swipe fee reform took effect. Consumers have benefitted from this price competition, and they will benefit even more from this court ruling.

In closing, I note that yesterday's court decision marks another important step in the effort to make sure the electronic payments system is reasonable and fair for American consumers and businesses. Our work is not over yet, but we are making great progress.

I want to thank my colleagues and all the consumers, merchants and advocates across America who have joined me in this effort. This marks a big win for Main Street over Wall Street, and it wouldn't have been possible without this excellent coalition.

TRIBUTE TO GLENN POSHARD

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I would like to thank Dr. Glenn Poshard for all he has done for Southern Illinois University and for his 40 years of public service to Illinois.

After more than 7 years as president of Southern Illinois University, Dr. Poshard will be retiring next year. Under Dr. Poshard's leadership, Southern Illinois University has been able to keep tuition costs low and the university's finances sound, despite the financial problems that have plagued the State.

Throughout his career, Dr. Poshard worked for the people of southern Illinois. He was born in Herald, IL, and graduated from Carmi Township High School. He left Illinois to serve his country in the U.S. Army in Korea,

where he received a commendation for outstanding service.

Following his military service, Dr. Poshard returned to Illinois and used the G.I. bill to earn a bachelor's degree in secondary education, a master's degree in health education, and a Ph.D. in higher education administration. He received all three degrees from Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

Appointed to the Illinois State Senate in 1984, Dr. Poshard held the seat until the people of the 22nd Congressional District sent him to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1989. During his 10 years in Congress, Dr. Poshard was a strong proponent of campaign finance reform. When he ran for Governor in 1998, he limited individual donations to his campaign and refused to accept contributions from political action committees.

Following his tenure in Congress, Dr. Poshard and his wife Jo founded the Poshard Foundation for Abused Children. For the last 14 years, the Poshard Foundation has helped children who have been victims of abuse, abandonment, or neglect in southern Illinois.

After a 40-year affiliation with the university, Dr. Poshard is leaving his beloved SIU in good shape. At SIU, Dr. Poshard has been a student, a student worker, a civil service worker, an adjunct professor, vice chancellor for administration, and now as he retires—the second longest serving president in the history of the Southern Illinois University system, an experience he calls ''the greatest honor of my life.''

I congratulate Glenn on his distinguished career and thank him for dedicating his life to public service. I wish him and his family all the best.

POLITICAL PRISONERS AND POLITICAL REPRESSION IN RUSSIA

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, over the years I have come to the floor to raise the plight of political prisoners being held around the globe. These have included journalists, activists, bloggers, musicians, and opposition candidates who all had the misfortune of landing in an autocrat's jail for exercising or advocating for basic freedoms that most of the world takes for granted.

Many of these cases are ones that have received little attention or are not in the world's media spotlight, including: Gambian journalist Ebrima Manneh, who has been held incommunicado since 2006 and probably has died in detention; Vietnamese blogger Dieu Cay, who was jailed for 12 years for anti-state propaganda and is in poor health due to a hunger strike amid his president's recent visit to Washington; Saudi blogger Hamza Kashgari, who was grabbed off a plane in Malaysia while fleeing for his safety and returned to Saudi Arabia to face charges of blasphemy; Turkmen political dissident and human rights activist Gulgeldy Annaniyazov, who has been in jail since 2008; and Belarusian opposition candidate Mikalai, who was thrown in jail for having the temerity to run against his country's strongman, President Lukashenko.

Many of my colleagues here have helped with these efforts, including 11 other Senators who recently joined in a letter to Uzbek President Karimov asking for the release of activist Akzam Turgunov and journalists Dilmurod Saidov and Salijon Abdurakhmanov.

Others have also championed the cause of political freedom around the world, including Senators MCCAIN and CARDIN, who have been leaders in trying to hold our Russian friends to a higher standard of political and human rights freedom.

In fact, Senator CARDIN was tireless in his effort to pass the Magnitsky law—a law that I supported—that tried to bring about some measure of accountability regarding the death of Russian lawyer Sergei Magnitsky, who was jailed after exposing official corruption and later died from mistreatment while in custody.

I have also watched with great dismay the deterioration of democracy and human rights in Russia.

A few years ago I had the chance to speak to the Lithuanian Parliament on that country's—the country of my mother's birth—20th anniversary of independence from the Soviet Union. One of the other speakers on that memorable occasion was Russian democrat small ''d'' democrat—Yuriy Afanasyev.

Many probably did not realize or have forgotten that during those heady days in the early 1990s a number of countries—such as Lithuania—were early in declaring independence and, as a result, helped change history in Eastern Europe.

And who helped support many such efforts?

Russian democrats in the streets of Moscow—the same ones who were also instrumental in bringing a transition to democracy in their own country.

Afanasyev was just such a Russian. He helped lead large public protests in Moscow during the January 1991 crackdown against Lithuania's independence movement.

That is why I find myself so saddened by what is happening in Russia today—the systematic state-sponsored harassment and dismantling of those Russian citizens and organizations that are still hoping for a democratic and free Russia so many years later.

Just 2 weeks ago, the Russian government tried and convicted popular opposition leader and candidate for mayor of Moscow Alesksei Navalny on charges that had already been thrown out as baseless after a local investigation.

If his conviction is upheld, he will be banned from public office for life.

Navalny's case is just one of a long list of politically motivated charges and actions in recent years used to squash any criticism of the Russian government or those who might want to run for political office:

A few weeks ago, hundreds of protesters were detained by Russian Interior Ministry personnel when protesting Navalny's dubious conviction—a fate met by scores of nonviolent protesters in recent years;

As of March of this year, the Russian Federal Security Service accompanied by tax enforcement and other government personnel has raided thousands of NGOs across Russia, seizing documents and interrogating staff—all in an orchestrated intimidation campaign;

Opposition leader Boris Nemtsov has been arrested multiple times for peacefully protesting government policies;

Deputy editor-in-chief of Russian newspaper Novaya Gazeta Sergei Sokolov fled Russia after the chief federal investigator took him into the forest and threatened to decapitate him;

Doctor of Political Sciences at Kuban State University Mikhail Savva, who was a member of the that region's Public Oversight Committee and an outspoken voice against corruption was arrested in April and has been held without bail on flimsy charges;

Leader of For Human Rights, Lev Ponomaryov, a prominent human rights advocacy group in Moscow, was kicked and beaten during a forceful eviction of his organization from their headquarters. The assault was carried out by men dressed in civilian clothing, but was observed by riot police officers;

Lastly—and very symbolic of the hundreds arrested at recent protests—human rights activist Nikolay Kavkazsky was arrested last year at his home for allegedly hitting a policeman during a protest although an independent investigation implies he was in fact dodging blows from a policeman.

Let me take a moment to pause and mention an extraordinary story and photo from the Washington Post of Russian schoolteacher Marina Rozumovskaya, standing alone in front of Moscow City Hall in the freezing Russian winter in January of 2011.

In the photo she is holding an 8 by 11 inch sign that said ''Freedom to political prisoners'' in response to the arrest and jailing of a prominent opposition leader who had criticized the Russian government.

Watching and waiting for her to break the law across the street in the 10 degree weather were a dozen or so Russian police officers.

This brave schoolteacher told the Washington Post, ''If you don't exercise your rights as a citizen, nothing will ever change.''

The Russian government has also used almost paranoid legislation to restrict Russian human rights and election monitoring organizations from doing their work.

For example, in March of 2013, Russian officials raided the offices of hundreds of non-governmental organizations, including Amnesty International.

Equally troubling, Russia's largest elections watchdog GOLOS, and its executive director Lilia Shibanova, were

fined for failing to register as a ''foreign agent,'' even after receiving the prestigious Sakharov Prize by the Norwegian Helsinki Committee and rejecting the monetary portion of the award.

Russia has also passed draconian laws that include fines equivalent to an average annual salary for taking part in unsanctioned protests, stiffer libel penalties, a broader definition of treason, and restrictions on websites—laws that former Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev has denounced as an ''attack on the rights of citizens.''

Earlier this year Gorbachev also warned Russian President Putin ''not to be afraid of his own people.''

Remember Sergei Magnitsky, the Russian who tried to draw attention to massive police and tax fraud who died in Russian custody? He was convicted a few weeks ago of perpetrating fraud himself—4 years after he died.

After what many brave Russian democrats did for countries such as Lithuania and others breaking free from the Soviet Union, we owe it to speak up for those who are fighting for basic political freedoms today in Russia.

These endless show trials are not for criminals or foreign agent organizations. They are not worthy of a great nation.

These are petty attacks on patriotic Russians who want the freedom to peacefully criticize and improve their government, to run for office, to have clean elections, and to have an independent judiciary that is not used to quash political opponents.

The Russian people—our friends—deserve better than to have such aspirations so brazenly and so shortsightedly repressed.

SMARTER SENTENCING ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, yesterday, I introduced the Smarter Sentencing Act, bipartisan legislation that would reform our drug sentencing laws to make Federal sentencing policy smarter, fairer, and more fiscally responsible.

This bill, which is cosponsored by Republican Senator MIKE LEE and Judiciary Committee chairman PATRICK LEAHY, would reduce certain mandatory minimum sentences for nonviolent drug offenses and give Federal judges more ability to impose individualized sentences for certain offenders. These modest changes will allow Federal law enforcement to focus limited government resources on the most serious offenders and public safety risks.

Why is this legislation needed? Let's look at where we are as a country. We incarcerate more individuals, including per capita, than any other nation in the world. Our rivals, with far lower incarceration rates, include countries like Rwanda, Cuba, China, and the Russian Federation.

And our incarceration rates are only growing over time. We have 500 percent more inmates in our Federal prisons than we did 30 years ago. For example, in 1980 we had fewer than 25,000 in Federal custody, and today there are more than 219,000.

Our Federal prison system is at nearly 40 percent over capacity—with more than 50 percent overcrowding at high-security facilities. As the Government Accountability Office has explained, this overcrowding is not only creating financial strain, but it is jeopardizing the safety of both inmates and prison guards.

And who are we incarcerating with our limited resources? Nearly 50 percent of Federal inmates are serving sentences for drug offenses.

Let's be clear: The price tag for this system is unsustainably high in terms of both financial and human costs. What we spend on Federal incarceration has increased more than 1100 percent in the last 30 years. The number was less than $330 million in 1980 and had skyrocketed to more than $6.6 billion by last year.

Our current incarceration policies are swallowing our limited law enforcement budget and forcing choices that many lawmakers and taxpayers would not agree with. Incarceration and detention costs account for nearly a third of the Department of Justice's discretionary budget. This threatens funding for Federal prosecutions, Federal law enforcement, funding and grant money for State and local law enforcement, and support for treatment, intervention, and reentry programs.

In the era of sequestration, we are faced with a choice: We can either change our sentencing policies or potentially suffer an erosion in public safety. We need to take steps to control Federal prison spending now or we will face significant cuts in the resources available for other pressing criminal justice priorities like making sure there are police on the streets, crime prevention programs in place, and an ability for offenders to reintegrate into their communities rather than become safety risks.

Many States across the country recognize that we are at a crossroads and they are pursuing important reforms with a high degree of success. A New York Times article published this week explains the ''new approach to crime'' many States are taking and the resulting decline in State prison populations. The Federal Government should follow suit.

And let's never forget the human costs. We hear every day about heartbreaking cases of mothers, fathers, uncles, aunts, and children who are behind bars for far too long sometimes decades—for nonviolent offenses. This harms communities and families.

One such case is a woman I came to know well, Eugenia Jennings. Because of unjust sentencing laws, she was incarcerated in Federal prison at the age of 23 for more than two decades for a nonviolent drug offense involving the exchange of a small amount of drugs for clothing. Eugenia had three children who were forced to grow up without their mother.

Even the sentencing judge acknowledged the injustice of Eugenia's sentence, lamenting ''there is nothing this court could do'' because of the laws that existed. Eugenia was a model prisoner winning awards, completing substance abuse programs, and serving as a model employee who worked at a call center and sewed thousands of pairs of shorts for the military. Eugenia suffered from a serious and rare form of cancer while in Federal custody. Eugenia would still be serving a sentence today—a sentence that would be costing taxpayers hundreds of thousands of dollars and depriving children of a mother—had it not been for the highly unusual grant of a Presidential commutation. Who benefited from the many years Eugenia spent in prison?

How do we fix this problem or at least take an important step toward solving it? We have learned that our exploding prison population is in large part due to ineffective sentencing laws and the increasing number and length of Federal mandatory minimum sentences. Mandatory sentences, particularly drug sentences, can take individualized review out of a judge's hands by requiring a one-size-fits-all sentence imposed by Congress. And the number of Federal mandatory sentences has doubled during the last 20 years.

More than 60 percent of Federal district court judges agree that existing mandatory minimums for all offenses are too high. Many think they are just bad policy. Justice Anthony Kennedy said: ''I am in agreement with most judges in the federal system that mandatory minimums are an imprudent, unwise and often unjust mechanism for sentencing.''

The Judicial Conference of the United States, which represents all Federal judges, has ''consistently opposed mandatory minimum sentences for more than 50 years.'' The bipartisan U.S. Sentencing Commission recently said, after studying this issue in a 369-page report, ''[T]he Commission unanimously believes that certain mandatory minimum penalties apply too broadly, are excessively severe, and are applied inconsistently. . . .''

We subject our Federal judges to a rigorous confirmation process. Congress should allow these judges to use their legal and law enforcement expertise to do their jobs and not micromanage their sentencing decisions. It is important in achieving both justice and public safety to have sentences tailored to the individual facts, background, and circumstances of each case and defendant. Only the judge who hears a case has the ability to set such a sentence.

We are at a crucial moment in history. We can no longer afford sentencing policies that are not working, are draining limited Federal funds, are leading to unjust sentences, and are failing to make our families and communities safer.

As a result of these problems, some of the country's leading sentencing experts have called for the repeal of all Federal mandatory minimums. The Smarter Sentencing Act takes more modest but important steps in modernizing drug sentencing policy.

First, it modestly expands the existing Federal safety valve, which allows Federal judges to sentence certain nonviolent drug offenders below existing mandatory minimum sentences. This change will only apply to certain nonviolent drug offenses that do not involve weapons. It is supported by nearly 70 percent of Federal district court judges.

Second, the bill will permit those serving sentences that Congress has determined are unjust and racially disparate to petition for a reduction in their sentence. I authored the bipartisan Fair Sentencing Act in 2009 to help reduce the sentencing disparity between crack and powder cocaine offenses and to eliminate the mandatory minimum sentence for simple possession of crack cocaine. While African Americans were approximately 30 percent of crack users, they comprised more than 80 percent of those convicted of Federal crack offenses.

The bill passed the Senate unanimously. As one Judiciary Committee Republican stated, ''[W]e are not able to defend'' the unfair sentences that existed before the Fair Sentencing Act—sentences that disproportionately affected African Americans. Another stated that these changes were ''long overdue'' and that ''Congress should act without any more delay to start to reduce the sentencing disparity.'' A third Republican member of the Judiciary Committee stated, ''The law created inequities. . . . We are working and will continue to work to roll back the injustice that was done.''

Because of the timing of their sentences, some individuals are still in jail serving lengthy, pre-Fair Sentencing Act sentences that Congress has determined are unfair. To be clear, the Smarter Sentencing Act does not automatically reduce a single sentence in this respect. But it allows individuals sentenced under the old crack-powder sentencing disparity to petition courts and prosecutors for a review of their case, consistent with changes in the law made by the Fair Sentencing Act. Considering all of the circumstances, including public safety and the nature of the offense, a judge can grant or deny any petition. Federal courts successfully and efficiently conducted similar crack-related sentence reviews after 2007 and 2011 changes to the Sentencing Guidelines. Based on recent U.S. Sentencing Commission data, this change in the law alone could significantly reduce prison overcrowding and save taxpayers more than $1 billion.

Third, the bill lowers mandatory penalties for certain nonviolent drug offenses. These modifications do not apply to, for example, statutory penalties involving firearms or bodily injury. And this bill does not repeal any mandatory minimum sentences. Rather, it reduces certain nonviolent drug mandatory sentences so that judges can determine, based on individual circumstances, when the harshest penalties should apply. Let's allow these judges to do their jobs.

This bill crosses party lines it is a bipartisan compromise from a Republican from Utah and a Democrat from Illinois. This bill is the right thing to do, which is why it is endorsed by faith leaders from the National Association of Evangelicals to the United Methodist Church. This bill would improve public safety, which is why it is endorsed by the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives. And this bill is good policy, which is why it is endorsed by groups on the right and left, ranging from Heritage Action to the ACLU. It is endorsed by Justice Fellowship of Prison Fellowship Ministries, Grover Norquist, the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, the NAACP, the Sentencing Project, Open Society Policy Center, the ABA, the Constitution Project, the National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers, NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Families Against Mandatory Minimums, the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, Drug Policy Alliance, and Brennan Center for Justice, among others.

I thank my partner in this effort, Senator LEE. We have taken many months to study this problem and work together on a bipartisan solution.

I am grateful to Senator LEAHY, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, for joining this effort and, as always, for his leadership on criminal justice reform.

I urge my colleagues to support the Smarter Sentencing Act.

REMEMBERING EDDY SIZEMORE, HERMAN 'LEE' DOBBS, AND JESSE JONES

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I rise today to commemorate the victims of a tragic accident that occurred recently in Clay County, KY. Three heroes were lost when a medical helicopter came down in the parking lot of Paces Creek Elementary School outside the town of Manchester on June 6 of this year. Crewmembers Eddy Sizemore, the pilot, Herman ''Lee'' Dobbs, the flight paramedic, and Jesse Jones, the flight nurse, sadly died in this crash.

The crew of this medical helicopter was returning back to their Manchester base after transporting a patient in urgent need of care to a hospital in London, KY. Medical helicopters help transport patients in remote areas to hospitals where they can receive all necessary medical attention. Sadly, these three crewmembers who worked to save others' lives lost their own.

Pilot Eddy Sizemore was 61 years old and a native of Laurel County, KY. He was a former chief deputy in the Laurel County Sheriff's Office. He worked most of his life in law enforcement, and was a veteran of the U.S. Army; he served his country in Vietnam and was awarded the Bronze Star Medal and the Purple Heart. He is remembered by his three daughters, Stacey Johnson, Kacey Bolton, and Jessica Sizemore; his son, Justin Sizemore; his father, Frank Sizemore; his brother, Jerry Sizemore; the mother and stepmother of his children, Pam Brock Sizemore; 10 grandchildren; and many other family members and friends.

Flight paramedic Herman ''Lee'' Dobbs, of London, KY, was 40 years old. He had worked for Knox County EMS and had a love of horses that led to his being put in charge of a horseback search unit for the Knox County Special Operations Response Team. He is remembered by his wife, Emilee Dobbs; his parents, Herman Dobbs and Patsy Light Dobbs; his children, Jordan, Hayden, and Walker Dobbs; his sister, Lori Crawford; his brother, Chad Dobbs; his aunt, Sherri Blakely; his uncle, Dale Light; his mother-in-law, Candace Hutton; and many other family members and friends.

Flight nurse Jesse Jones was 28 and from Bell County, KY. He graduated from Southeast Kentucky Community and Technical College as a registered nurse in 2007 and then pursued his dream of becoming a flight nurse. He is remembered by his grandparents, Mac and Ruby Jones; his son, Tyson Lee Jones; his father, Eddie Gene Jones; his stepmother, Patricia Maye Jones; his brother, Wiley Gene Jones; and many other family members and friends.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that an article that was published recently in a southeastern Kentucky publication describing the very moving memorial service held for the three crewmembers of the tragic Air Evac 109 flight be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Whitley County Times-Tribune, June 17, 2013]

''GOD SPEED AND BLUE SKIES''

AIR EVAC 109 CREW REMEMBERED

(By Jeff Noble)

CORBIN.—After the funerals of three of their crew members last week, it was time for Air Evac Lifeteam to remember Eddy Sizemore, Jesse Jones and Lee Dobbs.

On Saturday morning the company did just that, during an emotional and moving memorial service in London.

Outside the North Laurel High School Gymnasium, the weather was sunny and the skies blue, when an estimated 300 persons—including the families of the three who died, as well as Air Evac crews and first responders from Kentucky and other states as far away as Missouri, Illinois, Minnesota and North Carolina—came to say goodbye to their brothers who paid the ultimate price while doing their duty.

For all of them, the memory of what happened on that late Thursday night, June 6, will forever be seared in their hearts and minds.

Sizemore was the pilot. Jones was the flight nurse. Dobbs was the flight paramedic. All three died when their medical helicopter crashed in the parking lot of Paces Creek Elementary School in Clay County, just about 150 yards from the helipad where the crew is based in Manchester.

For the crews, it was their time to mourn. To persevere. And to have closure.

It was Pastor Donald Sims, of the City of Hope Community Fellowship in Manchester, whose opening prayer began the memorial service.

''Lord, be with the families, their friends, and bring hope, healing and comfort to all who are here,'' he prayed.

From the St. Louis suburb of O'Fallon, Missouri, came Air Evac Lifeteam's president, Seth Myers. He was the first speaker at the service, and told the audience and his employees, ''It with a heavy heart that I stand here. To honor the life of Eddy Sizemore, Lee Dobbs and Jesse Jones.''

He spoke of the three who perished, and spoke of the many first responders who came to pay their respects.

''I see uniforms of all colors. They all represent one thing. That's the dedication to serve others. The attendance today is a testament of these three people who served. They loved doing what they did, and the crews working with them. They helped to save lives and make a difference in peoples' lives. They're gone from us today, but they'll never be forgotten,'' Myers said.

He then read a letter from a woman, thanking the crews for their service.

''I can't imagine the emotions at this time, but you will work as a team and persevere . . . For Eddy, Lee and Jesse, their impact lives on in the life of every person they saved . . . I challenge you to move forward. A Japanese proverb said, 'Fall down seven times, stand up eight.' Signed, Mandy Curley,'' the letter said.

Eulogies were given for all three members of the helicopter crew by friends and family. Eddy Sizemore was remembered first.

''My definition of a hero is someone laying down their life helping someone they don't know. All three of those men did. I'm alive and able to stand on this stage today, because of Eddy's experience as a helicopter pilot. Eddy saved my life,'' said Officer Chuck Johnson of the Laurel County Sheriff's Department.

Johnson recalled riding with Sizemore as a spotter during a marijuana search in 2005 when both worked together with the sheriff's office. They were in the air when the chopper hit guy wires, then plunged to earth, hit the ground and skidded 96 feet on the blacktop. Johnson said it was Sizemore's skills, and cool in the hot seat, that brought the chopper down safely.

''I believe that God has a plan of a mission of all of us here on Earth. On that day, our mission wasn't finished. On June 6th, Eddy's mission was complete, and he was called home,'' he pointed out.

There was another side to Sizemore. A lighter side that permeated the workplace, and gave Johnson and his co-workers a wealth of what he affectionately called ''Eddy Stories.''

''He loved to sit and laugh and loved to cut up with us. Eddy loved to keep people entertained. He also liked to cheat at playing Rook during our times we worked the night shift years ago with the Sheriff's Office . . . Eddy always had our back. All of us who worked with him will continue to mourn. There was only one Eddy Sizemore,'' Johnson said.

Kathy Guyn spoke next. She remembered when Jesse Jones was in her nursing classes at the Pineville campus of Southeast Community and Technical College.

''He was the type of student everyone liked. Fun-loving, and had a good time. Jesse was very intelligent. He wanted to be a nurse. He made his patients feel very important, and that they were the most important person in the hospital. He loved to hunt. On more than one occasion he would remind me and the other teachers that it was the beginning of deer season. And he loved his family, especially his grandparents. When he graduated, he told me he wanted to be a flight nurse. He was meant to be in the skies. If I needed a flight nurse, I would want Jesse Jones, because I know he was the best,'' she stated.

Eliza Brooks started her nursing career with Jones at Pineville Community Hospital. She also spoke on behalf of Jesse's family.

''He had an eagerness to learn more. My husband also worked at the hospital, and he and Jesse became friends . . . We would serve lasagna for Jesse every deer season, and on Christmas, our family had a camouflage stocking for Jesse. To the family, we want to thank you for sharing Jesse with us. He loved all of you. He lived life every day to the fullest. He was always loving, kind and compassionate. He knew what to do, and never looked back. The sky was not the limit for Jesse,'' she said, holding back tears.

Letch Day, of Air Methods Corporation, gave the first of two eulogies for Lee Dobbs, the last of the crew of three that Day called ''Our fallen heroes, our fallen brothers.''

''To know Lee was an honor. He was a strong-willed person. EMS was his job. It was his life. It was his passion. The one letter to describe Lee was 'C' character, caring, compassion, commitment, companion, and childhood hero. His character was what propelled him to excellence. He loved and cared for his family. And he cared for his family and others with compassion and commitment. He was to others a companion, and to his children, a childhood hero to them,'' he said.

Day then looked at Dobbs's three sons and told them, ''Your Dad. He is a hero. Don't ever forget that.''

Lee's own father, Herman Dobbs, took the stage next. His voice cracked as he began to weep, while talking about the son he lost almost two weeks ago.

''Knowing Lee as my son, he would have said, Dad, did you tell the Jones family, and the Sizemore family, I'm sorry for their loss? They were my partners.' That's what he'd want me to say. He was my son. We tried to bring him up that way. I'm just so thankful the Lord gave me a son like that,'' Dobbs said, his voice choked with emotion.

In the place where the North Laurel High Jaguars held court, there were three wreaths on the stage—one each for the three fallen crew members. In the middle of each wreath was a picture of each of them. On each side of the stage was a large video screen, which showed pictures and moments of the lives of Lee, Eddy and Jesse. The seats on the gym floor were reserved for family members and Air Evac employees. When the doors opened at 10 a.m. for the service, the seats quickly filled, with other Air Evac crews and first responders joining the general public on the home side of the bleacher seats.

Two Air Methods Corporation employees from Missouri—Ray Haven and his wife, Veronica—sang the inspirational song ''I Will Rise.'' Ray played acoustic guitar, while he and Veronica sang the duet.

Towards the end of the service, three recorded songs were played over the speakers while the audience watched the visual montage of the three men they called ''their family.''

One was the song ''You Never Let Go,'' followed by ''Shine Your Light,'' a tribute to first responders by Robbie Robertson, a former member of The Band. The set ended with an encore of ''You Never Let Go.''

When that ended, Brian Jackson, the program director of Air Evac 109 in Manchester, came to the stage, accompanied by nine crew members. Some of the crew shared stories and lighthearted moments about their work with Lee, Jesse and Eddy.

Several in the audience got some good laughs from the stories, which a nearby person in the bleacher seats said they needed.

Jackson told the crews and first responders, ''Thank you for your prayers and your support during this time. It really means a lot. We agree. They were brothers to us. They would want me to tell you, Crawl back on that ambulance. Crawl back on that truck. Crawl back on that airplane. Do what you do best.'''

When the Manchester crew finished their final thoughts, they pinned the wings on the wreaths of Dobbs, Sizemore and Jones.

Letch Day returned, and presented a framed print in memory of the three crewmen to the Air Evac 109 base in Manchester.

''We're asking them to be our 'Guardian Angels' in memory of the job they did so well,'' he said.

Jackson and the base crew proudly accepted the print.

Kentucky state flags were presented to the families of the three crewmen by Mike Poynter, the state EMS director. Air Evac Lifeteam flags were also given to the three families, as were three fire helmets brought to them in memory of their fathers, by the Manchester Fire Department.

The tones were heard over the speakers, and the Last Call was given by a dispatcher. When that ended, a piper played ''Amazing Grace'' on the bagpipes as the color guard left the gymnasium. And the service ended.

Nearly everyone who attended went outside to wait for an aircraft flyover. Six helicopters and one airplane hovered overhead for the next five minutes, each one's pilot and crew showing in their own way their own respect and honor for their fallen comrades.

For those up in the air, and on the ground, this past Saturday was their time to remember.

It's a good bet that many of them will forever remember those final words when they heard the crew's last call inside the gymnasium.

''November One-One-Nine Alpha Echo is out of service. God speed and blue skies.''

IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I would like to speak briefly about how the immigration reform bill affects access to health insurance coverage. In particular, I am pleased that the Senate-passed legislation preserves the ability for States to cover lawfully residing pregnant women and children under Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program CHIP. Importantly, States may extend full benefits under these programs to individuals who gain legal status as a result of the bill, including those granted Registered Provisional Immigrant RPI, Blue Card, and V-visa status.

My home State of Washington is one of 27 that have decided to exercise the option to extend these health care benefits to children or pregnant women. We do this because we know that when women have access to prenatal care, children are born healthier. We all benefit when children receive the immunizations they need and are able to see a doctor when they are sick.

During the debate on S. 744, two of my colleagues, Chairman LEAHY and Senator ROCKEFELLER, came to the floor to discuss this issue. I join them in support of preserving States' rights to extend Medicaid and CHIP benefits to lawfully residing noncitizen children and pregnant women. I thank my colleagues for addressing an issue that is critical to my home State and I echo their comments on the intention of the Senate with regard to this issue.

Madam President, I would also like to speak today about the need for comprehensive immigration reform by highlighting the work of one of my constituents.

I was touched when I read a poem written by 10-year-old Erin Stark of Bellevue, WA. I met Erin last month at a welcoming ceremony for new immigrants in my home State of Washington. She told me about her passion for writing and explained that she won a national writing contest with the submission of her poem on immigration. I think her words exemplify the diversity and extraordinary contributions made by immigrants to this country.

''WHAT WOULD YOU MISS ABOUT IMMIGRANTS, IF THEY DIDN'T COME TO AMERICA?''

Would you miss the food?
The pot stickers, sushi, and dumplings,
Pizza, spaghetti, curry, or crepes?
Just think about it for a minute or two,
Could you survive eating fish at every meal?
Could you?
Immigrants are coming every day,
Variety is what they bring with them in every way.
Would you miss the holidays?
Day of the Dead, and Chinese New Year,
Hanukkah, Kwanzaa, and Ramadan too?
Why did the Christians travel the distance,
Was it to share their beliefs and Christmas?
Immigrants are coming every day,
Variety is what they bring with them in every way.
Would you miss their art,
Painting, literature, and music,
Plays, sculpture, and design?
Life would be dull without art,
People might become sad and would get broken hearts.
Immigrants are coming every day,
Variety is what they bring with them in every way.
Would you miss the things they made?
Railroads, canals, communities, and skyscrapers,
Schoolhouses, highways, churches, and businesses?
What would kids do without schools?
We might turn into fools!
Immigrants are coming every day,
Variety is what they bring with them in every way.
Immigrants are coming every day.
They bring recipes, celebrations, talents, and skills.
Variety is what they bring with them in every way.
USA would be bland without immigrants,
Now our nation is colorful and the joy is infinite.

—*Erin Stark*

Mr. President, I would like to extend a special welcome to Erin Stark. I look forward to seeing all that she will accomplish in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO ROHIT KUMAR

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I wish to pay tribute to my colleague Rohit Kumar, who will soon, unfortunately, be leaving Senate service for other pursuits.

Rohit stood by me and others here in the Senate as we navigated through deep challenges faced by our Nation, and he has consistently and vigilantly worked for the American people to promote a lot of good, and to prevent a lot of bad from happening.

Rohit is a consummate Senate professional whose skills and accomplishments have provided a long strand of service to this body and to the country. He is a rarity, combining a razor-sharp intellect, logical patterns of thought, and an ability to obtain fair and balanced assessments of challenges that typically involve tradeoffs across a host of competing interests. He adds to that an uplifting disposition and a keen wit.

Rohit possesses mastery of policy, politics, rules of the Congress, and more. While most of us would be content having mastery of any one of those realms, Rohit has managed to master them all. He is a complete package.

Rohit has been an asset to me, to my caucus, to Senate Leadership, and to the country, and his presence will be missed by all of us.

All of us here in the Senate are also indebted to Rohit's beautiful family, which has endured the often-rigorous demands that his Senate service has placed on them. I can think of more than a few occasions where Rohit was negotiating issues that are deeply important for the future of our Nation in stressful, around-the-clock marathon sessions.

If you were to ask me to construct a template for an ideal person to have by your side to navigate through the tough decisions, tradeoffs, and negotiations we face in Congress, I would simply point to Rohit Kumar.

We are all very sad to see Rohit leave. We trust that he will be able to take a bit more time with his family, and will pursue future endeavors with more of the same rigor and industriousness he has consistently shown in his service to the country while working in the Senate. Wherever he goes, without doubt, those around him will benefit tremendously.

I wish to thank Rohit for the many years of outstanding assistance he has provided to me, to my colleagues in the Senate, and to the country. I also thank his family for sharing Rohit with us, and for persevering as we often tapped his talents around the clock. I am proud to have worked with Rohit.

REMEMBERING HARRY BYRD JR.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I rise today to pay special tribute to a man I admired for many years, former U.S. Senator Harry Byrd Jr. Sadly, Harry passed away July 30, 2013, leaving behind a lasting legacy that garnered the respect of many throughout our State and Nation.

Senator Byrd made history in 1970 when he became the first person to win election to the U.S. Senate as an independent candidate. He used that independence to be a voice for good and was someone people respected for his deliberative manner.

Senator Byrd was not one to introduce unnecessary legislation and in fact believed legislation was not always the answer. However one of his proudest moments as a legislator was his work on a bill that mandated a balanced Federal budget in 1978. He set the tone for my own commitment to this principle that I have continued to fight for throughout my service in the Senate.

I had the pleasure of getting to know Harry during my early years as a Senator. In fact, after the important and difficult Labor Law Reform battle I waged 2-years into office, I received a note from Harry that I treasure to this day. This Independent Senator praised my work and declared that ''. . . the American people are indebted to you.'' Strong words from a strong man that I looked up to and admired as a very junior Senator just learning the ropes.

Senator Byrd not only conquered the political world—he was a highly respected voice in the newspaper business—two entities not always known for cohesive relationships. He spent many decades in publishing and served as editor and publisher for two newspapers; as well as the vice president of the Associated Press.

His service in the Senate was matched by his service to his country in the U.S. Navy as a Lieutenant Commander during World War II. His love for America and the ideals it represents could be found throughout the good works he performed throughout his life.

Our nation lost a truly wonderful man. I know that many people will truly miss his strength, leadership, and wisdom.

Elaine and I convey our deepest sympathies to his three children and their families. May our Heavenly Father bless them with peace and comfort at this time. The contributions and impact Senator Byrd made on his family, his community, and our Nation will be felt and appreciated for generations to come.

UNITED STATES-ISRAEL STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP ACT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2013 reaffirms the strong relationship the United States has with Israel. As the legislation states, our countries share a deep and unbreakable bond, forged by over 60 years of shared interests and shared values.

S. 462 includes provisions that will enhance cooperation between our countries in the areas of energy, defense, homeland security, and agriculture.

While I support the end goal of the bill, I do have reservations about a section dealing with the visa waiver program. The visa waiver program was created by Congress but is largely overseen and maintained by the executive branch. The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of State, may designate any country as a participant if certain qualifications are met. Congress laid out the criteria, which include low nonimmigrant visa refusal rate; machine readable passport program; law enforcement and security interests; reporting lost and stolen passports; repatriation of aliens; and passenger information exchange.

Once a country meets these requirements, the Secretary of Homeland Security allows the country to participate in the visa waiver program. Yet, S. 462 would amend the statute and allow Israel in the program even if all the criteria are not met. Specifically, under the legislation, Israel would not have to abide by the low nonimmigrant visa refusal rate. Currently, 37 countries participate in the visa waiver program without needing a special exception.

I am concerned about section 9 of the bill because it sets a precedent for other countries not to have to abide by all the terms of the program. Participating in the visa waiver program is a great benefit. Congress should not be making exceptions.

So, while I support the bill and am cosponsoring it today, I will advocate that section 9 be amended before it is passed by this body. The Senate should accept the House language, which simply includes a statement of policy and requires the Secretary of State to report on the extent to which Israel satisfies the requirements specified in law.

I hope my colleagues will work with me on this section, and I look forward to helping pass this bill in the Senate to reaffirm the partnership of United States with Israel.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

STAFF SERGEANT KIRK A. OWEN

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I pay tribute today to a true American hero, Army SSG Kirk A. Owen of Sapulpa, OK who died on August 2nd, 2011, serving our Nation in Paktya Province, Afghanistan. Staff Sergeant Owen was assigned as a scout to Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 1st Battalion, 179th Infantry Regiment, 45th Infantry Brigade Combat Team, Oklahoma Army National Guard.

Staff Sergeant Owen died of injuries sustained when the vehicle in which he was riding was attacked with an improvised explosive device in the Lajah District, Paktya Province while conducting combat operations. He was 37 years old.

Kirk enlisted in the Oklahoma National Guard at the age of 31 as a Chaplain's Assistant after seeing a recruiting commercial on television and deployed in support of disaster relief operations following Hurricane Katrina. Kirk then deployed again to Iraq in 2007 as an infantryman and rose through the ranks to Staff Sergeant. He served as a full time Army National Guard Soldier. He strived to be the best in everything he did and was repeatedly recognized for his excellence as the Hero of the Battlefield and the outstanding soldier in the 45th Infantry Brigade Combat Team for his performance at the Joint Readiness Training Center, and presented the Unsung Hero Award when he attended the Ranger Reconnaissance and Surveillance Leader Course for his scout training. He also was Soldier of the Cycle for basic training and given Distinguished Honors at Advanced Individual Training.

A true warrior and leader, Kirk died while escorting an Explosive Ordnance Disposal team to disarm dangerous explosive devices in Paktya Province. Kirk was a loving husband, endearing father, and faithful friend. His loving presence, strong faith, incredible sense of duty and honor, and his wonderful sense of humor left a lasting impression on every heart he touched.

First Baptist Church Pastor Doyle Pryor said, ''Kirk is one of those guys who had a natural sense of duty and honor. He really believed his military service was a calling from God.''

Major General Myles Deering, the Oklahoma National Guard Adjutant General, said, ''He was an outstanding non-commissioned officer, dedicated to loyally serving his country and fellow Soldiers. His loss is being felt across the state and he will be greatly missed.''

His daughter Kylie wrote:

My dad was a fantastic leader. All of his guys looked up to him. My nickname for him was Ironman. There was nothing to me that he couldn't do. He loved Jesus with all his heart and that's where my peace is coming from. I can just see him up in heaven following Jesus around wanting to know everything. A few weeks before he left we were at the grocery store and my dad and little sister were walking down the marshmallow aisle and he turned to her and said 'Kayci, I think heaven will smell like marshmallows.' I hope it does. The memory of my dad will live on forever and his good looks will too.

In July 2012, the town of Sapulpa dedicated a neighborhood park where the Owen family still lives as a tribute to Kirk and his service to our Nation. There is a lasting monument in his honor.

Kirk lived a life of love for God, his wife and daughters, family, friends, and country. He leaves behind a wonderful and loving family: his wife, Tiffany and daughters, Kylie and Kayci. He will be remembered for his commitment to and belief in the greatness of our nation. I am honored to pay tribute to this true American hero who volunteered to go into the fight and made the ultimate sacrifice for our protection and freedom. We will keep them in our thoughts and prayers, always.

HYDROPOWER REGULATORY EFFICIENCY ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. I rise today to express my support for the Hydropower Regulatory Efficiency Act of 2013, H.R. 267. This important legislation will encourage and facilitate the development of clean and renewable hydropower capacity in the United States.

Hydropower has played a key role in the economic and industrial development of the State of Alabama over the last 100 years. In fact, according to the National Hydropower Association, Alabama ranks among the top ten States in hydropower generation, with over 8,700,000 megawatt-hours of conventional hydrogeneration. I believe hydropower will continue to make important contributions to meet Alabama's energy needs well into the future. For that reason, I believe the Hydropower Regulatory Efficiency Act of 2013 is an important piece of legislation that merits this body's full support. I would like to recognize the excellent work of the Senate Energy Committee, including the chairman and ranking member, on this legislation. At this time, I wish to ask the ranking member for permission to engage her in a brief colloquy concerning her understanding of Section 6 of this legislation.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I welcome an exchange for the record.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank my colleague for her willingness to discuss this legislation. Section 6 of the Hydropower Regulatory Efficiency Act of 2013 promotes hydropower development by directing the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, FERC, to investigate the feasibility of a more streamlined licensing process for certain hydro projects that should not be subjected to the lengthy and expensive licensing process that was designed for projects with many more complicated issues and stakeholder interests.

Under H.R. 267, two types of projects would be eligible for the 2-year licensing process: new hydro developments at existing nonpowered dams and closed-loop pumped storage hydro. It is my understanding that adding generation capacity at existing nonpowered dams would tap into an important and substantial renewable energy resource at projects where the impacts of dam construction have already been realized.

For hydropower developers to take full advantage of any streamlined licensing process that FERC may develop as contemplated in Section 6 of the act, I believe there needs to be a good understanding of what types of pumped storage projects would be considered ''closed-loop pumped storage projects.'' This term is not defined in the act, and I am not aware of any generally accepted engineering or industry definition for that term.

In order that I might have a better understanding of the types of hydropower projects that would be eligible

for a streamlined licensing process that FERC may develop in accordance with Section 6 of the act, would the ranking member kindly provide a description of the types of pumped storage projects that she would consider to be ''closed-loop pumped storage''?

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Senator for his support of this legislation and for his inquiry about Section 6 of the Act. Streamlining the licensing process for ''closed-loop pumped storage'' projects will encourage development of new and important sources of renewable energy that will help balance the country's energy resources and provide critical support to the Nation's power grid.

Section 6 of the bill directs FERC to develop criteria for identifying projects featuring ''closed loop pumped storage'' that would be appropriate for licensing within a 2-year process. This term was used in the bill to generally describe pumped storage projects that have a low impact on the various resources considered by FERC during the licensing process such as environmental, recreational, and navigation interests.

For example, pumped storage projects that are removed from major streams are likely to have fewer significant resource impacts and issues to be addressed and resolved, which makes them appropriate for the 2-year licensing process. Accordingly, the types of pumped storage projects considered ''closed loop'' and, therefore, eligible for FERC's expedited licensing process under this bill, would include projects where the upper and lower reservoirs do not impound or directly withdraw water from a navigable stream and projects that are not continuously connected to a naturally-flowing water feature.

These types of ''closed loop pumped storage'' designs are candidates for a 2-year licensing process because the resource impacts associated with such projects can be minimal as compared to more traditional pumped storage hydro designs and other conventional hydro projects for which the existing FERC licensing process was designed.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank Ranking Member MURKOWSKI for her explanation. Again, I applaud her for her work on the Hydropower Regulatory Efficiency Act of 2013 and for her leadership in this body.

VOTE EXPLANATIONS

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I regret having missed the July 31, 2013 vote on the confirmation of Byron Jones, of Minnesota, to be Director, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of the confirmation of Mr. JONES.

I also regret having missed three votes on August 1, 2013. The three votes that I missed are as follows: the nomination of Raymond Chen to be a United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit; cloture on S. 1243, Transportation, Housing, and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations; and the nomination of Samantha Power to serve as the United States Ambassador to the United Nations. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of all three votes.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Madam President, I was unable to cast my vote earlier this week on the nomination of James Comey to be the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, FBI, and the nominees for the National Labor Relations Board.

Had I been present, I would have voted to confirm Mr. Comey as FBI Director and would have voted in support of the motions to invoke cloture and confirmation of the nominations of Kent Hirozawa, Nancy Schiffer, and Mark Pearce to be members of the National Labor Relations Board.

REMEMBERING LINDY BOGGS

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I wish to pay tribute to an incredible woman—former Congresswoman and Ambassador Lindy Boggs—who was a trailblazer for women and a passionate advocate for the people of Louisiana and people across the country who too often don't have a voice in Washington.

When I first became a Member of Congress in 1983, Lindy was one of only 21 women serving in the House of Representatives. I will always be grateful for the kindness and generosity she showed in taking me under her wing—and it was the same for so many other women who followed her in Congress and found in her a role model of such dignity and strength.

No one will ever forget her courage in the face of unspeakable tragedy—the loss of her husband, Congressman Hale Boggs, whose plane disappeared during a campaign trip to Alaska in 1972. Louisianans, including her husband's closest friends, urged her to run for the seat in a special election the next year, and she became the first woman elected to Congress from the State where she was beloved.

I remember visiting Lindy's home State of Louisiana years later and being overwhelmed at the outpouring of love and respect the people she represented had for her—and with good reason. Throughout her time in Congress, she was a champion for civil rights, women's equality, and social justice.

During her first term in Congress, Lindy was assigned to the House Banking Committee. At one point, the committee was considering an amendment to a lending bill banning discrimination on the basis of race, age or veteran status.

Seizing the opportunity, Lindy quickly added the words ''sex or marital status'' to the amendment and ran to a copy machine to make copies for each Member. She told her colleagues:

> Knowing the Members composing this committee as well as I do, I'm sure it was just an oversight that we didn't have 'sex' or 'marital status' included. I've taken care of that, and I trust it meets with the committee's approval.

That is how sex discrimination was made illegal in the Equal Credit Opportunity Act of 1974.

She was a skilled lawmaker who used her immense personal charm, political savvy and intellect to win over colleagues on issues that were critical to her State and the country. One of her Republican House colleagues remarked:

> It was impossible not to like Lindy. She liked everybody. She was nice to everybody. She achieved more with less huff and puff and bluster than any of the rest of us did.

Lindy stood up for equality and racial justice, even when her views were not popular with some voters in her own district. When she left Congress in 1991 after serving nine terms, she was the only White Member to represent a Black-majority district.

She led the fight for equal pay for women in government jobs and for greater access to government contracts for women business owners. She worked to protect women from domestic violence, and inspired so many young people—women and men—to follow her into public service.

Lindy was a pioneer in so many ways—the first woman to chair a major political party's nominating convention, the first woman to serve as U.S. Ambassador to the Vatican, and the first woman to have a room in the Capitol named in her honor. But because of her leadership and mentorship, Lindy made sure that she would not be the last and that generations of other women would be able to follow in her extraordinary footsteps.

My heart goes out to her family, her friends and all of those whose lives she touched. She will be dearly missed.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, today I honor and celebrate the life of an extraordinary American: Marie Corinne Morrison Claiborne Boggs, who we all knew as ''Lindy.'' She was a remarkable national leader, trailblazer for women everywhere, wife, mother, and a friend. Lindy taught me—and an entire generation of Louisianians, both men and women, through her example—to answer the call of public service.

With her death last Saturday, July 28, 2013, our entire State is in mourning but we are also celebrating a life well lived.

Throughout her life, she shaped the world to become a better and more just place. When she was born in 1916, women could not vote and segregation reigned supreme. But she refused to accept the world as it was and set about to change it. She lived through both World Wars and the Great Depression. Despite all of these daunting obstacles, Lindy—a graceful woman with a strong, passionate calling to serve others—was not deterred.

Like many women of her time, she married a man of great promise—and ultimately great power—Hale Boggs. But

when he was lost in a tragic plane accident in Alaska, she—unlike many—stepped up and into his shoes, trusting God to lead her forward.

She was elected to succeed her husband in Congress on March 20, 1973, and became the first woman elected to the House of Representatives from our State. At the time, there were only 15 women in the U.S. House of Representatives and none in the U.S. Senate.

But Lindy never let the novelty of this, the pressure of work and family, or any other challenge she faced throughout her career stand in her way or deter her from serving her State and her country.

Her keen political mind, iron will and graceful Southern charm helped her become one of the most formidable forces Congress has ever known. She was known for bridging the gap between Republicans and Democrats and convincing her colleagues to do what was right with poise, kindness and reason.

As her colleague Bill Frenzel, a Republican from Minnesota said of her: ''It was impossible not to like Lindy. She liked everybody. She was nice to everybody. She achieved more with less huff and puff and bluster than any of the rest of us did.''

She used her formidable influence to help lead the fight for civil rights, pay equity for women and the right for women to hold a mortgage on her own home without the necessity of a husband's signature.

As a member of the Banking Committee she inserted a provision barring discrimination over sex or marital status into the Equal Credit Opportunity Act of 1974. She did not tell her colleagues before she did it and simply told them:

Knowing the members composing this committee as well as I do, I'm sure it was just an oversight that we didn't have 'sex' or 'marital status' included. I've taken care of that, and I trust it meets with the committee's approval.

There was no objection! And tens of millions of women were given access to credit, opportunity and a future of their own.

Lindy never tired in her fight to expand opportunities for women, whether it was helping women as candidates for public office at all levels of government, pressing Federal cabinet secretaries and agency heads to promote women to senior leadership and policy positions in government, supporting women that work two to three jobs to keep food on the table and a roof over their head or speaking out for victims of domestic violence.

In fact today, there is a place named ''Lindy's Place'' in New Orleans that carries on her work to support abused and battered women.

In 1976, she nominated a young woman from New Orleans to the U.S. Military Academy as soon as the Army dropped the gender bar, and then quickly nominated women to all four service academies. She applauded NASA when Sally Ride was the first female American astronaut to go into space. She knew women could really excel at anything whether it was on this planet or beyond.

Following her retirement from Congress in 1991, she once again answered the call to serve as the first female ambassador to the Holy See where she continued to exhibit the same strength, intelligence and respect that she was known for throughout her life. She was most certainly the only person to call the Pope ''darlin'!''

Lindy's decades of service to her family, community, Nation and church reminds us all to give of ourselves fully to a worthy cause, and is an example of what we can achieve when we do. She has certainly set the gold standard for public service.

But knowing Lindy as well as I did, I believe she was most proud of her 3 children, 8 grandchildren and 18 great-grandchildren.

As many of you know, the special cloakroom for the women of the House bears Lindy's name. A few months ago when we celebrated the 40th anniversary of Lindy's election, she said she was proud of that room, but that ''Maybe, someday, the women will have to relinquish the room when women are the majority in the House.''

I know that Lindy will be proud when women achieve this milestone. Even after that day comes, Lindy's legacy will continue to inspire us for many years to come.

REMEMBERING WILLIAM H. GRAY III

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, today I wish to honor and remember the full life of Congressman William H. Gray, III, and his exceptional service to his community, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and our country.

Bill was born in Baton Rouge, LA, the second child of Dr. William H. Gray, Jr., and Hazel Gray. Though he spent the first 8 years of his life in Florida, Bill moved to Philadelphia in 1949 and remained a distinguished resident of our Commonwealth until his recent passing.

Bill was a pastor and shepherd for his congregation, a respected member of the U.S. House of Representatives, and a powerful advocate for higher education. Today we honor his life, his good works, and his legacy.

As a pastor, Bill followed in the footsteps of his father and grandfather and led Philadelphia's Bright Hope Baptist Church for more than 33 years. Knowing that the ministry was not just something you did on Sunday morning, Bill always believed strongly in the principle of a ''whole ministry,'' that the church must tend to all the needs of its entire congregation. Under Bill's leadership, that congregation quickly grew to over 4,000 parishioners, but Bill remained committed to his ''whole ministry'' and made sure to continue his important advocacy work on issues ranging from housing, to economic justice, to excellent education for all. Bill often said that his position as pastor of Bright Hope was the most important job he had ever had, one that cultivated the skills and priorities that shaped his life's work.

As a member of the U.S. House of Representatives, Bill proudly represented the Second District of Pennsylvania from 1979 to 1991 and built a reputation as a thoughtful and effective leader. Bill quickly rose through the ranks of leadership during his 12 years in Congress and assumed the chairmanship of the Budget Committee, after only 6 years in office. Three years later, in 1988, he was elected to chair his party's House caucus, and then in 1989 he became the House majority whip, the third-ranking leadership position in the House.

As a lifelong advocate for higher education, Bill chose to leave Congress at the pinnacle of his career to accept the position of president and CEO of the United Negro College Fund. He said at the time that ''Woodrow Wilson used to say, 'My constituency is the next generation,' and you know, that's why I left Congress, because my constituency, really, is the next generation.'' Bill's 12-year tenure at UNCF brought unexpected growth in support for historically Black colleges, and he constantly sought innovative ways to both attract new investment and increase existing funding. By the time he left UNCF 12 years later, Bill and his team had raised more than $1.54 billion.

Bill never rested and was never satisfied with one job at a time. While leading the UNCF, he was asked by President Clinton in 1994 to lead the efforts to restore democracy in Haiti. His work there earned him the Medal of Honor from the President of Haiti. In 2004, Bill started Gary Global Strategies, Inc., and served as a director on multiple corporate boards, including at Dell, JPMorgan Chase, and Pfizer. He also served as vice chairman for the Pew Commission on Children in Foster Care and on the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council.

Bill often said that he had ''always been taught by my folk, parents, grandparents, that service is sort of the rent you pay for the space you occupy. And so, what I've tried to do is direct my life towards service based on faith and commitment, and social justice.'' As Bill's family and friends mourn his passing, I pray that they will be comforted by the knowledge that this great Nation will never forget the commitment Bill demonstrated to each of us, to his ''whole ministry.'' May he rest in peace.

TRIBUTE TO BLAISE MESSINGER

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, today I wish to recognize Blaise Messinger, Connecticut's 2013 Teacher of the Year.

Every year the Connecticut State Department of Education selects one teacher for this prestigious title who

then serves as an ambassador for education throughout the State and also represents Connecticut on a national scale, working on panels and advisory committees with other State teachers of the year, as well as with the National State Teacher of the Year Program and the U.S. Department of Education. This year's Connecticut Teacher of the Year, Blaise Messinger, was selected from 4 finalists, 15 semifinalists, and over 80 district teachers of the year for this tremendous distinction.

Mr. Messinger makes an extraordinary difference in the lives of his students and their families and at his school. He is an inspiration to his colleagues. At Woodside Intermediate School in Cromwell, CT, he is well known for his commitment to making fifth grade engaging and interesting. An actor in Los Angeles and New York City for many years, Mr. Messinger dedicates this thespian acumen and ability to his students' progress. By making school fun and relevant, his students remember what he teaches and come out of his classroom as enthusiastic learners. When addressing fellow educators as Connecticut Teacher of the Year, he advised his colleagues to ''think back to that teacher you can still hear in your head.'' I am grateful that Mr. Messinger came to Connecticut to apply his talents, high energy, and positive spirit as a community leader.

One personal inspiration for Mr. Messinger's incredible impact as a teacher is his own family—especially his two sons, Ethan and Caleb, who live with him and his wife Kimberley in Cromwell. Mr. Messinger has said that his love for them—and his witnessing how teachers impacted their lives, especially his son Ethan who has autism—drives his desire to change the lives of children.

I thank the Connecticut State Department of Education and the National Teacher of the Year Program for representing the voices of passionate, talented teachers and recognizing their heroic efforts. Mr. Messinger has already done great work on a national level, sparking important discussions about changing the way we educate our future generations. I am very proud that he represents Connecticut as 2013 Teacher of the Year and invite my colleagues to join me in applauding his invaluable contributions to our country.

SYRIA

Mr. BEGICH. Madam President, I wish to speak about the crisis in Syria and the role that one company in one nation is playing in perpetuating the strife.

Every day Syria descends deeper into chaos and civil war. Since March 2011, more than 100,000 Syrians have been killed, an estimated 5 million have been internally displaced, and at least 1.6 million have fled their war-torn land. By the end of 2013, half of Syria's population may have left their homes.

The pressure on neighboring countries, Turkey, Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq, is only increasing. Beyond the refugee crisis, the resulting chaos threatens unprecedented violence and instability for all of Syria's neighbors. As Syria's conflict grows increasingly radical, its borders are increasably insecure.

In August 2011, now nearly 2 years ago, President Obama declared that Syria's dictator, Bashar Asad, had lost all legitimacy and ''must go.'' At the time of that statement, the number of Syrians butchered by the Asad regime numbered a then-shocking 6,000. There were frequent grim comparisons to Bashar al-Asad's father Hafez, who shelled Hama for days in 1982, killing perhaps 20,000. Now, today we see a nation on a path to destruction and Hafez Asad's 20,000 dead is just a fraction of the number his son has killed.

America must take seriously its commitment to doing what it can to bring an end to the Asad regime. We must not tolerate the empowerment of forces antithetical to our interests. And we certainly must not be complicit in their behavior.

The triumph of the Asad regime would validate and encourage the murderous behavior of leaders who spurn democracy and the rule of law. It would empower the belligerent regime in Tehran and offer support to Iranian proxies who seek to annihilate Israel and ultimately threaten our own nation.

While we view the Asad regime with rebellion, some others have stepped up support for him, facilitating Asad's brutal success. Among these is the Government of Russia. Russia has demonstrated time and again its support for Bashar Asad and its opposition to our own humanitarian and democratic values.

Russia has consistently thwarted multilateral efforts to stem the violence in Syria, including vetoing a United Nations Security Council resolution that would have penalized Asad's failure to carry out a peace plan. It has made clear its unwavering support for Asad's brutality. Addressing the compounding challenges posed by Russian intransience has proven increasingly difficult. The Obama administration has made a serious effort to engage in a direct dialog over matters related to Syria, most recently along the sidelines of the G8.

But that effort has not been fruitful. Indeed, the Russian Government has demonstrated no genuine interest in achieving a resolution to the Syria conflict. Moscow appears to simply enjoy the political cover that U.S.-Russian talks provide. Russia remains unwavering in its support for an Asad regime that has hosted its bases, served Russian economic interests, and anchored what remains of Russia's influence in the region.

At the same time, Moscow continues to flout international norms. Russia is acting antagonistically toward our Nation. It perpetuates human rights abuses at home. It sacrifices the well-being of Russia's orphans for the sake of political gains. And it is sheltering the fugitive Edward Snowden.

Russia's state-owned arms export firm, Rosoboronexport, has exacerbated the crisis in Syria. Instead of promoting a path to peace, Rosoboronexport has provided the Syrian Government with the means to perpetrate widespread and systemic attacks on its own people. It has supplied Asad with guns, grenades, tank parts, attack aircraft, anti-ship cruise missiles, and air defense missiles, which his regime in turn uses to perpetuate its rule and murder innocent civilians. Rosoboronexport also has made a commitment to provide Syria with S–300 advanced anti-aircraft missiles that would protect Syrian air dominance and facilitate its continued attacks on its civilian population.

These weapons do not threaten the Syrian people alone. They challenge American interests in the region, including the safety and security of Israel.

Let's look at one particular example that has received a good deal of international attention. It is certainly possible that NATO or our own Nation may decide it is necessary to create a no-fly zone over Syria to stop the carnage. Russian-provided S–300s would present a major threat to U.S. or allied aircraft and pilots seeking to establish such a zone. They would also pose a direct threat to Israeli civil and military air traffic.

The Russian transfer of weapons to Syria is not just inhumane, but it is a violation of U.S. law. The Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 and the Iran, North Korea, and Syria Nonproliferation Accountability Act, as well as Executive Orders 13382 and 13582 all demand sanctions against ''those entities that materially assist, or provide support for, the Government of Syria.''

In addition, the fiscal year 2013 National Defense Authorization Act prohibits contracts with Rosoboronexport, and section 1233 of S. 1197, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, which was passed by the Senate Armed Services Committee, prohibits the use of funds to enter contracts with Rosoboronexport.

In light of the lack of progress of diplomatic efforts to end Russian support for the Asad regime and the direct nature of the threat these escalating arms sales pose, it is incumbent upon the U.S. Government to pursue more aggressive measures as mandated by U.S. law to create incentives for the Russians to change their behavior. Indeed, Senator KELLY AYOTTE and I have written to the President urging that he take this course.

With the exception of particular circumstances of true military necessity, the administration must end all financial dealings with Rosoboronexport and begin to impose sanctions against Rosoboronexport.

We must also impose sanctions against any Russian manufacturers that provide military equipment such as advanced anti-aircraft systems to Syria in contravention of U.S. law.

In my view, it is unconscionable for us to provide Russia with the recently announced $550 million contract for 30 additional Mi-17 helicopters, a purchase the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction has strongly advised against.

American taxpayer dollars should not be provided to a Russian state-owned corporation that is complicit in the murder of tens of thousands of innocent Syrian men, women, and children. The Department of Defense has the authority to end this contract with Rosoboronexport, which fails to meet the requirements of the Afghan military, and I have joined many of my colleagues in urging the administration to review this sale.

The United States must not be complicit in the arming of the Asad regime nor in the empowerment of countries like Iran, which will triumph if Asad succeeds. I urge the administration to impose sanctions on Rosoboronexport and to demonstrate to Russia that its behavior in Syria will not be cost-free in its relations with our Nation.

REMEMBERING PETER SORBO

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, today I wish to honor the service of Mr. Peter Sorbo, of Connecticut, whose family resides in Waterbury, CT. In January 1943, 18 year-old Peter Sorbo enlisted in the Army to serve his country during World War II. Deployed to the European theater and assigned to Bombardment Group 384, Squadron 545, he served as a waist gunner on a B–17 Flying Fortress and perished on August 12, 1943 after his plane was shot down above the Rhine.

I would like to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Waterbury Republican American that outlines this fascinating story about one of Connecticut's brave soldiers.

Many of Connecticut's sons, like Peter Sorbo, gave their lives defending our freedom and they deserve our perpetual gratitude. I ask that this body devote itself to remembering these courageous men and women by honoring their sacrifices and forever preserving their memories.

The following article written by Mike Patrick appeared in the July 29, 2013 edition of the Waterbury Republican-American. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE TRUTH . . . FINALLY

IT TOOK DECADES, BUT WATERBURY SISTERS LEARN ABOUT THEIR BROTHER'S DEATH IN WORLD WAR II

WATERBURY.—A family friend, some Internet research and the handwritten notes of prisoners of war have unearthed a story of tragic heroism that after seven decades has at last brought closure for two Waterbury sisters whose brother died in World War II.

''He was a good kid, a really good boy,'' Marie Debiase said through tears. ''After 70 years, we're finally finding out what happened to him.''

All she knew all these years, she said, was that her brother, Peter Sorbo, died when his plane was shot down over the Rhine in 1943.

But recently, her sister Joann Devino met Carmen Mancuso, one of their brother's old friends, at church. Mancuso said his son Richard was pretty handy at Internet research and may be able to learn a little more about the circumstances of Sorbo's death.

The sisters gave them some of their brother's letters and other documents, and Richard Mancuso, a sales manager from Madison and self-described history buff, got to work.

''I read a few of them it struck my interest,'' he said. ''I started Googling it.''

Mancuso discovered a treasure trove of information, including reports of Sorbo's death written by the men who served with him that day.

The following story was pieced together from those reports, and from family recollections.

Peter Sorbo was working in the United Cigar store late in 1942 when a woman came in and chided him with something like, ''What are you doing working here when my son is overseas?''

The tall, quiet 17-year-old took it to heart. He quit school, to the consternation of his parents, and enlisted in January 1943.

''I remember every bit of that day he went into the Army,'' Debiase said. ''It was a terrible blizzard that day.''

For the next several months, he wrote his family letters from the European Theater, mostly general, mundane greetings. Those letters would later prove helpful to Mancuso in learning how he died.

In August that same year, the waist gunner on a recently formed B–17 Flying Fortress squadron went AWOL. Sorbo, by then a staff sergeant, was assigned to take his place on a bombing mission over a synthetic fuel plant in Germany.

It was an extremely dangerous operation. B–17s were large, obvious and difficult for their gunners to defend. That was especially so for waist gunners, who endured sub-zero temperatures and thin oxygen while shooting Axis fighter planes through a very small window into a powerful airstream that made it hard to lock onto a target.

The plane was hit by a 20-mm shell that caught Sorbo in the neck.

The plane started to go down under continuous enemy fire. The crew prepared to bail out. One tried desperately to get a parachute onto Sorbo, who was already dying from his neck wound.

Then the plane exploded.

Six airmen parachuted out, including one who said the blast blew him out of the craft, and another who said he saw the plane go down as he drifted into the Rhine.

All six survivors were captured by the Nazis. Sorbo and three others were killed, including the crewman who tried to save him.

Devino said she often thinks of that heroic airman.

''I thought of the family,'' she said. ''If he didn't stop to try and get a parachute on Peter, he might have just been a POW.''

The family didn't know any of this for decades.

After the plane was shot down, the military sent a letter saying Sorbo was missing in action.

''All those years, we were hoping maybe he was a prisoner, maybe he would get back,'' Debiase said. ''My mother never stopped hoping.''

It wasn't until the war was over that the government acknowledged the plane and Sorbo's remains had been found, and asked the family if it would like them to be returned for burial.

Debiase said her family doubted from the beginning that the remains were his, but figured it was a service member who needed burial anyway, so they accepted them.

''Who we got, I don't know, but we respect it as my brother,'' Debiase said. ''We visit the cemetery and put the flags on when they need to be put on.''

Sorbo's loss devastated his family. His father was so distraught that he walked off a 20-year job as a tool setter at Chase Brass & Copper.

''He couldn't handle it,'' Devino said.

The parents doted on and spoiled their remaining son. He ended up drafted into the Korean War, returned an alcoholic, and died young.

Debiase and her husband, Michael, live in a lovely house with a dining room table long enough to accommodate their many family gatherings.

Her brother Peter, she said, wanted to go into radio. He was funny and kind and protective—all the things an eldest brother should be to his siblings.

''We at least know what really happened,'' she said. ''We never knew. I'm glad my parents never really knew.''

Her memories of Peter, she said, she has ''stored away in my heart'' since she was 9, the age she was when he died. She's 79 now and Devino is 83.

Debiase looked over at that dining room table, on this day strewn with Sorbo's sepia-toned service photographs.

''Every holiday you sit down and say, There should be another chair,''' she said. ''But there isn't.''

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

SANDWICH, NEW HAMPSHIRE

● Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, today I wish to honor Sandwich, NH—a town in Carroll 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.

Sandwich is a picturesque community situated in the shadow of the Sandwich Dome, that has through the hard work and dedication of its citizens retained the look and feel of a traditional colonial New Hampshire village.

Sandwich was granted a charter by Governor Benning Wentworth on October 25, 1763, and derives its name from John Montague, the 4th Earl of Sandwich. Today, the population has grown to include over 1,300 residents.

Carpenters, wheelwrights, and blacksmiths formed the base of Sandwich's vibrant artisan history. The beauty of the region, and its rich history, has attracted a variety of artists to Sandwich.

In 1920, Sandwich Home Industries was founded. Today it is known statewide as the League of New Hampshire Craftsmen.

Sandwich is also home to one of New Hampshire's premier agricultural fairs. Held every year on Columbus Day weekend, the Sandwich Fair has been providing a venue for the celebration of

New Hampshire's agrarian history for the past 125 years.

Named for the owner of the nearby grist mill, the historic covered Durgin Bridge is listed on the National Register of Historic Places, and has been a part of the community since 1869. Before being washed away in 1865, a previous span served as a connection to North Conway for the Underground Railroad.

Sandwich 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 Sandwich as they celebrate the town's 250th anniversary.●

ROSHOLT, SOUTH DAKOTA

● Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Madam President, I wish to pay tribute to the 100th anniversary of the founding of Rosholt, SD. Rosholt is a thriving agricultural community in northeastern South Dakota.

Rosholt was named for Julius Rosholt, an entrepreneur whose efforts brought the railroad to the townsite. Lots were first sold in the newly platted town on August 11, 1913, and shortly thereafter residents began to start businesses that would serve the growing community. The visionary spirit of these early pioneers is evident 100 years later, as the town gathers for their centennial celebration.

Today, folks in Rosholt are as hardworking and determined as ever, exhibiting the small-town South Dakota values that make our State a great place to live. Numerous prosperous businesses line Main Street and the town is home to the region's largest grain elevator. Rosholt's educators and students set a high standard of academic excellence that serves as a model for the rest of our State. The Rosholt School has recently been recognized by the South Dakota Department of Education as a ''Distinguished School.''

Rosholt's history teaches us that when a community comes together it can do great things. The citizens of Rosholt have an undeniable pride in their community that will serve them well for many generations to come. I am proud to congratulate them on reaching this historic anniversary and wish them the best in the future.●

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT COLONEL TIM SCHEPPER

● Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Madam President, today I wish to recognize LTC Tim Schepper, who on July 15, 2013, became the first pilot to log 5,000 hours in the B–1 aircraft.

Lieutenant Colonel Schepper is a senior evaluator for the 28th Operations Group and a B–1 pilot at Ellsworth Air Force Base in South Dakota. His impressive flying record on the B–1 highlights an Air Force career that spans 27 years, including two stints totaling over 14 years at Ellsworth. His record of 5,000 hours is well ahead of any other B–1 pilot in the Air Force. It is nearly 1,800 hours more than any pilot at Ellsworth and nearly 800 hours more than anyone Air Force-wide. Over one-quarter of his flying time, 1,300 hours, are combat hours.

He grew up on a ranch near Vargas, MN and joined the Air Force in 1986. In addition to his various duty assignments at Ellsworth, Lieutenant Colonel Schepper has also been stationed at bases in California, Texas, Mississippi and North Dakota and served 3 years as B–1 Functional Area Manager, B–1 Realistic Training Manager, Deputy Chief Flight Operations and Training Branch at Air Combat Command Headquarters in Langley, VA. From June 2010 to June 2011, he served as Deputy Commander, 379th Expeditionary Operations Group, in Southwest Asia.

His major awards and accomplishments include the Bronze Star Medal; Global War on Terrorism Service Medal; Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal; Iraq Campaign Medal; Afghanistan Campaign Medal; Air Force Commendation Medal with three oak leaf clusters; Air Force Combat Action Medal; Meritorious Unit Award with one oak leaf cluster; Combat Readiness Medal with five oak leaf clusters; National Defense Service Medal with bronze star; Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal; Meritorious Service Medal with four oak leaf clusters; Aerial Achievement Medal; and Air Medal with five oak leaf clusters.

Lt. Col. Schepper's feat underscores the great work of all B–1 personnel in the Air Force as well as civilian personnel from Boeing, who have been working on the B–1 program since it was introduced to the Air Force 30 years ago. According to Boeing's Dan Ruder, who was on hand for Lieutenant Colonel Schepper's record-setting flight arrival back at Ellsworth, the B–1 ''has nearly 10,000 combat missions logged and has been deployed for 8 consecutive years. This day solidifies how the B–1 is still a critical element to our national security.''

Like many Air Force personnel, Lieutenant Colonel Schepper and his wife are quick to credit family as well as the military and civilian communities for their support over the years. ''My family has always supported me significantly,'' said the Ellsworth pilot. ''I've had five deployments over the past 10 years, and obviously as everyone knows, when you're away from home there are a lot of things that still need to be done. My wife and my kids had to endure and do a lot of things to make up for when I wasn't around.''

Added his wife, Tania, ''We have been part of this community for so long. He didn't just accomplish this on his own. It takes maintenance, and it takes the help and support of other pilots, and community members.''

Lieutenant Colonel Schepper will be retiring in August, and I congratulate him on his impressive flying record, as well as his distinguished military service career, both of which serve as great standards of achievement for military personnel and the civilian community. I wish him all the best in his retirement.●

REMEMBERING KIP YOSHIO TOKUDA

● Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I would like to pay tribute to a dedicated community leader, compassionate public servant, and advocate from the State of Washington, Kip Tokuda.

I am proud to recognize Kip as the kind of civic champion who did so much for all of the communities he touched, especially for children and families in need.

Mr. Tokuda was born in Seattle in 1946 and eventually served his home district in the Washington State House of Representatives from 1994 to 2002. Through his work on behalf of his constituents and Washington State, he earned a reputation as a deeply principled legislator and respect from both sides of the aisle.

In addition to his service as an elected official, Kip also cofounded the Asian Pacific Islander Community Leadership Foundation, an organization that empowers young people from Asian Pacific Islander communities to seek leadership positions in government and nonprofit organizations. He helped start the Japanese Cultural & Community Center of Washington and last year was awarded the Order of the Rising Sun from the Emperor of Japan for his work to build and maintain strong ties between the United States and Japan. Most recently, he was appointed to the city of Seattle's Community Police Commission, where he worked to create a more diverse police force.

But most importantly, he was a dedicated father, husband, friend, and mentor to many.

People respected Kip because he respected them, and even though he accomplished so much in his life and earned a position of influence, you could always count on Kip to listen.

As a longtime Seattle resident, his kindness and passion inspired all who knew him.

Kip passed away on July 13, 2013 from a heart attack at the age of 66.

Kip is survived by his wife Barb and their two children, Molly and Pei-Ming.

He will be missed by many, but his legacy of service will live on through the organizations he founded and the lives he touched.

Mr. President, I would like to ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Kip Tokuda. He lived a full life and our thoughts are with his loved ones at this time of great and sudden loss.●

50TH ANNUAL ARKANSAS STATE CHAMPIONSHIP HORSE SHOW

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, it is with pleasure that I rise today to honor

the 50th Annual Arkansas State Championship Horse Show. In 1963, three horse show associations in Arkansas joined efforts to hold a State equestrian championship. This championship show originated when the Hillbilly Horse Show Association, the Central Arkansas Horse Show Association, and the Northeast Central Arkansas Horse Show Association joined together to host a championship competition. Over the years, this partnership has expanded to include 12 horse show associations from across the great State of Arkansas. For the past 50 years, the top 5 contenders from each association compete to earn the honor of being named the Champion Rider of Arkansas.

Arkansans have long enjoyed riding horses for sport and pleasure. Horse shows across the State attract fans seeking to witness the athleticism and agility of the sportsmen and the horses. While these riders make it look easy, horse riding requires a great deal of balance, coordination, and physical strength. Each rider must also exemplify self-discipline, responsibility, and patience with their horse. Horse riding is important to the people of my State, and I support keeping this heritage strong.

At the 50th Annual Arkansas State Championship Horse Show later this summer, competitors will again showcase their talent by riding different breeds in a variety of equestrian disciplines. They will compete with great sportsmanship and at the end of the show one rider will be named as the best in Arkansas. The competitive events will include the talents of Arkansans of all ages and hailing from each corner of the State.

I ask my colleagues to join me today in congratulating the Arkansas State Championship Horse Show on its 50th anniversary and in wishing its competitors and fans a wonderful day of celebration.

QUALE'S ELECTRONICS

● Mr. RISCH. Madam President, family-owned small businesses are a crucial part of America's landscape. They supply a demand in locations all across the United States, and are built on the sweat and dedication of their owners and employees. It is for this reason that today I wish to rise to honor Quale's Electronics, its founder Mel Quale, and all those who now manage and work for this longstanding family business.

In 1966, Mr. Quale opened Quale's Electronics, located in Twin Falls, ID. Quale's Electronics began humbly as a television repair shop, but after only a year in business Mr. Quale expanded his business to include retail television and home electronics sales. Small businesses often have trouble obtaining deals to outlet products from top brands, but Mr. Quale's persistence in the late 1960s through early 1970s paid off with several high-level brands in the electronics industry signing them on as a local dealer. Sales quickly took off. Quale's Electronics expanded to a new and larger location in 1976. Always striving to stay ahead of the curve, Mr. Quale sought out and procured deals to sell many of the exciting new electronics that debuted in the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s. Quale Electronics to this day remains a family business. Today, Helen Quale, and Mr. Quale's sons, Bruce and Steve, spearhead the ownership and management responsibilities.

In addition to running a successful small business, Mr. Quale also takes a keen interest in his community, offering his time and funding to important local causes and projects. Mr. Quale has previously served as a member of the Bureau of Land Management Resource Advisory Council for 9 years, public lands advisor for the Magic Valley Trail Machine, and 20 years as a precinct committeeman for the Twin Falls Republican Party. Additionally, Mr. Quale is an active member of the Twin Falls Rotary Club.

The success Mr. Quale has found in his business and the work he has done for his community is a testament to the important economic and civic good that is created by self-employed entrepreneurs all across the U.S. and a prime example of the spirit of Idaho's entrepreneurs. It is inspirational to see a family-owned business with decades-old roots spanning more than one generation continue to grow and succeed. Such businesses are vital not only to the local and national economy, but also to their home communities, and will always have a prominent place in the fabric of the United States.●

HAMPTON FIRST RESPONDERS

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I wish to recognize first responders from New Hampshire who heroically worked together to save two swimmers who were struggling to make their way back to shore at Hampton Beach in Hampton, NH, on July 25, 2013.

On the night of July 25, Hampton Fire & Rescue and the Hampton Police Department received notification that three individuals swimming in the water at Hampton Beach were unable to make their way back to shore. First responders from the departments immediately sprang into action and quickly arrived at Hampton Beach. While one of the three individuals was rescued by fellow beachgoers, two young men remained in the water not far from shore, struggling in riptide conditions and unable to swim back to land.

Hampton firefighters including Fire Chief Christopher Silver, Deputy Fire Chief Jameson Ayotte, Captain William Kennedy, Lieutenant Michael Brillard, Greg Smushkin, Jed Carpentier, Nate Denio, Jason Newman, Kyle Jameson, Kyle Averill, Buck Frost, Matthew Clement, Donald Thibeault and Hampton Police Officer James Deluca worked together to save the two 28-year old men who were caught in the water. The first responders worked in varying capacities, with some in the water, some aboard the Hampton Fire Department's rescue boat and others on shore, and acted as a unified team to successfully pull the swimmers to safety.

First responders are fundamental to the safety of individuals and communities in New Hampshire and throughout the country, as evidenced by the lives that were so recently rescued at Hampton Beach. These public servants came together from across different departments and divisions, as they often do, to perform their selfless work on behalf of people in need. The work of heroes like those in Hampton often goes unnoticed, but it is important that we do not take for granted the daily efforts made by all first responders to make our communities safer and improve the quality of life of all Americans.

I commend these gentlemen for their selfless actions on the night of July 25. The Hampton-area community and all New Hampshire residents applaud the work that dedicated first responders do every day. We specifically thank this group of public servants for saving lives on the night of July 25, 2013.●

ALSTEAD, NEW HAMPSHIRE

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I wish to to commemorate the 250th anniversary of the town of Alstead, NH.

Alstead was first chartered by Massachusetts Governor Jonathan Belcher as one of nine forts established in 1735 to protect southwestern New Hampshire from attack. Once New Hampshire was decreed its own province, New Hampshire Governor Benning Wentworth granted the land, then called Newton, in 1752. The area was finally incorporated in 1763 and renamed Alstead in honor of Johann Heinrich Alsted, a German professor and encyclopedist, whose works were popular at Harvard College. Alstead was a predominantly agricultural community, but its waterways also provided sufficient power to run a number of small mills, including New Hampshire's first paper mill, built in 1793.

Alstead boasts a quintessentially New Hampshire history with the exception of a small misstep in 1781 when the town voted to join the State of Vermont. Alstead was not alone in this wavering allegiance after the Revolutionary War, but I am very pleased to report that residents came to their senses the following year and rejoined the Granite State.

Two hundred and fifty years later, Alstead's views of Feuer State Park and Warren Pond serve as a beautiful backdrop to the community's rich history and small town charm. From August to October, Alstead will celebrate their sestercentennial with historical plays and tours, parades, lectures and exhibits.

I congratulate Alstead on this milestone in their history and thank this

community for its great contributions to our State.●

CANDIA, NEW HAMPSHIRE

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I wish to commemorate the 250th anniversary of the town of Candia, NH.

Candia was first settled in 1743 and was colloquially known as ''Charmingfare,'' perhaps due to its many bridle paths and lovely scenery. Gov. Benning Wentworth incorporated the town in 1763 and renamed it Candia, likely in honor of the principal city of the Greek island of Crete, which he had visited after his graduation from Harvard College.

With some of the earliest farmed land in New Hampshire, Candia grew into a strong industrial center with the help of the railroad and well-established mills which dominated its economy. Today, Candia has become a popular tourist destination for its quaint New England feel, family-friendly attractions, beautiful scenery and ease of travel.

I was pleased to welcome award-winning Candia Vineyards to Washington this past June for our annual Experience New Hampshire reception, where Granite Staters and Washingtonians alike could sample their wonderful wares.

Candia will honor this 250th milestone through a yearlong series of celebrations commemorating their long and rich history. I congratulate this wonderful community on their sestercentennial and wish them continued success for their next 250 years.●

CROYDON, NEW HAMPSHIRE

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I rise today to commemorate the 250th anniversary of the town of Croydon, NH.

The town of Croydon was incorporated and granted in 1763 by Gov. Benning Wentworth. Named for the London suburb of Croydon, England, our Croydon is situated on the highlands between the Connecticut and Merrimack Rivers. It is home to Corbin Park, one of the largest private game reserves in New England. Visitors may hunt a variety of animals including elk, European boar and bison on 24,000 acres of forested and mountainous terrain. Croydon also boasts the Croydon Village School, one of two remaining one-room schoolhouses still in use in the State of New Hampshire.

Today, Croydon's quaint, small-town feel and natural beauty continue to charm visitors and residents alike today. I congratulate this close-knit community on their sestercentennial anniversary and wish them continued success in their next 250 years.●

GILSUM, NEW HAMPSHIRE

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, today I wish to recognize an important milestone for the town of Gilsum, NH, upon the occasion of its semiquincentennial anniversary. Situated in scenic southwest New Hampshire, Gilsum actually received its first charter in 1752 under the name Boyle but was never settled. Governor Benning Wentworth re-chartered this land in 1763 to five proprietors, including Samuel Gilbert and his son-in-law Thomas Sumner. The name ''Gilsum'' was a compromise reached to resolve Gilbert and Sumner's ongoing dispute over the name of their new settlement.

Historically, Gilsum was a farming and manufacturing community, making use of the nearby Ashuelot River to power multiple factories by the 1850s. Gilsum also boasted a productive mine, which provided important economic stability for the town during its early years of development. Today, Gilsum is home to the W.S. Badger Company, a quintessential New Hampshire small business success story that now sells its wonderful skincare products, including its ''Badger Balm,'' across the country.

Gilsum will mark its 250th anniversary in August with a parade, talent show, community exhibits and music to commemorate its proud heritage. I rise today to wish Gilsum a joyful celebration of this important milestone and thank all its citizens for their contributions to New Hampshire.●

HAMPTON, NEW HAMPSHIRE

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I rise today to congratulate the town of Hampton, NH, on the occasion of its 375th anniversary.

Coastal Hampton is one of the 4 original New Hampshire townships chartered by the General Court of Massachusetts. It was first settled in 1638 under the name Winnacunnet, an Algonquian word meaning ''pleasant pines. '' One year later, Winnacunnet's Puritan settlers renamed the town ''Hampton'' to honor the birthplace of their leader Reverend Stephen Bachiler, a colorful figure whose descendants still populate Hampton today.

Hampton was a modest but bustling community whose early industry centered around farming and fishing. All that changed with the arrival of the railroad in 1840. Visitors from Boston and other cities soon discovered the charms of Hampton's stunning coastline, aided by the Exeter, Hampton and Amesbury Trolley line, which connected inland mill towns to the seacoast. Today, thousands of visitors flock to Hampton's beaches to surf, sunbathe, or take to the high seas on chartered fishing or whale watching expeditions.

The Hampton Historical Society will host a series of events throughout 2013 to commemorate this important milestone through a series of lectures and town-wide activities. I congratulate this beautiful town on 375 years of success and thank them for their contributions to our great State.●

HAVERHILL, NEW HAMPSHIRE

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I wish to celebrate and recognize the 250th anniversary of the town of Haverhill, NH.

Haverhill, first known as Lower Coos, was settled by citizens from Haverhill, MA and incorporated by Governor Benning Wentworth in 1763. Haverhill is situated on our State border, next to the mouth of the Ammonoosuc River, and shares much of its heritage with its sister city of Newbury in Vermont across the Connecticut River. Haverhill's location at the end of the Old Province Road was critical to its rapid development; this road, one of the earliest highways in New Hampshire, served as a supply route connecting the northern and western settlements with the seacoast. Haverhill's village of Woodsville hosted a railway supply enterprise that played an important role in the early years of the Boston, Concord and Montreal Railroad. Haverhill may have looked remote on a map, but it was clearly a town on the move.

Today, visitors to Haverhill may visit the oldest covered bridge still in use in New Hampshire, the Haverhill-Bath Bridge, built in 1829 and listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The Haverhill Historic Society has painstakingly curated many artifacts from the town's long and industrious history and hosts fascinating lectures throughout the year. Haverhill is also home to the Museum of American Weather, which offers an unusual and insightful view into New England history through its exhibits documenting weather events across our region.

The town of Haverhill will celebrate its semiquincentennial jointly with Newbury, VT through a series of events this year, culminating in an old-fashioned skating party in December. I congratulate Haverhill on 250 years of accomplishments, and thank its citizens for their many contributions to the Granite State.●

LISBON, NEW HAMPSHIRE

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I congratulate the residents of the town of Lisbon, NH as they celebrate its 250th anniversary.

Lisbon's roots date back to 1749, when Samuel Martin went on a hunting trip with his son in the wilderness along the Ammonoosuc River in the White Mountains. This beautiful region made a lasting impression on Martin, who returned to build a small cabin on Henry Pond with his family. This area would soon be settled and named the Gunthwaite settlement, which grew in size as soldiers returned from the Revolutionary War. In 1824, Gov. Levi Woodbury renamed the town Lisbon in honor of his friend Colonel William Jarvis, who had been appointed by President Thomas Jefferson to be the United States consul in Lisbon, Portugal.

The Ammonoosuc River provided a natural source of power for mills and factories that bolstered Lisbon's industry and helped it grow into a bustling town. At one time, Lisbon's Parker Young Company was the largest manufacturer of piano sounding boards in the world. Lisbon was also the first site in New Hampshire to have a ski rope tow.

Many of Lisbon's residents are descended from the town's original settlers and feel a strong commitment to preserving their town's history. Lisbon proudly honors New Hampshire's State flower during its annual Lilac Festival, held every Memorial Day weekend. Lisbon is also known for its public library, which houses nearly 10,000 volumes and serves neighboring towns Lyman and Landaff. On August 10, 2013, Lisbon residents and friends will come together to commemorate their 250th anniversary with music and community events to celebrate their past, present and future.

I wish the town of Lisbon a wonderful celebration and congratulate its citizens on this milestone in New Hampshire history.●

NEW BOSTON, NEW HAMPSHIRE

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I wish today to honor the town of New Boston, NH, which celebrates its 250th anniversary this year. As its name suggests, New Boston's long and admirable history bridges that of New Hampshire and our neighbor Massachusetts.

New Boston's first settlers came north in search of new opportunity. The land was originally granted in 1736 by the regional governor of Massachusetts and New Hampshire, Jonathan Belcher. Records show that locals had originally planned to christen the town ''Lanestown,'' but over time referred to the property as New Boston in honor of their former home. From 1736 until 1763, New Boston was legally part of Massachusetts; but during the course of those 30 years, the original grantees failed to establish a proper claim. In 1763, New Boston was formally incorporated and recognized as part of New Hampshire by Governor Benning Wentworth.

From its first census, we know that New Boston's residents quickly established a bustling community, building a lumber mill and clearing 200 acres of land. By the early 19th century, New Boston boasted 16 school houses, a bark mill, clothing mills, over 25 saw mills and even a tavern to host both travelers and townsfolk after a long day. Unfortunately, many documents depicting New Boston's origins were destroyed by the Great Village Fire of 1887, which ravaged the town and set over 40 of its buildings ablaze. New Boston's residents were undeterred by this tragedy, taking stock and quickly rebuilding their industrial center.

By 1893, New Boston had a railroad station, allowing merchants to move goods and services through their town into Massachusetts and further northeast. In the 1940s, New Boston became the proud home of two military institutions: the Gravity Research Foundation, which conducted research in hopes of creating a gravitational shielding system, and the New Boston Air Force Station, which tracks military satellites.

New Boston continues to inspire our State with its industrious and creative spirit. There is much to celebrate in New Boston's 250 years, and I am sure that the next 250 years will be equally or even more successful.●

PLYMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I wish to congratulate the town of Plymouth, NH on their 250th anniversary.

Plymouth sits at the geographic center of New Hampshire on the west bank of the Pemigewasset River. Gov. Benning Wentworth granted this plot of land to returning soldiers from the French and Indian War and named it New Plymouth, after the original Plymouth Colony in Massachusetts. Plymouth's unparalleled views of mountains, fields and forests provide a stunning backdrop to a bustling town noted for its focus on industry and education, as well as its historical significance.

Plymouth's educational commitment began with its earliest settlers, whose children were predominantly literate. This devotion to education continues today through Plymouth State University, one of the area's oldest and finest institutions that counts Poet Laureate Robert Frost as a former faculty member. Every September, the Plymouth population doubles from 4,000 to 8,000 as students return to campus to take advantage of the rich opportunities offered at this university.

Plymouth was originally an industrial center known for its buck glove industry, its farming and its logging industry. It was also home to Draper and Maynard, a renowned sporting goods purveyor that supplied baseball gloves to Babe Ruth and his Boston Red Sox teammates.

Plymouth's strong tourism and skiing tradition dates back to the 1930s, when the once ubiquitous snow trains brought hundreds of skiers from Boston and other cities to the slopes of the White Mountains. Plymouth has taken great strides to preserve this history and heritage through the recently opened Museum of the White Mountains, which houses treasured art and artifacts from more than a century ago. The town continues to attract tourists hoping to see a quintessential New England town in action and remains a popular year-round destination for camping, hiking and winter sports.

I congratulate Plymouth on its 250th anniversary and wish all its citizens a joyous year of celebration of their proud history.●

SANDWISH, NEW HAMPSHIRE

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I wish to honor the town of Sandwich, NH, on the occasion of its 250th anniversary.

Sandwich is a quintessential New England village between the foothills of the White Mountains and breathtaking Squam Lake. Sandwich was chartered in 1763 by Governor Benning Wentworth and named for John Montagu, the 4th Earl of Sandwich. Lord Sandwich held various distinguished positions in British politics and its military, but is perhaps best known for his purported invention of a slice of meat between two slices of bread to sustain him while playing cards.

Sandwich's land would later double in size due to many concerns that the original grant was too inaccessible for a permanent settlement. In fact, from this expansion, Sandwich remains one of the largest towns in New Hampshire today. The first settlers arrived 4 years later, and by the early 19th Century the town of Sandwich had grown from uncharted wilderness into a bustling community of farms, schools, churches, traders, and artisans.

Sandwich's local fair is a wonderful New Hampshire tradition that celebrated its 100th anniversary last year. The Sandwich Fair has origins as far back as 1886, when local farmers gathered together to show off their livestock in hopes of drawing a crowd to trade and sell their goods. The event quickly grew to include community events such as band performances, beautiful baby contests, and, in the 21st Century, carnival rides. Sandwich's vibrant community, natural beauty, outdoor activities and historic and cultural events continue to draw visitors year-round.

I congratulate Sandwich on this important milestone and wish all citizens of Sandwich the best for their next 250 years.●

THORNTON, NEW HAMPSHIRE

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I wish to recognize of the 250th anniversary of Thornton, NH. Nestled in the beautiful Pemigewasset River Valley in the White Mountains, the land that became Thornton was originally granted to a small group of settlers on July 6, 1763 and subsequently incorporated in 1781. Thornton is named for one of those original settlers, Matthew Thornton, who would later become the first speaker of the New Hampshire House of Representatives and New Hampshire's delegate to the Continental Congress. Thornton, who signed Declaration of Independence, was an early and vocal advocate for compete independence from England.

Thornton was also the birthplace of Moses Cheney, an abolitionist and conductor on the Underground Railroad. Cheney founded and oversaw the printing of the Morning Star, an abolitionist Freewill Baptist newspaper distributed in New England from 1833 to

1874. Cheney's two sons added to their father's legacy through their own notable contributions to New England. Elder son Oren Cheney was the founder and first president of Bates College in Maine, and his younger brother Person Cheney served as a U.S. Senator and Governor of New Hampshire.

Thornton's original colonial meetinghouse, built in 1789, still stands in the center of town. Meetinghouses like this are considered the birthplace of small town democracy. This building hosted town meetings from 1790 to 1954. Today, it is being painstakingly restored by the Thornton Historical Society for future use as a museum to house the town's artifacts and documents from its long and proud history.

I honor this town's strong heritage and wish its citizens a wonderful sestercentennial celebration.●

WARREN, NEW HAMPSHIRE

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, today I wish to celebrate the 250th anniversary of Warren, NH. Situated in the White Mountain region just south of Franconia Notch, residents of Warren are surrounded by stunning wooded scenery that is quintessential North Country. Warren is a truly perfect example of small town New Hampshire.

In 1763, Gov. Benning Wentworth granted a tract of land to John Page, who settled on this land 4 years later. The area would be officially incorporated in 1770 by Benning Wentworth's nephew and successor, Gov. John Wentworth. Warren is one of two towns in New England that were named for Admiral Sir Peter Warren of County Meath, Ireland. Admiral Warren, a high ranking officer in the British Royal Navy, commanded a fleet that joined forces from Massachusetts to lay siege and capture the fort at Louisbourg, Nova Scotia in 1745. This victory united the colonies against Canada, as well as providing them with crucial fishing and fur trading rights.

For the better half of the 20th century, the Glencliff State Sanatorium operated in the village of Glencliff in Warren. Before the advent of antibiotics, it was thought that the thin, pure mountain air of the North Country could cure tuberculosis, and nearly 4,000 patients sought respite and cure in the White Mountains facility until its closing and conversion to Glencliff Home for the Elderly in 1970. While modern medicine has advanced by leaps and bounds, we certainly understand why a patient would seek the serene beauty of the North Country as a cure for any ill.

Warren's most famous landmark is a Redstone Ballistics Missile, which stands in the center of the village green today. These missiles were commissioned by the U.S. Army in West Germany during the Cold War as defense against the former Soviet Union and were the first to carry live nuclear warheads. This decommissioned missile was placed in the center of town to honor Senator Norris Cotton, a Warren native who served a long career in both the New Hampshire General Court and the United States Congress.

I honor Warren's sestercentennial and congratulate its residents on this important milestone.●

WOODSTOCK, NEW HAMPSHIRE

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, today I wish to congratulate the town of Woodstock, NH, on their sestercentennial anniversary.

Woodstock actually began as Peeling, NH, as decreed by Governor Benning Wentworth's 1763 charter. After a number of controversial name changes, the town eventually became known as Woodstock in 1840, possibly thanks to inspiration from the name of a novel by Sir Walter Scott. Appropriately, logging was thickly-forested Woodstock's primary industry, aided by the Pemigewasset River's power to run their saw mills and transport timber down to Lowell, MA. The arrival of the Gordon Pond Railroad helped the industry but also leveled thousands of acres of Woodstock forest.

These areas have long since recovered and 80 percent of Woodstock's land area is now protected under the White Mountain National Forest, which draws droves of tourists each year. In fact, Woodstock's and neighboring Thornton's forests make up Hubbard Brook Experimental Forest, one of the world's longest running ecosystem studies. For 50 years, Hubbard Brook has provided scientists and researchers with critical data and resources that identify and address environmental issues.

Woodstock is also home to local favorite Woodstock Inn Station and Brewery, a five time regional restaurant winner of New Hampshire Magazine's ''Best of New Hampshire'' feature. I was pleased to welcome this business to Washington in June for our annual Experience New Hampshire reception, where they shared their delicious craft beers and other products with Senators and their fellow Granite Staters.

I congratulate Woodstock on this important milestone and wish the community continuing success for their next 250 years.●

DELAWARE'S DREAM TEAM

● Mr. COONS. Madam President, Delaware is known as the First State, and I rise today to commemorate a first in my State. Forty years ago, the Howard High men's basketball team became the first boys' basketball team in the State-tournament era to complete an undefeated season. The 1973 Wildcats were honored for that achievement in Wilmington earlier this year, but today I would like to honor them on the Floor of the Senate.

You see, the story of the '73 Wildcats tells you something about my home State. They were never the tallest team out there—the tallest player was Lonnie Sparrow at 6 feet 3 inches—and they were never considered the team to beat. They were not even considered the best team at Howard High. The highly touted '72 squad had included John Irving who is still one of only two players in Hofstra University history to accumulate 1,000 points and 1,000 rebounds, and led them to their first two NCAA tournament appearances. They could only draw from a small student body of about 700 to 800 students, in contrast to some of the other local high schools.

But what Sparrow, Mike Miller, Eric Fuller, Kenny Hynson, Wayne Parson, Dave Roane, Istavan Norwood, Lemuel Glover, Rich Miles, Joe Robinson, Isaiah Reason, and Ernest Coleman had was better than height or the praise of outsiders. They had coaches that believed in them in Jay Thomas and Stan Hill, and they had a tight-knit group of supporters in the school and the community. Most of all, they had each other, and by playing ball together, they accomplished what no other team had done in Delaware history. Their amazing story includes last-minute buzzer shots to make it to the championships, and even a climactic showdown with long-time rivals Wilmington High, who had ended the school's dreams of a championship the previous year. It is a story made for Hollywood. In a fitting epilogue, they each continue their tradition of quality through teamwork as teachers, coaches, counselors, ministers, businessmen, members of the Armed Services, and civil servants.

But there is one more thing that must be noted. Named after the same Civil War general that Howard University honors and built around the same time, Howard was the first—and for many years only—African-American high school in Delaware. During the 1950's the shameful neglect towards the institution led to a court case challenging separate-but-equal laws that went on to become one of the five decided in the Brown v. Board Supreme Court decision. By the time of the '73 Wildcats, schools were desegregated but the poison of decades of racism persisted.

It was in this context that the all-black Howard team relied on each other, and did the impossible in Delaware. As such, they are an example to all of us—especially, I think, to those of us in the Senate faced with tough challenges for the future. You see, when everyone is betting against us, when it seems like we somehow lack the stature to get the job done, or when the world around us is tumultuous and seems more than any one of us alone can handle, we need to join together, find ways to trust each other, and get the job done. The 1973 Howard High Wildcats just wanted to play great basketball, and they did in storybook fashion. But in doing so, they became an inspiration to their friends, family, community, and at least one U.S. Senator.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and a withdrawal which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:15 a.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 bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 313. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to institute spending limits and transparency requirements for Federal conference and travel expenditures, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1660. An act to require the establishment of Federal customer service standards and to improve the service provided by Federal agencies.

H.R. 2768. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that a duty of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is to ensure that Internal Revenue Service employees are familiar with and act in accord with certain taxpayer rights.

H.R. 2769. An act to impose a moratorium on conferences held by the Internal Revenue Service.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1911) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish interest rates for new loans made on or after July 1, 2013, to direct the Secretary of Education to convene the Advisory Committee on Improving Postsecondary Education Data to conduct a study on improvements to postsecondary education transparency at the Federal level, and for other purposes.

At 11:43 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 850. An act to impose additional human rights and economic and financial sanctions with respect to Iran, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2565. An act to provide for the termination of employment of employees of the Internal Revenue Service who take certain official actions for political purposes.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution encouraging peace and reunification on the Korean Peninsula.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 8162 of Public Law 106–79, as amended, and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 1:00 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 bills:

H.R. 2611. An act 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 ''Douglass A. Munro Coast Guard Headquarters Building'', and for other purposes.

H.R. 2167. An act 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.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 1:30 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. 1911. An act to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish interest rates for new loans made on or after July 1, 2013, to direct the Secretary of Education to convene the Advisory Committee on Improving Postsecondary Education Data to conduct a study on improvements to postsecondary education transparency at the Federal level, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 313. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to institute spending limits and transparency requirements for Federal conference and travel expenditures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 850. An act to impose additional human rights and economic and financial sanctions with respect to Iran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 1660. An act to require the establishment of Federal customer service standards and to improve the service provided by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 2565. An act to provide for the termination of employment of employees of the Internal Revenue Service who take certain official actions for political purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 2768. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that a duty of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is to ensure that Internal Revenue Service employees are familiar with and act in accord with certain taxpayer rights; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 2769. An act to impose a moratorium on conferences held by the Internal Revenue Service; to the Committee on Finance.

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–2490. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulations; Dinghy Poker Run, Middle River; Baltimore County, Essex, MD'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0489)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2491. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulations; Revision of 2013 America's Cup Regulated Area, San Francisco Bay; San Francisco, CA'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2011–0551)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2492. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulation; Tall Ships Celebration Bay City, Bay City, MI'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0368)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2493. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulations; Red Bull Flugtag National Harbor Event, Potomac River; National Harbor Access Channel, MD'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0114)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2494. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Security Zone; Naval Exercise; Pacific Ocean, Coronado, CA'' ((RIN1625–AA87) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0482)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2495. A communication from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Connect America Fund'' ((RIN3060–AF85) (FCC 13–73)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2496. A communication from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Review of Wireline Competition Bureau Data Practices, Computer III Further Remand Proceedings: Bell Operating Company Provision of Enhanced Services; 1998 Biennial Regulatory Review—Review of Computer III and ONA Safeguards and Requirements'' ((RIN3060–AK03) (FCC 13–69)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2497. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the

report of a rule entitled ''Facilitating the Deployment of Text-to-911 and Other Next Generation 911 Applications Framework for Next Generation 911 Deployment'' (FCC 13–64) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2498. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulated Navigation Areas; Bars along the Coasts of Oregon and Washington'' ((RIN1625–AC01) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0216)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2499. 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'' ((RIN1625–AC06) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0397)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2500. 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; Outer Banks Bluegrass Festival; Shallowbag Bay, Manteo, NC'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0330)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2501. 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; Venetian Fireworks; Kalamazoo Lake, Saugatuck, MI'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0539)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2502. 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; Feast of Lanterns Fireworks Display, Pacific Grove, CA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0238)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2503. 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; City of Menominee 4th of July Fireworks, Green Bay, Menominee, MI'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0540)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2504. 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; Summer in the City Water Ski Show; Fox River, Green Bay, WI'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0541)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2505. 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; Sugar House Casino Fireworks Display, Delaware River; Philadelphia, PA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0495)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2506. 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 Displays, Delaware River; Philadelphia, PA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0493)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2507. 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; Grand Haven 4th of July Fireworks; Grand River; Grand Haven, MI'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0547)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2508. 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; Margate Mother's Association Fireworks Display, Atlantic Ocean; Margate, NJ'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0494)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2509. 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; Fort Monroe Fireworks Display, Chesapeake Bay, Hampton, VA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0443)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2510. 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; Big Bay Boom, San Diego Bay; San Diego, CA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0059)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2511. 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; National Cherry Festival Air Show and Fireworks Display, West Grand Traverse Bay, Traverse City, MI'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0189)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2512. 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 Zones; Annual Independence Day Fireworks Displays, Skagway, Haines, and Wrangell, AK'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0078)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2513. 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; Execpro Services Fireworks Display, Lake Tahoe, Incline Village, NV'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0383)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2514. 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; San Diego Symphony Summer POPS Fireworks 2013 Season, San Diego, CA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0388)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2515. 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; City of Martinez Fourth of July Fireworks Display, Carquinez Strait, Martinez, CA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0345)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2516. 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; City of Vallejo Fourth of July Fireworks Display, Mare Island Strait, Vallejo, CA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0355)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2517. 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 Firework Display, Pagan River; Smithfield, VA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0473)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2518. 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; Tennessee River, Mile 625.5 to 626.5'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0408)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2519. 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; Northside Park Pier Fireworks Display, Assawoman Bay, Ocean City, MD'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0439)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2520. 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; America's Cup Safety Zone and No Loitering Area, San Francisco, CA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0551)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2521. 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; South Park Bridge Construction, Lower Duwamish Waterway, Seattle, WA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0452)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2522. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Pilot Certification and Qualification Requirements for Air Carrier Operations'' ((RIN2120–AJ67) (Docket No. FAA–2010–0100)) 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–2523. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Adoption of Statuary Prohibition on the Operation of Jets Weighing 75,000 Pounds or Less That Are Not Stage 3 Noise Compliant'' ((RIN2120–AK25) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0503)) 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–2524. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Flight Data Recorder Airplane Parameter Specification Omissions and Corrections'' ((RIN2120–AK27) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0579)) 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–2525. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Combined Drug and Alcohol Testing Programs'' ((RIN2120–AK01) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0688)) 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–2526. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification of VOR Federal Airway V–345 in the Vicinity of Ashland, WI'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0236)) 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–2527. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Restricted Area R–2504A and R–2504B; Camp Roberts, CA, and Restricted Area R–2530; Sierra Army Depot, CA'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0515)) 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–2528. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Restricted Areas R–2907A and R–2907B, Lake George, FL; and R–2910, Pinecastle, FL'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2010–1146)) 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–2529. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (53); Amdt. No. 3543'' (RIN2120–AA65) 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–2530. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (78); Amdt. No. 3542'' (RIN2120–AA65) 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–2531. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Presidio, TX'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0770)) 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–2532. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Colt, AR'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1281)) 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–2533. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Elbow Lake, MN'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1121)) 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–2534. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Sanibel, FL'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1334)) 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–2535. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Grand Canyon, AZ'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0163)) 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–2536. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Worthington, MN'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1139)) 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–2537. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Ogallala, NE'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1138)) 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–2538. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification of Class D and E Airspace; Twin Falls, ID'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0258)) 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–2539. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Parkston, SD'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1282)) 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–2540. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0864)) 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–2541. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0302)) 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–2542. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Embraer S.A. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1230)) 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–2543. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2008–0620)) 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–2544. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Learjet Inc. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0214)) 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–2545. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation,

transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; PILATUS Aircraft Ltd. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0598)) 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–2546. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0522)) 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–2547. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0018)) 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–2548. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation (Sikorsky) Model Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1206)) 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–2549. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Piper Aircraft, Inc. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0535)) 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–2550. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Dowty Propellers Propellers'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2009–0776)) 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–2551. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; DASSAULT AVIATION Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1067)) 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–2552. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1039)) 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–2553. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1035)) 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–2554. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1305)) 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–2555. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland (Eurocopter) Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0520)) 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–2556. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1034)) 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–2557. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1330)) 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–2558. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Various Restricted Category Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0553)) 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–2559. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0223)) 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–2560. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turbofan Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1327)) 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–2561. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Forchlorfenuron; Temporary Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 9391–9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2562. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Sorbitan monooleate ethylene oxide adduct; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance'' (FRL No. 9389–8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2563. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Complex Polymeric Polyhydroxy Acids; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance'' (FRL No. 9391–2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2564. A communication from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Releasing Information; General Provisions; Accounting and Reporting Requirements; Reports of Accounts and Exposures'' (RIN3052–AC76) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2565. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Handling of Animals; Contingency Plans; Stay of Regulations'' ((RIN0579–AC69) (Docket No. APHIS–2006–0159)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2566. A communication from the Assistant Director, Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting, (6) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Defense, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2567. A communication from the Assistant Director, Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting, (2) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of the Navy, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2568. A communication from the Assistant Director, Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting, (2) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of the Air Force, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2569. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the review of internal records to verify employment of Iraqi nationals by the U.S. Government and request from each prime contractor or grantee that has performed work in Iraq information that can verify the employment of Iraqi nationals by such contractor or grantee; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2570. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report to Congress on Department of Defense Fiscal Year

2012 Purchases from Foreign Entities''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2571. A communication from the Attorney, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendments to the 2013 Mortgage Rules Under the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act (Regulation X) and the Truth in Lending Act (Regulation Z)'' ((RIN3170–AA37) (Docket No. CFPB–2013–0010)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 25, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2572. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 12947 with respect to terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2573. A communication from the Attorney, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Electronic Fund Transfers (Regulation E)'' ((RIN3170–AA33) (Docket No. CFPB–2012–0050)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 25, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2574. A communication from the Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Broker-Dealer Reports'' (RIN3235–AK2574) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2575. A communication from the Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Financial Responsibility Rules for Broker-Dealers'' (RIN3235–AJ85) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2576. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Pyroxasulfone; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 9393–6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2577. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Trifluralin; Pesticide Tolerance'' (FRL No. 9393–5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2578. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification of Significant New Uses of Ethaneperoxoic Acid, 1,1-Demethylpropyl Ester'' (FRL No. 9392–4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2579. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; State of Montana; Interstate Transport of Pollution for the 2006 PM2.5 NAAQS'' (FRL No. 9839–1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2580. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Quality Designations for the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide (SO2) Primary National Ambient Air Quality Standard'' (FRL No. 9841–4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2581. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Oregon: Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 and 2006 Fine Particulate Matter and 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards'' (FRL No. 9841–1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2582. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Colorado; Second Ten-Year Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan for Greeley'' (FRL No. 9840–9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2583. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Colorado; Second 10-Year Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan for Colorado Springs'' (FRL No. 9840–7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2584. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans, State of California, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District, New Source Review'' (FRL No. 9837–5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2585. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference'' (FRL No. 9811–9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2586. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; Permit Exemption Rule'' (FRL No. 9834–4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2587. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Conditional Exclusions from Solid Waste and Hazardous Waste for Solvent-Contaminated Wipes'' (FRL No. 9838–2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2588. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Software Requirement Specifications for Digital Computer Software used in Safety Systems for Nuclear Power Plants'' (Regulatory Guide 1.172, Revision 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2589. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Developing Software Life Cycle Processes for Digital Computer Software used in Safety Systems for Nuclear Power Plants'' (Regulatory Guide 1.173, Revision 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2590. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Safety Evaluation of Westinghouse Electric Company Topical Report WCAP–12610–P–A and CENPD–404–P–A, Addendum 2/WCAP–14342–A and CENPD 404–NP–A, Addendum 2, 'Westinghouse Clad Corrosion Model for ZIRLOTM and Optimized ZIRLOTM' '' (Project No. 700) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2591. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Preparation of Environmental Reports for Nuclear Power Plant License Renewal Applications'' (Regulatory Guide 4.2, Supplement 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2592. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Verification, Validation, Reviews, and Audits for Digital Computer Software Used in Safety Systems of Nuclear Power Plants'' (Regulatory Guide 1.168, Revision 2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2593. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Configuration Management Plans for Digital Computer Software Used in Safety Systems for Nuclear Power Plants'' (Regulatory Guide 1.169, Revision 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2594. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Software Unit Testing for Digital Computer Software Used in Safety Systems of Nuclear Power Plants'' (Regulatory Guide 1.171, Revision 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2595. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Software Unit Testing for Digital Computer Software Used in Safety Systems for Nuclear Power Plants'' (Regulatory Guide 1.171, Revision 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2596. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division,

Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Promulgation of State Implementation Plan Revisions; Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 and 2006 PM2.5 National Ambient Air Quality Standards; Montana'' (FRL No. 9839–2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2597. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to entering into a Memorandum of Understanding Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Belize Concerning the imposition of import restrictions on categories of archaeological material representing the cultural heritage of Belize from the pre-ceramic, pre-classic, classic, and post-classic periods of the pre-Columbian era through the early and late colonial periods; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2598. 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 ''Medicare Program; Impatient Psychiatric Facilities Prospective Payment System—Update for Fiscal Year Beginning October 1, 2013 (FY 2014)'' (RIN0938–AR63) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2599. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Recognizing Advance Payments for Gift Cards that are Redeemable for Goods and Services from an Unrelated Entity'' (Rev. Proc. 2013–29) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2600. A communication from the General Counsel, Peace Corps, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report relative to a vacancy in the position of Director of the Peace Corps, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2013; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2601. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''U.S. Department of State, Category Rating Report''; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2602. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13–109); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2603. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13–108); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2604. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13–015); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2605. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis, Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2606. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''ATF 2013 PACT Act Report''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–2607. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for a report entitled ''Transforming Today's Vision Into Tomorrow's Reality''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–2608. A communication from the Director of the Regulation Policy and Management Office of the General Counsel, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Patient Access to Records'' (RIN2900–AO61) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 25, 2013; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–118. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Maine memorializing the President of the United States and Congress of the United States to adopt the Veterans Remembered Flag in honor of all veterans; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

JOINT RESOLUTION

Whereas, there are flags for all branches of the Armed Forces of the United States and there is a flag for prisoners of war and those missing in action, but there is no flag to honor the millions of former military personnel who have served our nation; and

Whereas, a flag is a symbol of recognition for a group or an ideal, and veterans compose a group, certainly represent an ideal and surely deserve their own symbol; and

Whereas, the estimated 20,400,000 veterans, affiliated and unaffiliated with veterans' organizations, who have served in our nation's military compose a significant portion of our nation's population; and

Whereas, there is now a flag that has been designed and created to honor the veterans of the United States called the Veterans Remembered Flag, and displaying and flying a Veterans Remembered Flag would honor the lives of millions of individuals who have served our country in times of war, peace and national crisis; and

Whereas, a Veterans Remembered Flag would memorialize and honor past, present and future veterans and provide an enduring symbol to support tomorrow's veterans today; and

Whereas, displaying and flying a Veterans Remembered Flag would fill the need for a flag honoring all veterans who have served in our nation's armed forces; and

Whereas, the symbolism of this unique flag's design would be all-inclusive, would pay respect to all branches of the military and to the history of our nation and would honor those who have lived, and died, serving our nation; and

Whereas, the design of the flag honors the founding of our nation through the 13 stars that emanate from the hoist of the flag and lead to the large red star that represents our nation and the five branches of our nation's military, the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marines and the Coast Guard; and

Whereas, the white star on the flag symbolizes veterans' dedication to service, the blue star on the flag honors all the men and women who have served in our nation's military and the central gold star on the flag memorializes those who have fallen defending our nation; and

Whereas, the blue stripe that bears the title of the flag honors the loyalty of veterans to our nation, flag and government, and the green field on the flag represents the hallowed ground where fallen veterans rest eternally; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That We, your Memorialists, request that the President of the United States and the United States Congress work together to support adoption of the Veterans Remembered Flag to honor our nation's veterans; and be it further

Resolved, That suitable copies of this resolution, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State, be transmitted to the Honorable Barack H. Obama, President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and to each Member of the Maine Congressional Delegation.

POM–119. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the federal government of the United States to prioritize distribution of veterans' benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the members of the Armed Forces of the United States, including active duty members of the Massachusetts National Guard, have honorably and with great distinction served their country and have earned the right to be welcomed home with all honors and benefits prescribed by law by a grateful nation; and

Whereas, the words of our first president, George Washington, are a reminder of the importance of honoring promises made to our veterans and their families, when he said, ''the willingness with which our young people are likely to serve in any war, no matter how justified, shall be directly proportional to how they perceive the veterans of earlier wars were treated and appreciated by their nation''; and

Whereas, veterans' benefits must be delivered in a timely fashion out of respect for the significant sacrifice and valiant service of those to whom such benefits are owed, especially given the fact that today's veterans urgently need jobs, health care, housing, education and training in order to successfully re-enter civilian life; and

Whereas, the United States Department of Veterans Affairs is reported to be unable to keep up with a torrent of benefits claims, and the backlog leaves many service members waiting for well over a year after first filing their forms, according to a report from the Center for Investigative Reporting; and

Whereas, according to the center's report, the average wait time for veterans benefits is 273 days, and that veterans filing their first claim, including those who served in Iraq and Afghanistan, wait nearly two months longer, between 316 and 327 days, and in some major population centers wait up to twice as long—642 days in New York, 619 days in Los Angeles and 542 days in Chicago; and

Whereas, the ranks of veterans waiting more than a year for their benefits grew from 11,000 in 2009 to 245,000 in December 2012, an increase of more than 2,000 per cent, and the Veterans Administration is predicting that the situation will get worse, as the number of veterans waiting on the Department to process their claims is expected to reach 1 million by the end of March, 2013: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate hereby requests that the Federal Government of the United States provide sufficient funding and personnel to process veterans' claims in a more timely manner so that the tangible gratitude of the nation can be promptly distributed to all who have earned such recognition; and be it further

Resolved, That resolved, that a copy of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Clerk of the Senate to the President of the United States, the leaders of the Congress of the United States and to each United States senator and representative from Massachusetts.

POM–120. A communication from citizens of the State of Hawaii petitioning for verification and tabulation of State applications for an Article V Convention; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM–121. A resolution adopted by the Mayor and City Commission of the City of Miami Beach, Florida urging the United States Food and Drug Administration to repeal their longstanding prohibition on men who have sex with men from donating blood; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

POM–122. A resolution adopted by the Lawrence City Council of the City of Lawrence, Massachusetts supporting comprehensive immigration reform and urging action from the 113th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM–123. A resolution adopted by the City Electors of Fort Atkinson, Wisconsin seeking to reclaim democracy from the expansion of corporate personhood rights and the corrupting influence of unregulated political contributions and spending; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM–124. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of Orange County, New York opposing the enactment of any legislation that would infringe upon the right of people to bear arms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM–125. A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Webster, Texas protecting and defending the constitutional right to keep and bear arms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM–126. A resolution adopted by the Blount County Board of Commissioners of the State of Tennessee protecting and defending the constitutional right to keep and bear arms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM–127. A resolution adopted by the New Jersey State Federation of Women's Clubs urging the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation regarding gun control; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM–128. A resolution adopted by the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Edgewater, New Jersey expressing its condolences and support for the victims of gun violence and their families in Newtown, CT, Aurora, CO, Blacksburg, VA, Oak Creek, WI, Tucson, AZ, and other communities throughout the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM–129. A resolution adopted by the City of River Oaks, Texas supporting the Constitution of the United States and defending the constitutional right to keep and bear arms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM–130. A resolution adopted by the Board of Trustees of the Village of Tupper Lake, New York opposing any legislation infringing upon the right of the people to keep and bear arms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM–131. A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Naples, Florida urging Congress and the President to protect the constitutional right of the people to keep and bear arms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM–132. A resolution adopted by the Catlin Town Board of the State of New York calling for the repeal of the New York SAFE Act of 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM–133. A resolution adopted by the Northwest Municipal Conference supporting immigration reform that provides a clear and earned path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants, clears immigration backlogs, addresses the current labor market needs and improves state and local economic competitiveness, provides for effective employment verification, promotes immigrant integration, and enhances national security and safety with a sensible enforcement policy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM–134. A resolution adopted by the Alabama Town Board of the State of New York opposing the Early Voting Proposal; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. DURBIN, from the Committee on Appropriations, without amendment:

S. 1429. An original bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–85).

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 933. A bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the authorization of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program through fiscal year 2018.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ for the Committee on Foreign Relations. Steve A. Linick, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, Department of State.

*Matthew Winthrop Barzun, of Kentucky, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Nominee Matthew Winthrop Barzun.

Post United Kingdom.

(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.)

Contributors, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: $215, 2/23/2009, Democratic National Committee; $2,500, 9/12/2011, Chandler; $5,000, 9/8/2011, Tim Kaine/Virginia; $35,800, 9/9/2011, Obama Victory Fund; $2,500, 10/10/2011, Yarmuth; $5,000, 12/15/2011, DWS for Congress Weston FL; $9,200, 12/31/2011, Swing State Victory Chicago; $30,800, 1/13/2012, Obama Victory Fund; $5,000, 1/30/2012, Mark Warner/Senator-Virginia; $5,000, 3/10/2012, Claire McCaskill/Senator-Missouri; $2,500, 3/24/2012, Yarmuth; $2,500, 6/29/2012, Chandler, Ben for Congress; $2,500 7/26/2012, Russ Carnahan/U.S. Senate; $2,500, 8/2/2012, Jon Tester/U.S. Senate; $100,000, 9/12/2012, Committee for Charlotte 2 NC; $2,500, 9/25/2012, Kentucky Hse Dem Caucus; $2,500, 10/30/2012, Shelli Yoder/Congress.

2. Spouse: Brooke Browne Barzun: $35,800, 9/9/2011, Obama Victory Fund; $2,500, 10/10/2011, Yarmuth; $9,200, 12/31/2011, Swing State Victory Chicago; $30,800, 1/13/2012, Obama Victory Fund; $2,500, 3/24/2012, Yarmuth; $5,0000, 6/30/2012, Elizabeth Warren for Massachusetts; $2,500, 8/28/2012, Chandler, Ben for Congress; $2,500, 9/24/2012, Kentucky Hse Dem Caucus; $2,500, 10/25/2012, Shelli Yoder/Congress.

3. Children and Spouses: Charles Winthrop Barzun, None; Eleanor C. Barzun, None; Jacques M. Barzun, None.

4. Parents: Roger Barzun: $700, 10/7/2011, Obama for America; $700, 10/7/2011, Obama Victory Fund; $250, 10/29/2012, House Majority PAC; $338, 10/31/2012, Barack Obama For America. Serita Winthrop: $500, 5/30/2011, Bill Nelson for U.S. Senate; $10,000, 11/17/2011, Obama Victory Fund 2012; $2,500, 11/17/2011, Obama for America; $2,500, 11/17/2011, Obama for America; $5,000, 11/17/2011, DNC Services Corp./Democratic National Committee.

5. Grandparents: Deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Charles Barzun: $250, 3/15/2012, John Douglass for Congress; $250, 9/9/2012, John Douglass for Congress; $500, 2/8/2010, Thomas Perriello for Congress; $500, 3/22/2010, Thomas Perriello for Congress; $250, 6/4/2010, Thomas Perriello for Congress; $2,100, 10/12/2011, Obama for America; $2,500, 10/12/2011, Obama for America; $4,600, 10/12/2011, Obama Victory Fund 2012. Emily Little Barzun (sister in law): None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Mariana Mensch (sister), None; Jon Mensch (brother-in-law), None; Lucretia Barzun Donnelly (sister), None; Robert Donnelly (brother in law), None.

---

*David Hale, of New Jersey, 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 Lebanon

Nominee: David Hale.

Post: Beirut, Lebanon.

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: N/A.

2. Spouse: N/A.

3. Children and Spouses: N/A.

Parents: Marjorie Freeman: $25, 5/20/10, RNC; $25, 2/19/12, RNC; $10, 4/12/12, RNC; $20, 8/15/12, RNC; $20, 9/21/12, RNC; $25, 9/27/12, Romney Victory Fund.

5. Grandparents: N/A.

6. Brothers and Spouses: John Hale: $50, 5/20/10; Bridgewater, NJ Republican Municipal Committee.

7. Sisters and Spouses: N/A.

---

*Liliana Ayalde, of Maryland, 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 the Federative Republic of Brazil.

Nominee: Liliana Ayalde

Post: State/WHA

(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: Luis Jorge Narvaez: None.

3. Children and Spouses Names: Stefanie Narvaez: None. Natalia Narvaez: None.

4. Parents Names: Jaime Ayalde: None. Mercedes Ayalde: None.

5. Grandparents Names: Fernando Ayalde: Deceased; Elvia Ayalde: Deceased; Max Llorente: Deceased; Mercedes Llorente: Deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses Names: Jaime Ayalde: None. Julie Ayalde: None.

7. Sisters and Spouses Names: Gloria Perez-Ayalde: Deceased; Gustavo Perez: None. Maria Eugenia Ayalde: None. Sergio Romero: None.

---

*Kirk W.B. Wagar, of Florida, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Singapore.

Nominee: Kirk W.B. Wagar

Post: Singapore

(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: $5,000, 9/30/10, Democratic Congressional Campaign Cmte; $2,500, 4/29/11, Obama, Barack; $2,500, 4/29/11, Obama, Barack; $2,300, 3/15/07, Obama, Barack; $2,300, 11/14/07, Wexler, Robert; $2,300, 5/7/07, Kerry, John; $1,500, 12/25/07, Loebsack, David; $1,000, 10/5/07, Democratic Party of Iowa; $1,000, 2/26/08, Warner, Mark; $1,000, 1/15/10, Coakley, Martha; $500, 4/25/08, Carson Andre; $500, 7/10/08, Clinton, Hillary; $400, 3/19/08, Montana Democratic Central Cmte; $250, 11/9/11, McCaskill, Claire; $1,000, 3/30/11, American Assn for Justice; $1,000, 7/31/12, American Assn for Justice; $1,000, 7/6/07, American Assn for Justice; $2,500, 11/21/11, Kaine, Tim; $250, 12/7/11, Kaine, Tim; $250, 11/9/11, Tester, Jon; $250, 11/30/11, Brown, Sherrod; $30,800, 4/29/11, DNC Services Corp; 15,200, 3/31/10, DNC Services Corp; $5,000, 10/31/09, DNC Services Corp; $5,000, 10/31/09, DNC Services Corp; $1,000, 7/1/09, DNC Services Corp; $28,500, 6/16/08, DNC Services Corp.

2. Spouse: $2,195, 2/19/12, Obama, Barack; $1,000, 10/7/12, Obama, Barack; $305, 2/19/12, Obama, Barack; $250, 3/29/12, Jacobs, Kristin; $200, 11/2/11, Obama, Barack; $1,000, 6/8/11, Obama, Barack; $290, 9/19/12, Obama, Barack; $500, 6/17/09, Gibson, Shirley; $500, 8/20/08, Obama, Barack; $250, 9/30/09, Meek, Kendrick; $250, 3/31/07, Obama, Barack.

---

*Terence Patrick McCulley, of Washington, 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 Cote d'Ivoire.

Nominee: Terence Patrick McCulley.

Post: Republic of Côte d'Ivoire.

(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: none.

3. Children and Spouses: Sean Patrick McCulley: none; Liam Tyler McCulley: none.

4. Parents: William M. McCulley—deceased; Doris J. McCulley: none.

5. Grandparents: Roy Millage—deceased; Grace Millage Smith—deceased; Jesse McCulley—deceased; Elzie McCully—deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Larry A. McCulley, none; Karen McCulley (sister-in-law), none; Stephen W. McCulley, none; Christine McCulley (sister-in-law), none.

7. Sisters and Spouses: none.

---

*James C. Swan, of California, 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 Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Nominee: James Swan.

Post: Kinshasa, Democratic Republic of the 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, and donee:

1. Self: none.

2. Spouse: none.

3. Children and Spouses: Mitchell Henry Swan (Minor): none; Garner Victoria Swan (Minor): none.

4. Parents: Harold Frank Swan—deceased; Corinne Anne Waltham—deceased.

5. Grandparents: James Swan—deceased; Ethel Victoria Swan—deceased; Bertha Chamberlain—deceased; Donald Waltham—deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: (no brother).

7. Sisters and Spouses: Carol Anne Swan: none; Wolf Reade (husband): none.

---

*John R. Phillips, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Italian Republic, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of San Marino.

Nominee: John R. Phillips.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to Italy.

(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: $2,500, Summer 2012, Friends of Joe Kennedy; $2,500, 11/02/2012, Friends of Lois Capps for Congress (California); $2,500, October 2012, Chris Murphy (Connecticut); $2,500, October 2012, Richard Carmona (Arizona); $2,500, October 2012, Shelley Berkley (Nevada); $2,500, October 2012, Tammy Baldwin (Wisconson); $2,500, October 2012, Joe Donnelly (Indiana); $2,500, October 2012, Jon Tester (Wyoming); $2,500, October 2012, Claire McCaskill (Missouri); $2,500, September 2012, Elizabeth for Mass; $2,500, 8/21/2012, Act Blue; $2,500, 8/19/2012, Berman for Congress; $2,500, 4/02/2012, Friends of Joe Kennedy; $2,500, 3/28/2012, Elizabeth for Mass; $30,800, 3/27/2012, Obama Victory Fund; $2,500, 3/06/2012, Kaine for Virginia; $9,200, 12/14/2011, Swing State Victory Fund; $2,500, Fall 2011, Berman for Congress; $35,800, 5/18/2011, Obama Victory Fund; $2,500, 4/26/2011, Kaine for Virginia; $35,800, 4/7/2011, Obama Victory Fund; $16,000, 12/22/2010, DNC; $2,500, Summer 2012, Friends of Joe Kennedy; $2,600, May 2013, Markey for Senate.

S. Spouse: Linda D. Douglass: 0.

3. Children and Spouses: Katherine D. Byrd (daughter): Keith Byrd (son-in-law); 0.

4. Parents: Hilda M. Phillips—deceased; William E. Phillips—deceased.

5. Grandparents: Lucy Colussi—deceased; Angelo Filippi—deceased.

6. Brother: Ernest A. Phillips: Denise Phillips (sister-in-law): 0.

7. Brother: William Phillips: telephone response indicated contributions to several people but he has no records available to him. He has not responded further to my written request.

8. Sisters and Spouses: none.

---

*Kenneth Francis Hackett, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Holy See.

Nominee: Kenneth Francis Hackett.

Post: Ambassador to the Holy See.

(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: $250, 8/05/12, B. Obama; $250, 10/04/12, B. Obama.

2. Spouse: Joan: 0.

3. Children and Spouses: Jennifer: 0; Michael: 0.

4. Parents: Francis Mitchell: 0.

5. Grandparents: None.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Francis X Hackett: 0; Joseph & Ellie Hackett: 0.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Mary & Philip Rowlinson: 0; Kathryn Hackett: 0; Marjorie & David Weeks: 0.

Alexa Lange Wesner, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Austria.

Nominee: Alexa Lange Wesner.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Austria.

(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:

Self: $5,000, 06/27/13, Progress Texas PAC; $5,000, 05/29/13, Battleground Texas PAC; $1,000, 03/14/13, Udall for Colorado; $10,000, 03/12/13, Progress Texas PAC; $10,000, 03/08/13, Progress Texas PAC; $10,000, 12/13/12, Progress Texas PAC; $10,000, 11/14/12, Progress Texas PAC; $2,000, 09/30/12, Carmona for Arizona; $1,000, 09/30/12, Martin Heinrich for Senate; $2,500, 08/21/12, McCaskill for Missouri; $2,500, 05/15/12, Elizabeth for MA; $2,500, 05/15/12, Elizabeth for MA; $30,800, 02/29/12, DNC Services Corp; $2,000, 01/09/12, Al Franken for Senate; $1,012, 12/30/11, Dem Party of Virginia; $1,012, 12/27/11, Dem Party of Colorado; $552, 12/27/11, Dem Party of Nevada; $1,012, 12/27/11, Dem Party of North Carolina; $552, 12/27/11, Dem Party of Wisconsin; $276, 12/27/11, N.H. Dem. State Cmte.; $1,564, 12/27/11, Dem. Exec Cmte of Fld.; $1,472, 12/27/11, Dem Party of Ohio; $1,196, 12/27/11, Dem Party of Pennsylvania; $276, 12/27/11, MI Dem. State Central Cmte; $2,500, 09/23/11, Kaine for Virginia; $2,500, 06/28/11, Kaine for Virginia; $2,500, 05/03/11, Klobuchar, Amy; $2,500, 04/04/11, Obama, Barack; $2,500, 04/04/11, Obama, Barack; $400, 04/04/11, DNC Services Corp; $2,500, 04/04/11, Gillibrand, Kirsten; $2,500, 03/30/11, Cantwell, Maria; $2,500, 03/25/11, McCaskill, Claire; $2,400, 01/17/11, Friends of Sherrod Brown; $30,400, 01/07/11, DNC Services Corp; $500, 07/08/10, Bennet for Colorado; $2,400, 05/27/10, Friends of Mark Warner; $2,400, 05/27/10, Friends of Mark Warner; $500, 05/06/10, Mark Critz for Congress; $30,400, 03/24/10, DNC Services Corp; $2,400, 03/24/10, Robin Carnahan for Senate; $−2,400, 03/10/10, Friends of Chris Dodd; $1,400, 03/02/10, Chet Edwards for Congress; $1,500, 01/21/10, Travis Cnty Dem Party; $−2,400, 01/20/10, Jack McDonald for Congress; $−2,400, 01/20/10, Jack McDonald for Congress; $1,000, 01/15/10, Martha Coakley for Senate; $1,000, 11/17/09, Rob Miller for Congress; $9,100, 09/30/09, DCCC; $1,000, 08/03/09, Annie's List; $2,500, 07/30/09, Moving Wilco Forward; $5,000, 06/30/09, Annie's List; $2,400, 06/30/09, Robin Carnahan

for Senate; $1,000, 06/26/09, Chet Edwards for Congress; $500, 05/25/09, Franken Recount Fund; $500, 05/14/09, Murphy, Scott; $30,400, 04/30/09, DNC Services Corp; $2,400, 03/31/09, Ciro D. Rodriguez for Congress; $2,400, 03/31/09, Jack McDonald for Congress; $2,400, 03/31/09, Jack McDonald for Congress; $2,400, 03/30/09, Friends of Chris Dodd; $2,400, 03/30/09, Friends of Chris Dodd; $2,400, 02/26/09, Friends of Harry Reid; $2,400, 02/26/09, Friends of Harry Reid.

Spouse: Blaine Fleming Wesner: $2,773, 11/07/12, National Venture Cap. Assn.; $578, 10/26/12, Democratic Party of Virginia; $771, 10/20/12, Dem Party of Wisconsin; $964, 10/20/12, Dem Executive Cmte of Fld.; $449, 10/20/12, Democratic Party of CO; $642, 10/20/12, Democratic Party of Iowa; $642, 10/20/12, Democratic Party of Nevada; $449, 10/20/12, Democratic Party of North; $1,542, 10/20/12, Democratic Party of Ohio; $2,300, 07/25/12, Clinton, Hillary; $30,800, 02/29/12, DNC Services Corp; $2,773, 12/21/11, National Venture Cap. Assn; $2,500, 09/23/11, Kaine, Tim; $2,500, 09/23/11, Kaine, Tim; $30,800, 05/02/11, DNC Services Corp; $2,500, 05/02/11, Obama, Barack; $2,500, 05/02/11, Obama, Barack; $2,773, 11/16/10, National Venture Cap. Assn; $2,400, 05/27/10, Warner, Mark; $2,400, 05/27/10, Warner, Mark; $2,400, 03/02/10, Edwards, Chet; $−2,400, 01/20/10, McDonald, Jack; $−2,400, 01/20/10, McDonald, Jack; $5,000, 01/14/10, Forward Together PAC; $2,773, 12/22/09, National Venture Cap. Assn; $2,400, 03/31/09, McDonald, Jack; $2,400, 03/31/09, McDonald, Jack.

Children and Spouses: Natalie Keep Wesner: None; Tennyson Lange Wesner: None; Livia Hawk Wesner: None.

Parents: Per Lange: $1,000, 10/28/12, Obama, Barack; $250, 02/02/12, DNC Services Corp; $2,500, 12/31/11, Obama, Barack; $250, 04/15/11, DNC Services Corp; $250, 02/22/11, DNC Services Corp; Brigitte Lange: None.

Grandparents: Gertrude Bruecher-Herpel, Herald Bruecher-Herpel—Deceased.

Brothers and Spouses: (I have no brothers), NA.

Sisters and Spouses: (I have no sisters), NA.

---

*Daniel A. Sepulveda, of Florida, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State 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.

*Ryan Clark Crocker, of Washington, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2013.

*Ryan Clark Crocker, of Washington, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2016.

*Matthew C. Armstrong, of Illinois, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2015.

*Jeffrey Shell, of California, to be Chairman of the Broadcasting Board of Governors.

*Jeffrey Shell, of California, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2015.

By Mr. LEAHY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Patricia Ann Millett, of Virginia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit.

Gregory Howard Woods, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York.

Debra M. Brown, of Mississippi, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Mississippi.

Elizabeth A. Wolford, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of New York.

*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 Mrs. HAGAN (for herself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 1417. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize programs under part A of title XI of such Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CARDIN:

S. 1418. A bill to require the Attorney General to make competitive grants to State, tribal, and local governments to establish and maintain witness protection and assistance programs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1419. A bill to promote research, development, and demonstration of marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. RISCH):

S. 1420. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for transparency of payments made from the Judgment Fund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEAHY:

S. 1421. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a refundable tax credit for the installation of sprinklers and elevators in historic structures; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. KING, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 1422. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 respecting the scoring of preventive health savings; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 1423. A bill to amend the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 to strengthen the quality control measures in place for part B lung disease claims and to establish the Advisory Board on Toxic Substances and Worker Health for the contractor employee compensation program under subtitle E of such Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. COONS):

S. 1424. A bill to require the Supreme Court of the United States to promulgate a code of ethics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1425. A bill to improve the safety of dietary supplements by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require manufacturers of dietary supplements to register dietary supplements with the Food and Drug Administration and to amend labeling requirements with respect to dietary supplements; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1426. A bill to prohibit employers from compelling or coercing any person to authorize access to a protected computer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1427. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to clarify the rule allowing discharge as a nonpriority claim of governmental claims arising from the disposition of farm assets under chapter 12 bankruptcies; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1428. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide for wildfire mitigation grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 1429. An original bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Appropriations; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1430. A bill 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 for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. THUNE, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HELLER, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 1431. A bill to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HIRONO:

S. 1432. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating portions of the Ka'u Coast in the State of Hawaii as a unit of the National Park System; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. PRYOR):

S. 1433. A bill to require that members of the Armed Forces who were killed or wounded in the attack that occurred at a recruiting station in Little Rock, Arkansas, on June 1, 2009, are treated in the same manner as members who are killed or wounded in a combat zone; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 1434. A bill to designate the Junction City Community-Based Outpatient Clinic located at 715 Southwind Drive, Junction City, Kansas, as the Lieutenant General Richard J. Seitz Community-Based Outpatient Clinic; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 1435. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide certain port authorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. VITTER, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1436. A bill to prevent a fiscal crisis by enacting legislation to balance the Federal budget through reductions of discretionary and mandatory spending; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1437. A bill to provide for the release of the reversionary interest held by the United States in certain land conveyed in 1954 by the United States, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, to the State of Oregon for the establishment of the Hermiston Agricultural Research and Extension Center of Oregon State University in Hermiston, Oregon; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. PRYOR (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 1438. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to provide that military technicians (dual status) shall be included in military personnel accounts for purposes of any order issued under that Act; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 1439. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for advanced illness care coordination services for Medicare beneficiaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. REID (for Ms. LANDRIEU):

S. 1440. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to allow the use of physical damage disaster loans for the construction of safe rooms; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1441. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to facilitate water leasing and water transfers to promote conservation and efficiency; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. KING, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HARKIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 1442. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the minimum low-income housing tax credit rate for unsubsidized buildings and to provide a minimum 4 percent credit rate for existing buildings; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 1443. A bill to facilitate the remediation of abandoned hardrock mines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 1444. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment under part A of the Medicare Program on a reasonable cost basis for anesthesia services furnished by an anesthesiologist in certain rural hospitals in the same manner as payments are provided for anesthesia services furnished by anesthesiologist assistants and certified anesthetists in such hospitals; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PRYOR:

S. 1445. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of optometrists in the National Health Service Corps scholarship and loan repayment programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Ms. STABENOW, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1446. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the affordability of the health care tax credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 1447. A bill to make technical corrections to certain Native American water rights settlements in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 1448. A bill to provide for equitable compensation to the Spokane Tribe of Indians of the Spokane Reservation for the use of tribal land for the production of hydropower by the Grand Coulee Dam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER:

S. 1449. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that income attributable to certain passenger cruise voyages beginning or ending in the United States shall be treated as effectively connected with the conduct of a trade or business within the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER:

S. 1450. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose an ad valorem excise tax on certain passenger cruise voyages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. REID, Mr. HELLER, and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 1451. A bill to provide for environmental restoration activities and forest management activities in the Lake Tahoe Basin, to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the importation or shipment of quagga mussels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DURBIN, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1452. A bill to enhance transparency for certain surveillance programs authorized by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 1453. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish an interagency coordinating committee on pulmonary hypertension to develop recommendations to advance research, increase awareness and education, and improve health and health care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. REID (for Ms. LANDRIEU):

S. 1454. A bill to authorize the Small Business Administrator to establish a grant program to empower encore entrepreneurs; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 1455. A bill to condition the provision of premium and cost-sharing subsidies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act upon a certification that a program to verify household income is operational; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. AYOTTE (for herself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 1456. A bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Shimon Peres; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. PAUL):

S. 1457. A bill to exempt the aging process of distilled spirits from the production period for purposes of capitalization of interest costs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 1458. A bill to establish the Daniel Webster Congressional Clerkship Program; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 1459. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit the transportation of horses in interstate transportation in a motor vehicle containing 2 or more levels stacked on top of one another; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. TESTER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1460. A bill to create two additional judge positions on the court established by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 and modify the procedures for the appointment of judges to that court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 1461. A bill to establish a National Catastrophe Risks Consortium and a National Homeowners' Insurance Stabilization Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. MCCASKILL, and Mr. PRYOR):

S. 1462. A bill to extend the positive train control system implementation deadline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mr. VITTER):

S. 1463. 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 Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. RISCH):

S. 1464. A bill to facilitate and enhance the declassification of information that merits declassification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. HARKIN):

S. 1465. A bill to ensure that persons who form corporations in the United States disclose the beneficial owners of those corporations, in order to prevent the formation of corporations with hidden owners, stop the misuse of United States corporations by wrongdoers, and assist law enforcement in detecting, preventing, and punishing terrorism, money laundering, tax evasion, and other criminal and civil misconduct involving United States corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 1466. A bill to establish a regulatory review process for rules that the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency plans to propose, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. COONS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. TESTER, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1467. A bill to establish the Office of the Special Advocate to provide advocacy in cases before courts established by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 1468. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to establish the Network for Manufacturing Innovation and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 1469. A bill to provide higher-quality, lower-cost health care to seniors; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1470. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act with respect to the guidelines for specification of certain disposal sites for dredged or fill material; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. COATS (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. BURR):

S. 1471. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of the Army to reconsider decisions to inter or honor the memory of a person in a national cemetery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1472. A bill to create a division within the Congressional Budget Office that would perform regulatory analysis; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR:

S. 1473. A bill to develop a model disclosure form to assist consumers in purchasing long-term care insurance; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BEGICH (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1474. A bill to encourage the State of Alaska to enter into intergovernmental agreements with Indian tribes in the State relating to the enforcement of certain State laws by Indian tribes, to improve the quality of life in rural Alaska, to reduce alcohol and drug abuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S. 1475. A bill to establish the position of National Nurse for Public Health, to be filled by the same individual serving as the Chief Nurse Officer of the Public Health Service; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1476. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the denial of deduction for certain excessive employee remuneration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. THUNE):

S. 1477. A bill to clarify the rights of Indians and Indian tribes on Indian lands the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CARDIN:

S. 1478. A bill to provide that certain uses of a patent or copyright in compliance with an order of the Federal Communications Commission for emergency communications services shall be construed as use or manufacture for the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. FLAKE):

S. 1479. A bill to address the forest health, public safety, and wildlife habitat threat presented by the risk of wildfire, including catastrophic wildfire, on National Forest System land and public land managed by the Bureau of Land Management by requiring the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to expedite forest management projects relating to hazardous fuels reduction, forest health, and economic development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1480. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide assistance for condominiums and housing cooperatives damaged by a major disaster, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR:

S. 1481. A bill to require issuers of long term care insurance to establish third-party review processes for disputed claims; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. HEITKAMP, and Mr. VITTER):

S. 1482. A bill to recognize the primacy of States, provide for the consideration of the economic impact of additional regulations, and provide for standards and requirements relating to certain guidelines and regulations relating to health and the environment; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. CANTWELL:

S. 1483. A bill to amend the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 to establish the Federal Oil Spill Research Committee, and to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to include in a response plan certain planned and demonstrated investments in research relating to discharges of oil and to modify the dates by which a response plan must be updated; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. REID (for Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. CORNYN)):

S. 1484. A bill to provide for an exchange of land between the Secretary of Agriculture and the Sabine River Authority of Texas; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 1485. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an income tax credit for eldercare expenses; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. COBURN):

S. 1486. A bill to improve, sustain, and transform the United States Postal Service; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CHIESA, Mr. COATS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 212. A resolution commending David J. Schiappa; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. NELSON, Mr. KAINE, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. KIRK):

S. Res. 213. A resolution expressing support for the free and peaceful exercise of representative democracy in Venezuela and condemning violence and intimidation against the country's political opposition; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. PRYOR (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. Res. 214. A resolution designating the week of October 13, 2013, through October 19, 2013, as ''National Case Management Week'' to recognize the value of case management in improving healthcare outcomes for patients; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. COATS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. SHELBY):

S. Res. 215. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Federal Government should not bail out any State; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. Res. 216. A resolution electing Laura C. Dove, of Virginia, as Secretary for the Minority of the Senate; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. Res. 217. A resolution expressing support for designation of October 6, 2013, through October 10, 2013, as ''American College of Surgeons Days'' and recognizing the 100th anniversary of the founding of the organization; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. REID:

S. Con. Res. 22. A concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and an adjournment of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. Con. Res. 23. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States Postal Service should issue a commemorative postage stamp honoring the Reverend Doctor Leon Sullivan and that the

Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee should recommend to the Postmaster General that such a stamp be issued; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 15

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 15, a bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law.

S. 132

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 132, a bill to provide for the admission of the State of New Columbia into the Union.

S. 183

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 183, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for fairness in hospital payments under the Medicare program.

S. 203

At the request of Mr. KAINE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 203, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition and celebration of the Pro Football Hall of Fame.

S. 316

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 316, a bill to recalculate and restore retirement annuity obligations of the United States Postal Service, to eliminate the requirement that the United States Postal Service prefund the Postal Service Retiree Health Benefits Fund, to place restrictions on the closure of postal facilities, to create incentives for innovation for the United States Postal Service, to maintain levels of postal service, and for other purposes.

S. 323

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 323, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for extended months of Medicare coverage of immunosuppressive drugs for kidney transplant patients and other renal dialysis provisions.

S. 367

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 367, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 420

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 420, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the logical flow of return information between partnerships, corporations, trusts, estates, and individuals to better enable each party to submit timely, accurate returns and reduce the need for extended and amended returns, to provide for modified due dates by regulation, and to conform the automatic corporate extension period to long-standing regulatory rule.

S. 424

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 424, a bill to amend title IV of the Public Health Service Act to provide for a National Pediatric Research Network, including with respect to pediatric rare diseases or conditions.

S. 462

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 462, a bill to enhance the strategic partnership between the United States and Israel.

S. 489

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) were added as cosponsors of S. 489, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to increase and adjust for inflation the maximum value of articles that may be imported duty-free by one person on one day, and for other purposes.

S. 501

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 501, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and increase the exclusion for benefits provided to volunteer firefighters and emergency medical responders.

S. 557

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

S. 623

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 623, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure the continued access of Medicare beneficiaries to diagnostic imaging services.

S. 629

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) 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. 635

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) and the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) were added as cosponsors of S. 635, a bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

S. 642

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 642, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make the provision of technical services for medical imaging examinations and radiation therapy treatments safer, more accurate, and less costly.

S. 653

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 653, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia.

S. 654

At the request of Mr. MORAN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 654, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for collegiate housing and infrastructure grants.

S. 686

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 686, a bill to extend the right of appeal to the Merit Systems Protection Board to certain employees of the United States Postal Service.

S. 689

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 689, a bill to reauthorize and improve programs related to mental health and substance use disorders.

S. 695

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 695, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the authorization of appropriations for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to pay a monthly assistance allowance to disabled veterans training or competing for the Paralympic Team and the authorization of appropriations for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide assistance to United States Paralympics, Inc., and for other purposes.

S. 710

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 710, a bill to provide exemptions from municipal advisor registration requirements.

S. 719

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Delaware

(Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 719, a bill to provide for the expansion of Federal efforts concerning the prevention, education, treatment, and research activities related to Lyme and other tick-borne diseases, including the establishment of a Tick-Borne Diseases Advisory Committee.

S. 723

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 723, a bill to require the Commissioner of Social Security to revise the medical and evaluation criteria for determining disability in a person diagnosed with Huntington's Disease and to waive the 24-month waiting period for Medicare eligibility for individuals disabled by Huntington's Disease.

S. 734

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

S. 783

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

S. 798

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 798, a bill to address equity capital requirements for financial institutions, bank holding companies, subsidiaries, and affiliates, and for other purposes.

S. 862

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 862, a bill to amend section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an additional religious exemption from the individual health coverage mandate.

S. 878

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 878, a bill to amend title 9 of the United States Code with respect to arbitration.

S. 917

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 917, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a reduced rate of excise tax on beer produced domestically by certain qualifying producers.

S. 971

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 971, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to exempt the conduct of silvicultural activities from national pollutant discharge elimination system permitting requirements.

S. 981

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 981, a bill to direct the Federal Trade Commission to prescribe rules prohibiting deceptive advertising of abortion services, and for other purposes.

S. 1048

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1048, a bill to revoke the charters for the Federal National Mortgage Corporation and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation upon resolution of their obligations, to create a new Mortgage Finance Agency for the securitization of single family and multifamily mortgages, and for other purposes.

S. 1056

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1056, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a refundable adoption tax credit.

S. 1064

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

S. 1068

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1068, a bill to reauthorize and amend the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Commissioned Officer Corps Act of 2002, and for other purposes.

S. 1075

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1075, a bill to extend the phase-in of actuarial rates for flood insurance for certain properties under the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012.

S. 1088

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1088, a bill to end discrimination based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in public schools, and for other purposes.

S. 1114

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1114, a bill to provide for identification of misaligned currency, require action to correct the misalignment, and for other purposes.

S. 1118

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1118, a bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to better enable State child welfare agencies to prevent sex trafficking of children and serve the needs of children who are victims of sex trafficking, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1118, supra.

S. 1123

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1123, a bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to curb waste, fraud, and abuse in the Medicare and Medicaid programs.

S. 1143

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1143, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to physician supervision of therapeutic hospital outpatient services.

S. 1158

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CHIESA), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1158, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins commemorating the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 1174

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

S. 1181

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1181, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt certain stock of real estate investment trusts from the tax on foreign investments in

United States real property interests, and for other purposes.

S. 1188

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1188, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of full-time employee for purposes of the individual mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 1235

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1235, a bill to restrict any State or local jurisdiction from imposing a new discriminatory tax on cell phone services, providers, or property.

S. 1254

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1254, a bill to amend the Harmful Algal Blooms and Hypoxia Research and Control Act of 1998, and for other purposes.

S. 1269

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1269, a bill to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to support community college and industry partnerships, and for other purposes.

S. 1272

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1272, a bill to provide that certain requirements of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act do not apply if the American Health Benefit Exchanges are not operating on October 1, 2013.

S. 1282

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1282, a bill to reduce risks to the financial system by limiting banks' ability to engage in certain risky activities and limiting conflicts of interest, to reinstate certain Glass-Steagall Act protections that were repealed by the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1300

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1300, a bill to amend the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 to provide for the conduct of stewardship end result contracting projects.

S. 1302

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1302, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for cooperative and small employer charity pension plans.

S. 1313

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1313, a bill to promote transparency, accountability, and reform within the United Nations system, and for other purposes.

S. 1320

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 1320, a bill to establish a tiered hiring preference for members of the reserve components of the armed forces.

S. 1335

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1335, a bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

S. 1343

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1343, a bill to protect the information of livestock producers, and for other purposes.

S. 1349

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) 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. 1351

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1351, a bill to provide for fiscal gap and generational accounting analysis in the legislative process, the President's budget, and annual long-term fiscal outlook reports.

S. 1385

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1385, a bill to provide for the appointment of additional Federal circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 13

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 13, a concurrent resolution commending the Boys & Girls Clubs of America for its role in improving outcomes for millions of young people and thousands of communities.

S. RES. 206

At the request of Mr. SESSIONS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 206, a resolution designating September 2013 as ''National Prostate Cancer Awareness Month''.

S. RES. 208

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 208, a resolution designating the week beginning September 8, 2013, as ''National Direct Support Professionals Recognition Week''.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1419. A bill to promote research, development, and demonstration of marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today Senator MURKOWSKI and I are introducing legislation to promote a new form of hydropower, marine hydrokinetic renewable energy, or MHK. An MHK project generates energy from waves, currents, and tides in the ocean, an estuary or a tidal area as well as from the free-flowing water in a river, lake, or stream.

Our bill will help commercialize MHK technologies through research and development and a more efficient and timely regulatory process for the siting of pilot projects intended to demonstrate the viability of these technologies. It is an ideal follow-up to a pair of bills, H.R. 267 and H.R. 678, to streamline the regulatory process for low-impact conventional hydropower that were reported by the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources by unanimous bipartisan votes a few months ago. Considered together, the two conventional hydropower bills approved by the Committee along with this MHK legislation are a major step forward in advancing carbon-free hydropower technologies.

MHK has tremendous potential to generate a substantial amount of clean renewable energy in the United States and across the globe. It is poised to be a key participant in the transition to a low carbon economy.

What distinguishes MHK from conventional hydropower is that it generates energy without the use of a dam or other impoundment. This gets MHK off on the right foot in terms of minimizing any adverse environmental impact. Investments to capture our nation's rich domestic marine energy resources can also play a major role in the creation of essential domestic engineering and manufacturing jobs.

The energy contained in predictable waves, tidal flows and currents is the basis for worldwide investments in this emerging industry. Water is approximately 800 times denser than air, providing great potential power density along with predictability. These characteristics mean that MHK technologies could provide predictable

base-load renewable power in the future.

At the present time there are many different types of MHK technologies with multiple applications under development that are intended to capture the power contained in waves, tides and currents.

Wave energy devices capture the heave and/or surge power of waves and convert them via hydraulic or geared direct drive systems into electricity. Some of these devices are moored to the ocean floor, some are floating on the surface, while others are attached to breakwaters near shore. By last count, there are over 100 wave energy devices under development worldwide. Tidal energy technologies capture the ebb and flow of tides. It is estimated that 60 different tidal energy technologies are under development worldwide. There are other technologies that include run-of-river systems and offshore ocean current technologies. Most of these technologies under development capture uni-directional water flows and look similar to the tidal devices.

The United States has not been a world leader in the development of these cutting edge technologies to date. Instead, our country is seen as a huge potential market for our international competitors in this new industrial sector. The United States has significant wave, tidal, current and instream energy resources. The Electric Power Research Institute has estimated that the commercially available wave energy potential off the coast of the United States is roughly 252 million megawatt hours—equal to 6.5 percent of today's entire generating portfolio. This is approximately the amount of electricity presently being produced by the existing fleet of American conventional hydroelectric dams.

The Department of Energy, DOE, has released two nationwide resource assessments that indicate the waves, tides, and ocean currents off the nation's coasts could contribute significantly to the United States' total annual electricity production. DOE is currently developing an aggressive strategy to support its vision of producing at least fifteen percent of our nation's electricity from water power, including conventional hydropower, by 2030.

Our goal should be the establishment of a commercially viable U.S. MHK renewable energy industry, supported by a robust domestic supply chain for fabrication, installation, operations and maintenance of MHK devices. The development of a substantial marine hydrokinetic industry in the U.S. could drive billions of dollars of investment in heavy industrial and maritime sectors, as well as in advanced electrical systems and materials common to many renewable technologies. Federal investments would stimulate private funds and jobs in the construction, manufacturing, engineering, and environmental science sectors.

I am very pleased that my home State of Oregon has made a strategic decision to be an international leader in the commercialization of the marine renewable energy industry. Led by the Oregon Wave Energy Trust, the Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center co-located at Oregon State University, and several private companies that are part of the MHK supply chain, Oregon is positioning itself to be a leading force supporting this newly emerging industry.

Unfortunately, the U.S. is falling behind in the race to capture the rich energy potential of our oceans and the jobs that will come with this new industry. The United Kingdom, Ireland, Portugal, Scotland, Australia, and other countries are committed to producing emission-free, renewable energy from MHK sources. Scotland has had a grid-connected, wave energy convertor unit in operation since 2001 and maintains a national goal of producing 2 GW of generation capacity from MHK renewable energy. The U.K. and Ireland have also set aggressive goals for MHK generation by 2020.

The Ocean Renewable Energy Coalition, the industry's trade group here in Washington DC, calculates that more than $782 million has been spent by the UK government on wave energy R&D over the past 10 years. That total approaches $1 billion over the same period if you add in the commitments to ocean energy R&D from France, Portugal, Spain, Norway, and Denmark.

Early funding support, along with development of full-scale device testing centers, demonstrates that the significant technological advances and the competitive advantages in this industry are trending in Europe's direction. As an example of the disparity in investments, Europe currently has several wave and tidal energy test facilities, led by the European Marine Energy Center in Scotland, that are helping technology developers commercialize their wave and tidal energy convertors. The United States clearly has a need for such infrastructure. I know that Oregon State University has a strong desire to compete for funding to help establish a testing center in the Pacific Northwest. Unfortunately, recent funding levels have not supported development of such offshore testing infrastructure in the U.S. to date.

Given this internationally competitive situation, I believe that Congress must make targeted Federal investments to close the gap. Commercialization of technologies to harness marine renewable energy resources will require Federal funding to augment research and development efforts already underway in the private sector. Just as the wind and solar industries have received DOE funding support for over 3 decades, which has resulted in the rapid deployment of these technologies in recent years, the nascent marine energy industry seeks similar Federal assistance to develop promising technologies that are on the verge of commercial viability.

Unfortunately, in addition to the limited private sector funding available to these startup companies, permitting and regulatory obstacles are tremendous disincentives to technology developers of marine energy projects in the United States. While other countries have adopted permitting and regulatory regimes that appear to be more efficient, the United States is still struggling with how to permit and regulate these technologies. I cannot overstate the seriousness of this problem. To give just one example, it took one MHK developer 5 years and $2 million to obtain a license from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for a 1.5 megawatt project.

The regulatory situation is simply unacceptable and is greatly slowing progress in the MHK industry. Until companies get projects in the water, Congress and the public will not learn about the environmental impacts, engineering challenges or the true costs of offshore renewables.

Capturing the benefits of our vast marine-based renewable resources will require a mix of new incentives, updated regulatory regimes and general outreach and education. However, the most important actions that can be taken by the Federal Government in the short term are to provide the necessary resources for research, development and demonstration of various marine renewable energy technology platforms and a workable and efficient regulatory process. Increased federal support will accelerate deployment of these technologies, create thousands of high paying jobs, give confidence to investors, and help attract private capital.

The Marine and Hydrokinetic Renewable Energy Act of 2013 helps accomplish these goals in a number of ways. It reauthorizes the DOE's MHK research, development and demonstration 3 programs, including the National Marine Renewable Energy Research, Development, and Demonstration Centers.

Increased resources for the DOE Water Power Program will enable the United States to leverage its technological superiority in shipbuilding and offshore oil and gas production. This will create jobs and diversify these maritime industries. In the absence of such funding, however, the United States will have to depend on foreign suppliers for ocean energy technologies, and will have missed a significant opportunity to expand our economic competiveness in this renewable energy sector.

The regulatory component of the bill makes the regulatory process for MHK of not more than 10 MW more efficient and timely. It modifies and improves the FERC ''pilot license'' process in many ways. Improvements include a goal to complete the pilot license process in 12 months or less; a designation of FERC as the ''Lead Agency'' for the purpose of coordinating environmental review; a clarification that any shut

down requirement be ''reasonable,'' and a clarification that an MHK project does not need to be removed when it is shut down if FERC deems leaving it in place is preferable for environmental and other reasons

MHK is a clean, home-grown, emissions-free source of electricity that can improve the security and reliability of the electric grid. Investing in MHK research, development and demonstration today will pay great dividends in the future. MHK has tremendous potential to benefit the United States and the entire world. Now is the time to move forward on MHK and the Marine and Hydrokinetic Renewable Energy Act is the way to do it.

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. 1419

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Marine and Hydrokinetic Renewable Energy Act of 2013''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

TITLE I—MARINE AND HYDROKINETIC RENEWABLE ENERGY TECHNOLOGIES

SEC. 101. DEFINITION OF MARINE AND HYDROKINETIC RENEWABLE ENERGY.

Section 632 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17211) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking ''electrical''.

SEC. 102. MARINE AND HYDROKINETIC RENEWABLE ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

Section 633 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17212) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 633. MARINE AND HYDROKINETIC RENEWABLE ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

''The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, shall carry out a program of research, development, demonstration, and commercial application to expand marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy production, including programs—

''(1) to assist technology development to improve the components, processes, and systems used for power generation from marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy resources;

''(2) to establish critical testing infrastructure necessary—

''(A) to cost effectively and efficiently test and prove marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy devices; and

''(B) to accelerate the technological readiness and commercialization of those devices;

''(3) to support efforts to increase the efficiency of energy conversion, lower the cost, increase the use, improve the reliability, and demonstrate the applicability of marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy technologies by participating in demonstration projects;

''(4) to investigate variability issues and the efficient and reliable integration of marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy with the utility grid;

''(5) to identify and study critical short- and long-term needs to create a sustainable marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy supply chain based in the United States;

''(6) to increase the reliability and survivability of marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy technologies, including development of corrosion-resistant and anti-fouling materials;

''(7) to verify the performance, reliability, maintainability, and cost of new marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy device designs and system components in an operating environment;

''(8) to coordinate and avoid duplication of activities across programs of the Department and other applicable Federal agencies, including National Laboratories;

''(9) to identify opportunities for joint research and development programs and development of economies of scale between—

''(A) marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy technologies; and

''(B) other renewable energy and fossil energy programs, offshore oil and gas production activities, and activities of the Department of Defense; and

''(10) to support in-water technology development with international partners using existing cooperative procedures (including memoranda of understanding)—

''(A) to allow cooperative funding and other support of value to be exchanged and leveraged; and

''(B) to encourage the participation of international research centers and companies in the United States and the participation of research centers and companies of the United States in international projects.''.

SEC. 103. NATIONAL MARINE RENEWABLE ENERGY RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND DEMONSTRATION CENTERS.

Section 634 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17213) is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

''(b) PURPOSES.—The Centers (in coordination with the Department and National Laboratories) shall—

''(1) advance research, development, demonstration, and commercial application of marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy technologies;

''(2) support in-water testing and demonstration of marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy technologies, including facilities capable of testing—

''(A) marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy systems of various technology readiness levels and scales;

''(B) a variety of technologies in multiple test berths at a single location; and

''(C) arrays of technology devices; and

''(3) serve as information clearinghouses for the marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy industry by collecting and disseminating information on best practices in all areas relating to developing and managing marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy resources and energy systems.''.

SEC. 104. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 636 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17215) is amended by striking ''2008 through 2012'' and inserting ''2014 through 2017''.

TITLE II—MARINE AND HYDROKINETIC RENEWABLE ENERGY REGULATORY EFFICIENCY

SEC. 201. MARINE AND HYDROKINETIC RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECTS AND FACILITIES.

Part I of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 792 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 34. PILOT LICENSE FOR MARINE AND HYDROKINETIC RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECTS.

''(a) DEFINITION OF HYDROKINETIC PILOT PROJECT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In this section, the term 'hydrokinetic pilot project' means a facility that generates energy from—

''(A) waves, tides, or currents in an ocean, estuary, or tidal area; or

''(B) free-flowing water in a river, lake, or stream.

''(2) EXCLUSIONS.—The term 'hydrokinetic pilot project' does not include a project that uses a dam or other impoundment for electric power purposes.

''(b) PILOT LICENSES AUTHORIZED.—The Commission may issue a pilot license to construct, operate, and maintain a hydrokinetic pilot project that meets the criteria listed in subsection (c).

''(c) LICENSE CRITERIA.—The Commission may issue a pilot license for a hydrokinetic pilot project if the project—

''(1) will have an installed capacity of not more than 10 megawatts;

''(2) is for a term of not more than 10 years;

''(3) will not cause a significant adverse environmental impact or interfere with navigation;

''(4) is removable and can shut down on reasonable notice in the event of a significant adverse safety, navigation, or environmental impact;

''(5) can be removed, and the site can be restored, by the end of the license term, unless the project has obtained a new license or the Commission has determined, based on substantial evidence, that the project should not be removed because it would be preferable for environmental or other reasons not to; and

''(6) is primarily for the purpose of—

''(A) testing new hydrokinetic technologies;

''(B) locating appropriate sites for new hydrokinetic technologies; or

''(C) determining the environmental and other effects of a hydrokinetic technology.

''(d) LEAD AGENCY.—In carrying out this section, the Commission shall act as the lead agency—

''(1) to coordinate all applicable Federal authorizations; and

''(2) to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

''(e) SCHEDULE GOALS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Commission receives a completed application, and following consultation with Federal, State, and local agencies with jurisdiction over the hydrokinetic pilot project, the Commission shall develop and issue pilot license approval process scheduling goals that cover all Federal, State, and local permits required by law.

''(2) COMPLIANCE.—Applicable Federal, State, and local agencies shall comply with the goals established under paragraph (1) to the maximum extent practicable, consistent with applicable law.

''(3) 1-YEAR GOAL.—It shall be the goal of the Commission and the other applicable agencies to complete the pilot license process by not later than 1 year after the date on which the Commission receives the completed application.

''(f) SIZE LIMITATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may grant a pilot license for a project located in the ocean if the project covers a surface area of not more than 1 square nautical mile.

''(2) EXCEPTION.—The Commission, at the discretion of the Commission and for good cause, may grant a pilot license for a project that covers a surface area of more than 1 square nautical mile.

''(3) LIMITATION.—For proposed projects located in an estuary, tidal area, river, lake, or stream, the Commission shall determine the size limit on a case-by-case basis, taking into account all relevant factors.

''(g) EXTENSIONS AUTHORIZED.—On application by a project, the Commission may make a 1-time extension of a pilot license for a term not to exceed 5 years.''.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. RISCH):

S. 1420. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for transparency of payments made from the Judgment Fund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise to discuss legislation that I am introducing in the U.S. Senate today, the Judgment Fund Transparency Act.

As my colleagues may or may not know, the Judgment Fund is administered by the Treasury Department and is used to pay certain court judgments and settlements against the Federal Government. It is essentially an unlimited amount of money available to pay for Federal Government liability. It is not subject to the annual appropriations process, and even more remarkably, the Treasury Department has no reporting requirements, so these funds are paid out with very little oversight or scrutiny.

This is no small matter, as the Judgment Fund disburses billions of dollars in payments per year. In recent years, Treasury has paid the following from the Fund: fiscal year 2012—$2.9 billion, fiscal year 2011—$2.2 billion, fiscal year 2010—$1.1 billion, fiscal year 2009—$2.3 billion, fiscal year 2008—$790 million, fiscal year 2007—$1 billion, and fiscal year 2006—$628 million.

Before the Judgment Fund was established, claims against the government were assigned to a Congressional committee that would appropriate funds in order to pay liability, attorneys' fees, and costs associated with the claim. Once the Judgment Fund was established in 1956, however, Congressional committees stopped appropriating funds explicitly for this purpose. Now, if a government agency does not use its own annual budget to cover the costs, Treasury simply pays the bill out of the Fund.

Because the Treasury Department has no binding reporting requirements, few public details exist about where the funds are going and why, and the information that is readily accessible is only made available at the administration's discretion.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce highlighted the nature of this problem in an article about the Judgment Fund written by Bill Kovacs on February 1, 2013:

Without knowing who is being paid under the Judgment Fund and for what reason, not to mention the validity of the claim, Congress cannot oversee and control the federal governments litigation costs, risks and exposure. Simply, without disclosure Congress is being denied the opportunity to take effective mitigation measures against improper agency action that results in claims against the federal government. Non-disclosure of Judgment Fund payments hides from Congress what might be excessive markers of agency mismanagement and/or structural defects in statutes and programs. And due to a lack of reporting, Congress is denied the opportunity to understand claims against agencies that might shed light on how to improve agency operations.

The National Cattlemen's Beef Association has also decried the lack of oversight of the Judgment Fund by stating, ''Certain groups continuously sue the federal government, and Treasury simply writes a check to foot the bill without providing Members of Congress and American taxpayers basic information about the payment.''

The Judgment Fund Transparency Act seeks to address these problems by requiring a public accounting of the taxpayer funds distributed via the Judgment Fund to parties who bring successful claims against the Federal government.

The Judgment Fund Transparency Act promotes transparency and oversight by requiring the Treasury Department to post on a publicly accessible website the claimant, counsel, agency, fact summary, and payment amount for each claim from the Judgment Fund, unless a law or court order otherwise prohibits the disclosure of such information.

The Judgment Fund Transparency Act would increase transparency and oversight of the Fund and would provide Members of Congress and the public with the ability to see how taxpayers' dollars are being spent.

I am proud to introduce the Judgment Fund Transparency Act today and invite my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation.

By Mr. LEAHY:

S. 1421. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a refundable tax credit for the installation of sprinklers and elevators in historic structures; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, each year fire destroys hundreds of vulnerable historic buildings that serve as the anchors of America's vibrant villages and downtowns. These fires leave gaping holes in Main Streets all across the country. All have destroyed property. Some have taken lives. And many could have been prevented by sprinkler systems. This upfront but costly investment could have helped prevent the loss of life, reduced property damage, and decreased federal expenditures on rebuilding efforts after these fires.

To prevent fires from destroying buildings in historic downtowns and to preserve access to upper-story office, retail, and housing space in these buildings, I am introducing legislation today—the Historic Downtown Preservation and Access Act—that will create a 50 percent refundable tax credit, capped at $50,000, for the installation of fire sprinklers and elevators in older, multi-use buildings in historic downtowns.

Since 2000, Vermont has had more than a dozen significant downtown fires causing tens of millions of dollars of damage and taking at least three lives. The original owners of at least 8 of these buildings were unable to rebuild—leaving the critical task of rebuilding both the building and the community to nonprofit entities that rely primarily on Federal funds. These 8 projects cost the Federal Government $20 million in Low Income Housing Tax Credits, Community Development Block-Grant building, and HOME funding. Only one of these 8 buildings had a sprinkler system. If the building owners had installed sprinklers in all eight buildings using the credit created by this legislation, the Federal Government may have saved $19.6 million, dozens of Vermonters would still be in their homes, more than a dozen businesses would have been sparred, and at least three Vermonters might still be alive today.

According to the National Fire Sprinkler Association, housing units with sprinklers receive 69 percent less property damage during a fire than units without sprinklers, the death rate per fire in a home with a sprinkler is 83 percent less than in a home without a sprinkler, and firefighters are 65 percent less likely to be injured in a fire where a sprinkler is present than in a fire where a sprinkler is not present.

This legislation also incentivizes the installation of elevators because too often upper story office, retail, and housing space in historic downtown buildings goes unused due to accessibility requirements.

Financial cost-benefit modeling and existing federal incentives for rehabbing an historic building with sprinklers or an elevator fail to adequately incentivize building owners to install these assets. For instance, the Qualified Rehabilitation Tax Credit requires significant rehabilitation to a building equal to the value of the building before renovation in order to claim the credit. Asset depreciation tax benefits take decades for a building owner to offset the cost of a sprinkler or elevator system, and building owners who make no profit or minimal profit have no use for existing tax credits.

The new refundable tax credit I am introducing today—modeled after the State of Vermont's highly successful

downtown historic tax credit—would allow private entities with little tax liability and nonprofits alike to install these important property- and life-saving devices in historic buildings.

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. 1421

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 ''Historic Downtown Preservation and Access Act''.

SEC. 2. CREDIT FOR INSTALLATION OF SPRINKLERS AND ELEVATORS IN HISTORIC BUILDINGS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart C of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after section 36B the following new section:

''SEC. 36C. HISTORIC BUILDING EXPENSES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There shall be allowed a credit against the tax imposed by this subtitle for the taxable year an amount equal to 50 percent of the qualified historic building expenses paid or incurred by the taxpayer during such taxable year.

''(b) LIMITATION.—The credit allowed under subsection (a) with respect to any taxpayer for any taxable year shall not exceed $50,000.

''(c) QUALIFIED HISTORIC BUILDING EXPENSES.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified historic building expenses' means amounts paid or incurred to install in a certified historic structure an elevator system or a sprinkler system that meets the requirements found in the most recent edition of NFPA 13: Standard for the Installation of Sprinkler Systems.

''(2) NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARKS.—In the case of a certified historic structure that is designated as a National Historic Landmark in accordance with section 101(a) of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470a(a)) and that is open to the public, the term 'qualified historic building expenses' shall not include an expense described in paragraph (1), unless the installation of property described in such paragraph meets the requirements for a certified rehabilitation under section 47(c)(2)(C).

''(3) CERTIFIED HISTORIC STRUCTURE.—The term 'certified historic structure' has the meaning given such term in section 47(c)(3), except that such term shall not include any structure which is a single-family residence.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 1324 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting '', 36C'' after '', 36B''.

(2) The table of sections for subpart C of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 36B the following new item:

''Sec. 36C. Historic building expenses.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. KING, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 1422. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 respecting the scoring of preventive health savings; to the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise to introduce legislation to modernize the Congressional budget scoring process with respect to health spending and the effects of preventive health care.

Although the United States spends more than any other Nation in the world on health care, $2.6 trillion in 2010, our citizens' health status lags behind that of most developed countries, and we have the highest rate of preventable deaths among 19 industrialized nations. One reason is that the United States' expenditures for the treatment of disease far exceed our investments in preventive health.

Our neglect of prevention has been costly. Spending on the treatment of chronic diseases is overwhelming our health care budgets, particularly those of the Medicare and Medicaid programs. The following statistics come from the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: 7 out of 10 deaths among Americans each year are from chronic diseases. Heart disease, cancer and stroke account for more than 50 percent of all deaths each year.

In 2005, 133 million Americans almost 1 out of every 2 adults had at least one chronic illness.

About ¼ of people with chronic conditions have one or more daily activity limitations.

Arthritis is the most common cause of disability, with nearly 19 million Americans reporting activity limitations.

Diabetes continues to be the leading cause of kidney failure, nontraumatic lower-extremity amputations, and blindness among adults, aged 20–74.

Excessive alcohol consumption is the third leading preventable cause of death in the U.S., behind diet, physical activity, and tobacco.

CDC also tells us that four health risk behaviors—lack of physical activity, poor nutrition, tobacco use, and excessive alcohol consumption—are responsible for much of the illness, suffering, and early death related to chronic diseases.

More than ⅓ of all adults do not meet recommendations for aerobic physical activity based on the 2008 Physical Activity Guidelines for Americans, and 23 percent report no leisure-time physical activity at all in the preceding month.

In 2007, 22 percent of high school students and only 24 percent of adults reported eating 5 or more servings of fruits and vegetables per day.

More than 43 million American adults, approximately 1 in 5, smoke. Lung cancer is the leading cause of cancer death, and cigarette smoking causes almost all cases. Compared to nonsmokers, men who smoke are about 23 times more likely to develop lung cancer and women who smoke are about 13 times more likely. Smoking causes about 90 percent of lung cancer deaths in men and almost 80 percent in women. Smoking also causes cancer of the voicebox, mouth and throat, esophagus, bladder, kidney, pancreas, cervix, and stomach, and causes acute myeloid leukemia.

Excessive alcohol consumption contributes to over 54 different diseases and injuries, including cancer of the mouth, throat, esophagus, liver, colon, and breast, liver diseases, and other cardiovascular, neurological, psychiatric, and gastrointestinal health problems.

Binge drinking, the most dangerous pattern of drinking, defined as consuming more than 4 drinks on an occasion for women or 5 drinks for men, is reported by 17 percent of U.S. adults, averaging 8 drinks per binge.

By addressing just these four behaviors, we can alter the trajectory of chronic disease and the health costs associated with them. That is the power of prevention. As Dr. Albert Reece of the University of Maryland School of Medicine once said, ''Lifestyle is primary care.''

Prevention also means early screening. In addition to increasing survival rates, identifying diseases early reduces health care costs. In the case of colorectal cancer, Medicare will pay under $400 for a colonoscopy, but if the patient is not diagnosed until the disease has metastasized, the costs of care can exceed $58,000 over the patient's lifetime. A screening mammography costs the Medicare program a small fraction of the tens of thousands of dollars that treatment of breast cancer costs, depending on when the cancer is found and the course of treatment used. One drug used to treat late stage breast cancer can cost as much as $40,000 a year.

Research has shown that increasing to 90 percent the number of women aged 40 and older who have been screened for breast cancer in the past two years would save more than 100,000 lives each year in the United States.

One of the most compelling cases for prevention is in the area of oral health. The tragic, preventable death of 12 year-old Marylander Deamonte Driver in 2007 illustrated the consequences of poor access to oral health care. His untreated tooth abscess spread to his brain and after two extensive operations, he died. Although a tooth extraction would have cost about $80, the final total cost of his medical care exceeded $250,000.

The American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry tells us that dental decay is the most common chronic childhood disease among children in the United States. It affects one in five children aged 2 to 4, half of those aged 6 to 8, and nearly ⅗ of 15 year olds. But it is also the most preventable disease if basic oral care is provided starting at an early age.

The good news in that for nearly every category of chronic disease we can reduce its prevalence by making preventive health care a priority. All around us are examples of why prevention is an essential part of health care

and why effective use of preventive measures, such as screening and smoking cessation can save lives and lower health care costs in the long run.

But the current Congressional budget process has hindered our ability to get appropriate credit for the cost savings that prevention can bring. For this reason, investing in initiatives that can move our Nation forward toward optimal health often requires us to cut funding in other important areas because of the budget rules.

Today, budget resolutions, budget reconciliation, and CBO scoring analyses use a ten-year ''scoring'' window. But the research performed at the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, MD and at research centers across the nation has demonstrated that some expenditures for preventive services result in cost savings when considered in the long term. Unfortunately, Congressional budget scoring rules only permit taking into account the first ten years, a time frame in which savings may not be apparent.

We want to change that. Today, with Senators MIKE CRAPO, ANGUS KING, TOM UDALL, and JEANNE SHAHEEN, I am introducing the Preventive Health Savings Act of 2013. It would allow the Chairman or Ranking Member of the House or Senate Budget Committee, or the health committees—HELP, Finance, Ways and Means, or Energy and Commerce—to request an analysis of preventive measures extending beyond the existing 10-year window to two additional ten-year periods.

Re-evaluating our budget rules is not a new phenomenon. In recent years, Congress has increasingly looked for ways to assess long-term budget consequences. For example, Congress currently requests that CBO report on measures that would cause a large future increase in the deficit—more than $5 billion in the following four decades.

The Preventive Health Savings Act would direct CBO to incorporate credible data on prevention. Because we want to ensure that CBO's projections are tied to scientific data, our bill would define preventive health as ''an action designed to avoid future health care costs that is demonstrated by credible and publicly available epidemiological projection models, incorporating clinical trials or observational studies in humans, longitudinal studies, and meta-analysis.'' This narrow, responsible approach encourages a sensible review of health policy that Congress believes will promote public health, and it will make it easier for us to invest in proven methods of saving lives and money.

CBO would be required to conduct an initial analysis to determine whether the provision would result in substantial savings outside the 10-year scoring window and to include a description of those future-year savings in its budget projections.

The broad coalition of groups supporting this bill includes: the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, Aetna, Allscripts, American Association of Diabetes Educators, American College of Occupational Medicine, American College of Preventative Medicine, American Diabetes Association, BlueCross BlueShield Tennessee, Building Healthier America, Care Continuum Alliance, Council for Affordable Health Coverage, Dialysis Patient Citizens, The Endocrine Society, Healthcare Leadership Council, Healthways, IHRSA: International Health Racquet & Sportsclub Association, Johnson & Johnson, Marshfield Clinic, Memorial Care Health System, National Association of Public Hospitals and Health Systems, National Retail Federation, National Kidney Foundation, Novo Nordisk, the Partnership to Fight Chronic Disease, Sanofi, Texas Health Resources, and Weight Watchers.

I also wish to applaud the bipartisan House sponsors of this legislation—two physicians—Representatives MICHAEL BURGESS of Texas and DONNA CHRISTENSEN of the U.S. Virgin Islands, for their vision in introducing the companion bill, HR 2663, which now has 19 cosponsors.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation, which will give our budget process the flexibility needed to dramatically bend the health care cost curve.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 1423. A bill to amend the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 to strengthen the quality control measures in place for part B lung disease claims and to establish the Advisory Board on Toxic Substances and Worker Health for the contractor employee compensation program under subtitle E of such Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I rise to speak about bipartisan legislation I am introducing today with Senator ALEXANDER to provide much needed help to our Cold War patriots.

In 2000, Congress passed the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program to help Cold War workers like those from Rocky Flats in my home state of Colorado and other nuclear weapons facilities around the country. This effort was designed to get these patriots the help they need to treat cancer and other illnesses they developed as a result of exposure to radiation. Since then, the program has been plagued by procedural inconsistencies and delays preventing former nuclear workers from accessing the benefits they are owed.

In March 2010, the U.S. Government Accountability Office issued a report on the efficacy of EEOICPA, confirming workers' ongoing frustrations with the program and recommending that Congress consider creating an advisory board. More recently, in March 2013, the Institute of Medicine issued a report recommending that an external advisory panel be created to review the health effects of the Department of Labor's approach to awarding benefits.

Today, Senator ALEXANDER and I are reintroducing our bill requiring the President to establish an independent advisory panel to do just that. This advisory board would add much needed transparency and certainty to decisions made affecting workers' compensation and access to benefits.

Some 600,000 Cold War era workers, including thousands of workers at Rocky Flats, put their health on the line to preserve our national security during one of the most uncertain times in our nation's history. They were exposed to radiation and are sick and dying. Our country made a commitment to these patriots, but so far that promise has not been kept. Coloradans find that unacceptable. We cannot let another family suffer through the uncertainty of delays caused by bureaucratic red tape or see their loved ones denied the benefits they deserve. It is time for us to do right by these workers.

I urge my colleagues to join me and Senator ALEXANDER in this fight by cosponsoring this important legislation.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1425. A bill to improve the safety of dietary supplements by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require manufacturers of dietary supplements to register dietary supplements with the Food and Drug Administration and to amend labeling requirements with respect to dietary supplements; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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. 1425

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 ''Dietary Supplement Labeling Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. REGULATION OF DIETARY SUPPLEMENTS.

(a) REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 415(a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 350d(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(6) REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO DIETARY SUPPLEMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A facility engaged in manufacturing or processing dietary supplements that is required to register under this section shall comply with the requirements of this paragraph, in addition to the other requirements of this section.

''(B) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—A facility described in subparagraph (A) shall submit a registration under paragraph (1) that includes, in addition to the information required under paragraph (2)—

''(I) a description of each dietary supplement manufactured or processed by such facility;

''(II) a list of all ingredients in each such dietary supplement; and

''(III) a copy of the label for each such dietary supplement.

''(ii) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary shall make the information provided under clause (i) publicly available, including by posting such information on the Internet Web site of the Food and Drug Administration.

''(C) REGISTRATION WITH RESPECT TO NEW, REFORMULATED, AND DISCONTINUED DIETARY SUPPLEMENTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the date described in clause (ii), if a facility described in subparagraph (A)—

''(I) manufactures or processes a dietary supplement that the facility previously did not manufacture or process and for which the facility did not submit the information required under subclauses (I) through (III) of subparagraph (B)(i);

''(II) reformulates a dietary supplement for which the facility previously submitted the information required under subclauses (I) through (III) of subparagraph (B)(i); or

''(III) no longer manufactures or processes a dietary supplement for which the facility previously submitted the information required under subclauses (I) through (III) of subparagraph (B)(i),

such facility shall submit to the Secretary an updated registration describing the change described in subclause (I), (II), or (III) and, in the case of a facility described in subclause (I) or (II), containing the information required under subclauses (I) through (III) of subparagraph (B)(i).

''(ii) DATE DESCRIBED.—The date described in this clause is—

''(I) in the case of a facility described in subclause (I) of clause (i), 30 days after the date on which such facility first markets the dietary supplement described in such subclause;

''(II) in the case of a facility described in subclause (II) of clause (i), 30 days after the date on which such facility first markets the reformulated dietary supplement described in such subclause; or

''(III) in the case of a facility described in subclause (III) of clause (i), 30 days after the date on which such facility removes the dietary supplement described in such subclause from the market.''.

(2) ENFORCEMENT.—Section 403 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 343) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(z) If it is a dietary supplement for which a facility is required to submit the registration information required under section 415(a)(6) and such facility has not complied with the requirements of such section 415(a)(6) with respect to such dietary supplement.''.

(b) LABELING.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF LABELING REQUIREMENTS.—Chapter IV of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 341 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 411 the following:

''SEC. 411A. DIETARY SUPPLEMENTS.

''(a) DIETARY SUPPLEMENT INGREDIENTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Dietary Supplement Labeling Act of 2013, the Secretary shall compile a list of dietary supplement ingredients and proprietary blends of ingredients that the Secretary determines could cause potentially serious adverse events, drug interactions, or contraindications, or potential risks to subgroups such as children and pregnant or breastfeeding women.

''(b) IOM STUDY.—The Secretary shall seek to enter into a contract with the Institute of Medicine under which the Institute of Medicine shall evaluate dietary supplement ingredients and proprietary blends of ingredients, including those on the list compiled by the Secretary under subsection (a), and scientific literature on dietary supplement ingredients and, not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the Dietary Supplement Labeling Act of 2013, submit to the Secretary a report evaluating the safety of dietary supplement ingredients and proprietary blends of ingredients the Institute of Medicine determines could cause potentially serious adverse events, drug interactions, or contraindications, or potential risks to subgroups such as children and pregnant or breastfeeding women.

''(c) ESTABLISHMENT OF REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than 2 years after the date on which the Institute of Medicine issues the report under subsection (b), the Secretary, after providing for public notice and comment and taking into consideration such report, shall—

''(1) establish mandatory warning label requirements for dietary supplement ingredients that the Secretary determines to cause potentially serious adverse events, drug interactions, or contraindications, or potential risks to subgroups; and

''(2) identify proprietary blends of ingredients for which, because of potentially serious adverse events, drug interactions, or contraindications, or potential risks to subgroups such as children and pregnant or breastfeeding women, the weight per serving of the ingredient in the proprietary blend shall be provided on the label.

''(d) UPDATES.—As appropriate, the Secretary, after providing for public notice and comment, shall update—

''(1) the list compiled under subsection (a);

''(2) the mandatory warning label requirements established under paragraph (1) of subsection (c); and

''(3) the requirements under paragraph (2) of subsection (c).''.

(2) ENFORCEMENT.—Section 403 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 343) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (q)(5)(F)(ii), by inserting '', and for each proprietary blend identified by the Secretary under section 411A(c)(2), the weight of such proprietary blend,'' after ''ingredients)''; and

(B) in paragraph (s)(2)—

(i) in clause (A)(ii)(II), by inserting '', and for each proprietary blend identified by the Secretary under section 411A(c)(2), the weight of each such proprietary blend per serving'' before the semicolon at the end;

(ii) in clause (D)(iii), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(iii) in clause (E)(ii)(II), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

''(F) the label does not include information with respect to potentially serious adverse events, drug interactions, or contraindications, or potential risks to subgroups such as children and pregnant or breastfeeding women, as required under section 411A(c)(1); or

''(G) the label does not include the batch number.''.

(c) STRUCTURE AND FUNCTION CLAIMS.—Section 403(r)(6)(B) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 343(r)(6)(B)) is amended by inserting '', and provides such substantiation to the Secretary, as the Secretary may require'' after ''misleading''.

(d) CONVENTIONAL FOODS.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and after providing for public notice and comment, shall establish a definition for the term ''conventional food'' for purposes of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.). Such definition shall take into account conventional foods marketed as dietary supplements, including products marketed as dietary supplements that simulate conventional foods.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1427. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to clarify the rule allowing discharge as a nonpriority claim of governmental claims arising from the disposition of farm assets under chapter 12 bankruptcies; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce, along with Senator FRANKEN, the Family Farmer Bankruptcy Clarification Act of 2013. We introduced similar legislation in the 112th Congress, but the Senate never had a chance to consider the bill. The bill addresses the 2012 United States Supreme Court case Hall v. United States. In a 5–4 decision, the Supreme Court ruled that a provision I inserted into the 2005 Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act did not accomplish what we in Congress intended. The Family Farmer Bankruptcy Clarification Act of 2013 corrects this and clarifies that bankrupt family farmers reorganizing their debts are able to treat capital gains taxes owed to a governmental unit, arising from the sale of farm assets during a bankruptcy, as general unsecured claims. This bill will remove the Internal Revenue Service's veto power over a bankruptcy reorganization plan's confirmation, giving the family farmer a chance to reorganize successfully.

In 1986 Congress enacted Chapter 12 of the Bankruptcy Code to provide a specialized bankruptcy process for family farmers. In 2005 Chapter 12 was made permanent. Between 1986 and 2005 we learned what aspects worked and did not work for family farmers reorganizing in bankruptcy. One problematic area was where a family farmer needed to sell assets in order to generate cash for the reorganization. Specifically, a family farmer would have to sell portions of the farm to generate cash to fund a reorganization plan so that the creditors could receive payment. Unfortunately, in situations like this, the family farmer is selling land that has been owned for a very long time, with a very low cost basis. Thus, when the land is sold, the family farmer is hit with a substantial capital gains tax, which is owed to the Internal Revenue Service.

Under the Bankruptcy Code, taxes owed to the Internal Revenue Service receive priority treatment. Holders of priority claims must receive payment in full, unless the claim holder agrees to be treated differently. This creates problems for the family farmer who needs the cash to pay creditors to reorganize. However, since the Internal Revenue Service has the ability to require full payment, they hold veto

power over a plan's confirmation, which means in many instances the plan will not be confirmed. This does not make sense if the goal is to give the family farmer a fresh start. Thus, in 2005 Congress said that in these limited situations, the taxes owed to the Internal Revenue Service would be stripped of their priority and treated as general, unsecured debt. This removed the government's veto power over plan confirmation and paved the way for family farmers to reorganize.

Unfortunately, in Hall v. United States, the Supreme Court ruled that despite Congress's express goal of helping family farmers, the language inserted into the Bankruptcy Code in 2005 conflicted with the Tax Code. The Hall case was one of statutory interpretation. There is no question what Congress was trying to do; rather, did Congress use the correct language? My goal, along with others at the time, was to relieve family farmers from having their reorganization plans fail because of huge tax liabilities to the federal government. Justice Breyer noted this in the dissent: ''Congress was concerned about the effect on the farmer of collecting capital gains tax debts that arose during, and were connected with, the Chapter 12 proceedings themselves. . . . The majority does not deny the importance of Congress' objective. Rather, it feels compelled to hold that Congress put the Amendment in the wrong place.'' Hall v. United States, 132 S.Ct. 1882, 1897 (2012) (Breyer, J., dissenting) (internal citations and quotations omitted).

As a result of the Hall case, family farmers facing bankruptcy now find themselves caught in a tough spot. The rules have now changed and must be corrected in order to provide certainty and clarity in the law. The Family Farmer Bankruptcy Clarification Act of 2013 will provide the clarity needed to help family farmers.

This bill, which has been worked on over the past year to make sure the problem is addressed correctly, adds a new section 1232 to title 11 of the United States Code. This new section, along with other conforming changes to the Bankruptcy Code, will provide clarity to practitioners and courts as to how these claims are to be treated during bankruptcy. I am pleased that what we are introducing today, building from the bill we introduced last Congress, is an improved product that can help family farmers who are facing hard times. The Family Farmer Bankruptcy Clarification Act of 2013 will ensure that what Congress sought to do in 2005 actually occurs. In the wake of the Hall decision, clarification is needed to help family farmers reorganize successfully.

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. 1427

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 ''Family Farmer Bankruptcy Clarification Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. CLARIFICATION OF RULE ALLOWING DISCHARGE TO GOVERNMENTAL CLAIMS ARISING FROM THE DISPOSITION OF FARM ASSETS UNDER CHAPTER 12 BANKRUPTCIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 12 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 1232. Claim by a governmental unit based on the disposition of property used in a farming operation

''(a) Any unsecured claim of a governmental unit against the debtor or the estate that arises before the filing of the petition, or that arises after the filing of the petition and before the debtor's discharge under section 1228, as a result of the sale, transfer, exchange, or other disposition of any property used in the debtor's farming operation—

''(1) shall be treated as an unsecured claim arising before the date on which the petition is filed;

''(2) shall not be entitled to priority under section 507;

''(3) shall be provided for under a plan; and

''(4) shall be discharged in accordance with section 1228.

''(b) For purposes of applying sections 1225(a)(4), 1228(b)(2), and 1229(b)(1) to a claim described in subsection (a) of this section, the amount that would be paid on such claim if the estate of the debtor were liquidated in a case under chapter 7 of this title shall be the amount that would be paid by the estate in a chapter 7 case if the claim were an unsecured claim arising before the date on which the petition was filed and were not entitled to priority under section 507.

''(c) For purposes of applying sections 523(a), 1228(a)(2), and 1228(c)(2) to a claim described in subsection (a) of this section, the claim shall not be treated as a claim of a kind specified in section 523(a)(1).

''(d)(1) A governmental unit may file a proof of claim for a claim described in subsection (a) that arises after the date on which the petition is filed.

''(2) If a debtor files a tax return after the filing of the petition for a period in which a claim described in subsection (a) arises, and the claim relates to the tax return, the debtor shall serve notice of the claim on the governmental unit charged with the responsibility for the collection of the tax at the address and in the manner designated in section 505(b)(1). Notice under this paragraph shall state that the debtor has filed a petition under this chapter, state the name and location of the court in which the case under this chapter is pending, state the amount of the claim, and include a copy of the filed tax return and documentation supporting the calculation of the claim.

''(3) If notice of a claim has been served on the governmental unit in accordance with paragraph (2), the governmental unit may file a proof of claim not later than 180 days after the date on which such notice was served. If the governmental unit has not filed a timely proof of the claim, the debtor or trustee may file proof of the claim that is consistent with the notice served under paragraph (2). If a proof of claim is filed by the debtor or trustee under this paragraph, the governmental unit may not amend the proof of claim.

''(4) A claim filed under this subsection shall be determined and shall be allowed under subsection (a), (b), or (c) of section 502, or disallowed under subsection (d) or (e) of section 502, in the same manner as if the claim had arisen immediately before the date of the filing of the petition.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 12 of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in section 1222(a)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking ''unless—'' and all that follows through ''the holder'' and inserting ''unless the holder'';

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(iii) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) subject to section 1232, provide for the treatment of any claim by a governmental unit of a kind described in section 1232(a).'';

(B) in section 1228—

(i) in subsection (a)—

(I) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(aa) by inserting a comma after ''all debts provided for by the plan''; and

(bb) by inserting a comma after ''allowed under section 503 of this title''; and

(II) in paragraph (2), by striking ''the kind'' and all that follows and inserting ''a kind specified in section 523(a) of this title, except as provided in section 1232(c).''; and

(ii) in subsection (c)(2), by inserting '', except as provided in section 1232(c)'' before the period at the end; and

(C) in section 1229(a)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) provide for the payment of a claim described in section 1232(a) that arose after the date on which the petition was filed.''.

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for subchapter II of chapter 12 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''1232. Claim by a governmental unit based on the disposition of property used in a farming operation.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to any bankruptcy case that—

(1) is pending on the date of enactment of this Act and relating to which an order of discharge under section 1228 of title 11, United States Code, has not been entered; or

(2) commences on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1430. A bill 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 for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill called the Idaho Wilderness Water Facilities Act. This bill is identical to the House version, H.R. 876, which was introduced and carried through the House by my colleague from Idaho, Representative MIKE SIMPSON, who did yeoman's work on pursuing this and putting it together and shepherding it through. It passed unanimously in the House. I thank him on behalf of all Idahoans for his work on this issue.

The need for this legislation is simple. The Frank Church River of No Return Wilderness, which was designated by Congress in 1980, abuts the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness area, which was designated by Congress in 1964. These areas contain some of the largest and most rugged remote tracts of land in the lower 48 States. It is magnificent in its beauty—substantially better, in my opinion, than the Alps.

There are a number of water diversions within the Idaho wilderness areas that have existed since the time of this legislation—since the time these wilderness areas were established. Although the diversions continue to exist, the owners currently lack authority to maintain and repair the facilities.

Predating the existence of these two wilderness areas, private landowners had received permits to maintain and repair water diversions that existed on National Forest System lands. The water is used for a combination of many things, including, but not limited to, drinking water for private cabins and ranches and also for generating electricity in some places on a very small scale. Many of the permits have since expired, leaving those who own the water diversions without any options for mechanically maintaining their water systems. In some cases, this lack of management threatens the environment and the watersheds in which they exist.

The Idaho Wilderness Water Facilities Act will give the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to reissue and issue special use authorizations to the owners of these diversion facilities within the Frank Church and the Selway Wilderness areas for the continued maintenance of their water facilities. The permits would only be issued if the owner could prove the facility existed prior to those lands being designated as wilderness, the facility has been used to deliver water to the owner's land since the designation, and the owner had a valid water right and it would not be practical to move the facility outside of the wilderness area. Undoubtedly, in exercising the discretion, the Secretary would ensure that in no way would it denigrate these wilderness areas. There are several different individuals or businesses that have water diversions in these wilderness areas that meet the description I have given.

Earlier this week the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources held a hearing on H.R. 876. The U.S. Forest Service appeared at that hearing and testified in support of this bill. I look forward to working with Chairman WYDEN and Ranking Member MURKOWSKI to pass this bill quickly so as to allow for the maintenance of this water infrastructure.

By Ms. HIRONO:

S. 1432. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating portions of the Ka'u Coast in the State of Hawaii as a unit of the National Park System; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Ka'u Coast Preservation Act of 2013, a bill directing the National Park Service to assess the feasibility of designating certain coastal lands on the Ka'u Coast of the island of Hawaii as units of the National Park System.

The National Park Service conducted a reconnaissance survey in 2006 that made a preliminary assessment of whether the Ka'u Coast would meet the National Park Service's demanding criteria as a resource of national significance. The reconnaissance survey concluded that ''based upon the significance of the resources in the study area and the current integrity and intact condition of these resources, a preliminary finding of national significance and suitability can be concluded.'' The report goes on to recommend that Congress proceed with a full resource study of the area.

Since the time of the initial reconnaissance report and my introduction of this Act in previous Congresses, two additional properties in the Ka'u that deserve evaluation have come to my attention: the Kahuku Coastal Property, also known as Sands of South Kona and Road to the Sea, and the Nani Kahuku 'Aina property adjacent to Pohue Bay. I have added these areas to the study area for the full resource study.

The coastline of Ka'u is still largely unspoiled. The study area contains significant natural, geological, and archeological features. The northern part of the study area is adjacent to Hawaii Volcanoes National Park and contains a number of noteworthy geological features, including an ancient lava tube known as the Great Crack, which the National Park Service has expressed interest in acquiring in the past.

The study area includes both black and green sand beaches as well as a significant number of endangered and threatened species, most notably the endangered hawksbill turtle, at least half of the Hawaiian population of this rare sea turtle nests within the study area, the threatened green sea turtle, the highly endangered Hawaiian monk seal, the endangered Hawaiian hawk, the endangered Hawaiian bat, native bees, the endangered and very rare Hawaiian orange-black damselfy, the largest population in the State, and a number of native birds. Humpback whales and spinner dolphins also frequent the area. The Ka'u Coast also boasts some of the best remaining examples of native coastal vegetation in Hawaii.

The archeological resources related to ancient Hawaiian settlements within the study area are also very impressive. These include dwelling complexes, heiau, religious shrines, walls, fishing and canoe houses or sheds, burial sites, petroglyphs, water and salt collection sites, caves, and trails. The Ala Kahakai National Historic Trail runs through the study area.

The Ka'u Coast is a truly remarkable area: its combination of natural, archeological, cultural, and recreational resources, as well as its spectacular viewscapes, are an important part of Hawaii's and our nation's natural and cultural heritage.

As this process evolves, the successful preservation of this pristine land will depend on the federal government working closely with local stakeholders, seeking their input, and collaborating with them to address concerns as they arise. I encourage the National Park Service to continue working with all involved to ensure this coastline is preserved for decades to come.

I believe a full feasibility study, which was recommended in the reconnaissance survey, will confirm that the area meets the National Park Service's high standards as an area of national significance.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1437. A bill to provide for the release of the reversionary interest held by the United States in certain land conveyed in 1954 by the United States, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, to the State of Oregon for the establishment of the Hermiston Agricultural Research and Extension Center of Oregon State University in Hermiston, Oregon; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce a bill that will give Oregon State University the flexibility to continue its important agricultural work in Hermiston, Oregon. I am pleased to be joined on this bill with my colleague from Oregon, Senator MERKELY. I look forward to working with Senator MERKLEY, other colleagues, and supporters of the bill to update the federal interests in the land to match current needs and conditions.

The Hermiston Agricultural Research & Extension Center, HAREC, provides support to one of the most unique and important agricultural areas in the world: the Columbia Basin region of Oregon and Washington. As one of Oregon State University's, OSU, 12 Agricultural Experiment Stations, HAREC concentrates on the discovery and implementation of agricultural opportunities while also providing solutions to production issues for regional growers and beyond.

Research at HAREC emphasizes identification of new crop opportunities, improved production practices that save money while reducing inputs, plant breeding and varietal evaluation of cereals and potatoes. Through this work it has developed new lines with higher nutritional value, integrated pest management of insects and insect-

transmitted diseases, and provided information related to environmental issues and salmon restoration. In recent years the center provided leadership, research, and new knowledge essential to allow growers to diversify production and convert 30,000 acres of commodity crops to high-value crops. The station has led efforts to cultivate value-added agriculture in Morrow and Umatilla counties, resulting in over $50,000,000 in annual economic return.

The history of HAREC and a Umatilla agricultural research center spans more than a century. The Federal Government paved the way in the development of farming and ranching in the Umatilla Basin. In 1954, the Bureau of Land Management granted land to the State of Oregon on the condition that the land is used for cooperative agricultural experimental work. Over the past nearly 60 years, OSU has developed a center with state-of-the-art laboratories, irrigation technology abilities, greenhouses, screenhouses and research and extension faculty. HAREC now supports nearly 500,000 acres of irrigated agriculture.

Just as agriculture in the Columbia Basin has grown by leaps and bounds since 1954, so has the community of Hermiston. This bill removes the reversionary clause from the original land grant while conditioning that any consideration gained by OSU from the sale, lease, or other use of the land be put back into agricultural experimental and research work. It gives OSU the flexibility to adapt to the population growth and city expansion that will ultimately necessitate the relocation of HAREC from inside the urban growth boundary to a more rural location. Without this bill, moving the station would mean triggering the federal reversionary clause and losing HAREC land and all the buildings and improvements over nearly six decades to the Federal Government. I'm sponsoring this bill to ensure HAREC can continue for another hundred years.

Regional leaders and Oregon State University support removing the barriers to the continued operation of the center. I express my gratitude for their work with me on this legislation. I also look forward to working with Senator Merkley to advance this bill and support the agricultural heart of the regional economy.

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. 1437

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 ''Hermiston Agricultural Research and Extension Center Land Conveyance Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) RESEARCH CENTER LAND.—The term ''research center land'' means the approximately 290 acres of land in Hermiston, Oregon, identified as the ''Reversionary Interest Area'' on the map entitled ''Hermiston Agricultural Research and Extension Center'' and dated July 23, 2013, including any improvements to, and building on, the land.

(2) PATENT.—The term ''patent'' means the patent granted by the Director of the Bureau of Land Management (acting on behalf of the United States) to the State, numbered 130889, and dated September 17, 1954.

(3) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the State of Oregon (acting through the Oregon State Board of Higher Education on behalf of Oregon State University).

SEC. 3. RELEASE OF REVERSIONARY INTEREST AND RESERVATION OF MINERAL RIGHTS TO BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LAND CONVEYED TO THE STATE OF OREGON FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF HERMISTON AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND EXTENSION CENTER.

(a) RELEASE OF REVERSIONARY INTEREST AND RESERVATION OF MINERAL RIGHTS.—Subject to subsection (b), there are released by the United States without consideration—

(1) the reversionary interest retained by the United States to the research center land under the patent; and

(2) the reservation of mineral rights by the United States to the research center land under the patent.

(b) CONDITION.—The release of the reversionary interest under subsection (a)(1) is subject to the condition that the State agrees to use any consideration received by the State from the sale, lease, or other conveyance of the research center land after the date of enactment of this Act for agricultural experimental and research work of Oregon State University.

(c) INSTRUMENT OF RELEASE.—The Secretary of the Interior (acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management) shall execute and file in the appropriate office a deed of release, amended deed, or other appropriate instrument reflecting the release under subsection (a).

By Mr. REID (for Ms. LANDRIEU):

S. 1440. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to allow the use of physical damage disaster loans for the construction of safe rooms; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to speak on an issue that is of great importance to my home state of Louisiana: disaster preparedness. As you know, along the Gulf Coast, we keep an eye trained on the Gulf of Mexico during hurricane season. This is following the devastating one-two punch of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita of 2005 as well as Hurricanes Gustav and Ike in 2008. Unfortunately, our region also has had to deal with the economic and environmental damage from the Deepwater Horizon disaster in 2010 and more recently Hurricane Isaac. For this reason, as Chair of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, ensuring Federal disaster programs are effective and responsive to disaster victims is one of my top priorities. While the Gulf Coast is prone to hurricanes, other parts of the country are no strangers to disaster. For example, the Midwest and Southeast have tornadoes, California experiences earthquakes and wildfires, and the Northeast sees crippling snowstorms. So no part of our country is spared from disasters—disasters which can and will strike at any moment. This certainly hit home when the northeast was struck by Hurricane Sandy in October of last year and when Moore, Oklahoma was hit by a massive tornado earlier this summer. With this in mind, we must ensure that families have the resources they need to be better prepared the next time disasters strike their communities.

In order to give families in tornado prone areas more resources to protect lives and property, I am proud to file the Tornado Family Safety Act of 2013. Representative TOM COLE from Oklahoma is filing the House companion bill today as well. I want to thank him for being my partner in this effort as his district has seen firsthand how destructive these tornadoes can be to homes and businesses. In particular, our bill would allow U.S. Small Business Administration, SBA, disaster home mitigation loans to go towards the construction of tornado safe rooms. Under current law, SBA can increase the size of a home disaster loan by 20 percent of the total damage to decrease future disaster risk. The Small Business Act lists out examples of mitigation activities such as ''. . . retaining walls, sea walls, grading and contouring land, relocating utilities and modifying structures . . .'' The bill would add safe rooms as an eligible activity so homeowners would have access to these low-interest loans. It does not replace or duplicate other programs, but instead provides a backstop for families in disaster prone areas.

Under guidelines from the Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA, and the International Code Council, ICC, a safe room should withstand 250 mph winds and the impact of a 15-pound plank hitting a wall at 100 miles per hour, according to the Insurance Institute for Business and Home Safety, IBHS. Safe rooms designed to the FEMA and ICC standards are recommended for both tornadoes and hurricanes. For individual homes, a safe room could range anywhere from $3,000 to $12,000.

The concept for the bill came about after discussions with the FEMA and the SBA on recent disasters. We learned that safe rooms are not allowable under FEMA preparedness grant programs. Safe rooms would be considered construction and FEMA only allows for limited construction under the preparedness grants for very specific items, such as communications towers, as specified in the appropriations acts. Safe rooms are an eligible activity under the FEMA Hazard Mitigation Grant Program, HMGP. States decide how they use their HMGP, and reimbursing safe room construction for homeowners could be eligible. However, given the larger cost involved in reimbursing individual homeowners, HMGP funded safe rooms are oftentimes community-owned not residential.

As I have indicated, FEMA Individual Assistance does not allow the construction of safe rooms. FEMA does allow HMGP grants for safe rooms and states can decide to reimburse safe room construction for homeowners. However, most are typically community-owned not residential since HMGP funds both single and multi-use facilities—schools, community centers, etc. For example, according to FEMA data, out of 21 states funding safe rooms, only four states, Oklahoma, Alabama, Mississippi, and Arkansas, represent the bulk of residential safe rooms, appproximately 21,600 of the 21,880 funded.

But let me give you an example of how the needs for these types of structures are often outpacing the resources currently available. Following the May 20, 2013 tornado there, Moore, OK, Mayor Glenn Lewis proposed a requirement that all new homes built in the city include a safe room. Oklahoma Governor Fallin also told the Associated Press that only 100 of the 1,752 public schools in Oklahoma have a safe room. In a subsequent June 9, 2013, interview, Albert Ashwood, Director of the Oklahoma Department of Emergency Management, estimated that putting safe rooms in 1,000 Oklahoma schools, via traditional FEMA grant programs, would cost between $500 million to $1 billion alone. So in the near future, there is likely to be less, not more, Federal funding available at the State level for these types of residential safe rooms. Our bill would allow a backstop to homeowners in the event that other Federal/State funds are not available for safe rooms for that particular disaster.

In closing, I believe that this commonsense disaster reform will greatly benefit homeowners impacted by future tornadoes and other disasters.

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. 1440

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 ''Tornado Family Safety Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. USE OF PHYSICAL DAMAGE DISASTER LOANS.

Section 7(b)(1)(A) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(b)(1)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''the Administration may increase'' and inserting ''the Administration may, subject to section 18(a), increase''; and

(2) by striking ''and modifying structures'' and inserting '', and modifying structures (including construction of a safe room or similar storm shelter designed to protect property and occupants from tornadoes or other natural disasters)''.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 1443. A bill to facilitate the remediation of abandoned hardrock mines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing legislation designed to help promote the cleanup of abandoned and inactive hard rock mines that are a great detriment to the environment and public health throughout the country, but especially to the West. I want to thank my colleague Senator BENNET for joining me in this effort.

For over one hundred years, miners and prospectors have searched for and developed valuable ''hard rock'' minerals—gold, silver, copper, molybdenum, and others. Hard rock mining has played a key role in the history of Colorado and other states, and the resulting mineral wealth has been an important contributor to our economy and the development of essential products.

Too often, however, the miners would abandon their work and move on, seeking riches over the next mountain. The resulting legacy of unsafe open mine shafts and acid mine drainages can be seen throughout the country and especially on public lands in the West where mineral development was encouraged to help settle our region.

Unfortunately, many of our current environmental laws designed to mitigate the impact from operating hard rock mines are of limited effectiveness when applied to abandoned and inactive mines. As a result, many of these old mines continue to pollute streams and rivers and pose a risk to the health of people who live nearby or downstream.

The bill I am reintroducing today will help address this impediment and make it easier for volunteers, who had no role in creating the problem, to help clean up these sites and improve the environment. It does so by providing a new permit program under the Clean Water Act whereby volunteers can, under an approved plan, reduce the water pollution flowing from an abandoned mine. At the same time, volunteers will not be exposed to the full liability and ongoing responsibility provisions of the Clean Water Act.

I would be remiss not to thank the Environmental Protection Agency for its work in addressing this issue. Most recently, EPA issued a memorandum on December 12, 2012, to reduce the Clean Water Act legal vulnerability faced by ''Good Samaritans'' by clarifying that parties who volunteer to clean up these abandoned sites are generally not responsible for obtaining a permit under the Clean Water Act both during and following a successful cleanup. While this was an important step forward, my legislation will provide binding legal protections for Good Samaritans, allowing them to move forward—knowing the long-term certainty of their rights—with the imperative work of mine cleanup.

The new permits proposed in this bill would help address problems that have frustrated federal and state agencies throughout the country. As population growth continues near these old mines, more and more risks to public health and safety are likely to occur. We simply must begin to address this issue—not only to improve the environment, but also to ensure that our water supplies are safe and usable. This bill does not address all the concerns some would-be Good Samaritans may have about initiating cleanup projects and I am committed to continue working to address those additional concerns, through additional legislation and in other ways. However, this bill can make a real difference, and I think it deserves approval without unnecessary delay.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 1444. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment under part A of the Medicare Program on a reasonable cost basis for anesthesia services furnished by an anesthesiologist in certain rural hospitals in the same manner as payments are provided for anesthesia services furnished by anesthesiologist assistants and certified anesthetists in such hospitals; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President. I am honored to join my colleague from Georgia, Senator JOHNNY ISAKSON, in introducing a bill essential to expanding health care options for rural hospitals and beneficiaries living in rural areas, the Medicare Access to Rural Anesthesiology Act.

As it stands today, low Medicare Part B anesthesia payments and low patient volume in rural areas makes it difficult for rural hospitals to attract and retain anesthesiologists. Our legislation would take an important step towards leveling the playing field between urban and rural health care by ensuring that rural Medicare beneficiaries have similar access to anesthesia services.

Generally, Medicare pays for anesthesia services under the Medicare Part B fee schedule, but in order to attract anesthesia providers to rural areas, a statutory exception was created in the 1980s that allows eligible rural hospital to use Part A funds to employ or contract with non-physician anesthesiologist assistants, AA, or certified registered nurse anesthetists, CRNA. This policy however, does not permit eligible hospitals to use pass-through funds to pay anesthesiologists. Leaving anesthesiologists out also prevents AAs from receiving pass through payment because AAs must have an anesthesiologist on premises in order to practice. As a result, many folks in rural areas only have access to one type of anesthesia provider compared to folks in urban areas who can easily visit an anesthesiologist, CRNA, or an AA.

Our legislation would allow eligible rural hospitals to use ''pass-through'' Part A funds to employ CRNAs, AAs, and anesthesiologists. This common

sense change would give eligible rural hospitals the power to choose the anesthesia providers that best suit the medical needs of their patients, and would provide these hospitals with another tool to recruit and retain anesthesiology professionals as well as expand the availability of anesthesiology care in medically underserved areas.

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. 1444

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 ''Medicare Access to Rural Anesthesiology Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. MEDICARE PART A PAYMENT FOR ANESTHESIOLOGIST SERVICES IN CERTAIN RURAL HOSPITALS BASED ON CRNA PASS-THROUGH RULES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1814 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395f) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''Anesthesiologist Services Provided in Certain Rural Hospitals

''(m)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, coverage and payment shall be provided under this part for physicians' services that are anesthesia services furnished by a physician who is an anesthesiologist in a rural hospital described in paragraph (3) in the same manner as payment is made under the exception provided in section 9320(k) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1986, as amended by section 6132 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989 (42 U.S.C. 1395k note) (relating to payment on a reasonable cost, pass-through basis), for certified registered nurse anesthetist services furnished by a certified registered nurse anesthetist in a hospital described in such section.

''(2) No payment shall be made under any other provision of this title for physicians' services for which payment is made under this subsection.

''(3) A rural hospital described in this paragraph is a hospital described in section 9320(k) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1986, as so amended (42 U.S.C. 1395k note), except that—

''(A) any reference in such section to a 'certified registered nurse anesthetist' or 'anesthetist' is deemed a reference to a 'physician who is an anesthesiologist' or 'anesthesiologist', respectively; and

''(B) any reference to 'January 1, 1988' or '1987' is deemed a reference to such date and year as the Secretary shall specify.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to services furnished during cost reporting periods beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER:

S. 1449. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that income attributable to certain passenger cruise voyages beginning or ending in the United States shall be treated as effectively connected with the conduct of a trade or business within the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, today I am introducing comprehensive legislation to repeal corporate tax loopholes that allow the cruise industry to avoid paying its fair share of U.S. corporate income taxes.

These bills change the treatment of the revenue that foreign-based cruise lines earn from ships that embark or disembark nearly 15 million passengers a year in the United States. A string of recent incidents has demonstrated that when cruise ships get into trouble, the companies rely on the resources and assistance of the U.S. Navy and Coast Guard. The industry also uses the services of over 20 other U.S. agencies to the tune of millions of taxpayer dollars every year.

The majority of cruise companies are organized as foreign corporations, even though many of their headquarters and executives are located in the United States. By incorporating in foreign countries, the cruise industry enjoys a special exemption under section 883 of the Internal Revenue Code, which provides that certain foreign corporations are not subject to U.S. taxes on income derived from the international operation of ships, even if the source of the income is in the United States.

Today, I am introducing two bills, S. 1449 and S. 1450. The first would eliminate the section 883 special exemption for cruise industry income derived from passenger cruise voyages that embark or disembark passengers in the United States. This income would be treated as being U.S. sourced and effectively connected with a U.S. trade or business, so it would be subject to U.S. taxes at the same rate as other income.

The second bill would impose a 5 percent excise tax on gross income from cruises where passengers embark or disembark in the United States. Funds generated from the excise tax will help fund a national program to make infrastructure improvements vital to the efficient transportation of goods and services.

For too long, the cruise industry has been able to use taxpayer provided services without actually paying for them. It is time the cruise industry begins to pay for the services it uses.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bills be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bills were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1449

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

SECTION 1. TAXATION OF UNITED STATES CRUISE INDUSTRY INCOME OF NONRESIDENT ALIENS AND FOREIGN CORPORATIONS.

(a) UNITED STATES CRUISE INDUSTRY INCOME TREATED AS EFFECTIVELY CONNECTED TO THE CONDUCT OF A TRADE OR BUSINESS WITHIN THE UNITED STATES.—

(1) INCOME FROM SOURCES WITHOUT THE UNITED STATES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (4) of section 864(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (C) and by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraph:

''(C) UNITED STATES CRUISE INDUSTRY INCOME.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—United States cruise industry income shall be treated as effectively connected with the conduct of a trade or business within the United States.

''(ii) UNITED STATES CRUISE INDUSTRY INCOME.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'United States cruise industry income' means income attributable to any covered passenger cruise (as defined in paragraph (8)), including income directly or indirectly attributable to the carriage of passengers and any on-board or off-board activities incidental to such covered passenger cruise.''.

(B) COVERED PASSENGER CRUISE.—Subsection (c) of section 864 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(8) COVERED PASSENGER CRUISE.—For purposes of paragraph (4)(C)—

''(A) DEFINITION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The term 'covered passenger cruise' means a voyage of a commercial passenger cruise vessel—

''(I) that extends over 1 or more nights,

''(II) during which passengers embark or disembark the vessel in the United States.

''(ii) EXCEPTIONS FOR CERTAIN VOYAGES.—Such term shall not include any voyage—

''(I) on any vessel owned or operated by the United States, a State, or any subdivision thereof,

''(II) which occurs exclusively on the inland waterways of the United States, or

''(III) in which a vessel in the usual course of employment proceeds, without an intervening foreign port of call from one port or place in the United States to the same port or place or to another port or place in the United States.

''(B) PASSENGER CRUISE VESSEL.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The term 'passenger cruise vessel' means any passenger vessel having berth or stateroom accommodations for at least 250 passengers.

''(ii) EXCEPTIONS.—Such term shall not include any ferry, recreational vessel, sailing school vessel, small passenger vessel, offshore supply vessel, or any other vessel determined under regulations by the Secretary to be excluded from the application of this part.

''(iii) DEFINITIONS.—Any term used in this section which used in chapter 21 of title 46, United States Code, shall have the meaning given such term under section 2101 of such title.''.

(C) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subparagraph (A) of section 864(c)(4) of such Code is amended by striking ''subparagraphs (B) and (C)'' and inserting ''subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D)''.

(2) INCOME FROM SOURCES WITHIN THE UNITED STATES.—Paragraph (4) of section 887(b) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following flush sentence:

''The preceding sentence shall not apply to with respect to any United State source gross transportation income which is United States cruise industry income (as defined in section 864(c)((4)(C)(ii)).''.

(b) REPEAL OF EXEMPTION FROM GROSS INCOME FOR CERTAIN TAXPAYERS.—

(1) NONRESIDENT ALIENS.—Paragraph (1) of section 872(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting ''(other than United States cruise industry income (as defined in section 864(c)(4)(C)))'' after ''or ships''.

(2) FOREIGN CORPORATIONS.—Paragraph (1) of section 883(a) of such Code is amended by inserting ''(other than United States cruise industry income (as defined in section 864(c)(4)(C)))'' after ''or ships''.

(c) INCOME TAX TREATIES.—Section 894 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) SPECIAL RULE FOR UNITED STATES CRUISE INDUSTRY INCOME.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), no tax exemption or reduced tax rate shall be permitted under any treaty of the United States with respect to United States cruise industry income (as defined in section 864(c)(4)(C)).''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to income attributable to voyages made after the date of the enactment of this Act.

S. 1450

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

SECTION 1. EXCISE TAX ON GROSS RECEIPTS DERIVED FROM CRUISES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter B of chapter 36 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after section 4472 the following:

''PART II—AD VALOREM TAX

''Sec. 4476. Imposition of tax.
''Sec. 4477. Definitions.

''SEC. 4476. IMPOSITION OF TAX.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—In addition to any other tax, there is hereby imposed a tax of 5 percent of the allocable amount with respect to any covered passenger cruise.

''(b) BY WHOM PAID.—The tax imposed by this section shall be paid by the person providing the covered passenger cruise.

''SEC. 4477. DEFINITIONS.

''For purposes of this section—

''(1) COVERED PASSENGER CRUISE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'covered passenger cruise' means a voyage of a commercial passenger cruise vessel—

''(i) that extends over 1 or more nights,

''(ii) during which passengers embark or disembark the vessel in the United States.

''(B) EXCEPTIONS FOR CERTAIN VOYAGES.—Such term shall not include any voyage—

''(i) on any vessel owned or operated by the United States, a State, or any subdivision thereof,

''(ii) which occurs exclusively on the inland waterways of the United States, or

''(iii) in which a vessel in the usual course of employment proceeds, without an intervening foreign port of call from one port or place in the United States to the same port or place or to another port or place in the United States.

''(2) PASSENGER CRUISE VESSEL.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'passenger cruise vessel' means any passenger vessel—

''(i) having berth or stateroom accommodations for at least 250 passengers, and

''(ii) that is used in the business of carrying passengers for hire.

''(B) EXCEPTIONS.—Such term shall not include any ferry, recreational vessel, sailing school vessel, small passenger vessel, offshore supply vessel, or any other vessel determined under regulations by the Secretary to be excluded from the application of this part.

''(C) DEFINITIONS.—Any term used in this section which is used in chapter 21 of title 46, United States Code, shall have the meaning given such term under section 2101 of such title.

''(3) ALLOCABLE AMOUNT.—The term 'allocable amount' means—

''(A) in the case in which a majority of the passengers on any covered passenger cruise embark or disembark in the United States, 100 percent of the gross receipts attributable to such covered passenger cruise, and

''(B) in any other case, 50 percent of the gross receipts attributable to such covered passenger cruise.

''(4) UNITED STATES.—The term 'United States' includes any possession of the United States.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subchapter B of chapter 36 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking all preceding section 4471 and inserting the following:

''Subchapter B—Transportation by Water

''PART I—PER PASSENGER TAX

''PART II—AD VALOREM TAX

''PART I—PER PASSENGER TAX

''Sec. 4471. Imposition of tax.
''Sec. 4472. Definitions.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to voyages made after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2. INTERMODAL INFRASTRUCTURE TRUST FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter A of Chapter 98 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 9512. INTERMODAL INFRASTRUCTURE TRUST FUND.

''(a) CREATION OF TRUST FUND.—There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the 'Intermodal Infrastructure Trust Fund', consisting of such amounts as may be appropriated or credited to the Intermodal Infrastructure Trust Fund in this section or section 9602(b).

''(b) TRANSFERS TO INTERMODAL INFRASTRUCTURE TRUST FUND.—There are hereby appropriated to the Intermodal Infrastructure Trust Fund amounts equivalent to the taxes received in the Treasury under section 4471.

''(c) EXPENDITURES FROM INTERMODAL INFRASTRUCTURE TRUST FUND.—Amounts in the Intermodal Infrastructure Trust Fund shall be available, as provided in appropriations Acts, for transportation improvement, including—

''(1) the construction or improvement of—

''(A) passenger or freight rail lines,

''(B) highways,

''(C) bridges,

''(D) airports,

''(E) air traffic control systems,

''(F) port or marine facilities,

''(G) inland waterways,

''(H) transmission or distribution pipelines,

''(I) public transportation facilities or systems

''(J) intercity passenger bus or passenger rail facilities or equipment, and

''(K) freight rail facilities or equipment, and

''(2) planning, preparation, or design of any project described in paragraph (1).''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter A of Chapter 98 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Sec. 9512. Intermodal Infrastructure Trust Fund.''.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. REID, Mr. HELLER, and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 1451. A bill to provide for environmental restoration activities and forest management activities in the Lake Tahoe Basin, to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the importation or shipment of quagga mussels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to again discuss the need to restore and protect Lake Tahoe. Lake Tahoe is a national treasure. Her alpine beauty has drawn and inspired people for centuries: artists and poets, John Muir and Mark Twain, and countless millions the world over.

As a girl, I went to Lake Tahoe to ride horses through the woods, to swim in the clear blue waters and to bike around the magnificent Basin.

For over 16 years, representatives from different ends of the political spectrum have come together to Keep Tahoe Blue.

The challenges are great. Climate change and drought have created a persistent threat from catastrophic wildfire. Sedimentation and pollution threaten water quality and the lake's treasured clarity. And invasive species threaten the economy of the region.

The time to act is now, and the federal government must take a leading role—78 percent of the land surrounding Lake Tahoe is public land, primarily the Eldorado, Toiyabe and Tahoe National Forests.

That is why today I am reintroducing the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act of 2013, which is co-sponsored by Senators HARRY REID, DEAN HELLER and BARBARA BOXER.

The bill would continue the Federal commitment at Lake Tahoe by authorizing $415 million over ten years to improve water clarity, reduce the threat of catastrophic fire, combat invasive species, and restore and protect the environment in the Lake Tahoe Basin.

Specifically, it would do the following:

Provide $243 million over 10 years for the highest priority restoration projects, according to scientific data. The legislation authorizes at least $138 million for stormwater management and watershed restoration projects scientifically determined to be the most effective ways to improve water clarity.

This bill also requires prioritized ranking of environmental restoration projects and authorizes $80 million for State and local agencies to implement these projects with costs being split evenly between the Federal agencies and non-federal partners.

Eligible projects must demonstrate their cost effectiveness, stakeholder support, ability to leverage non-federal contributions and meet environmental improvement goals.

Implementation of priority projects will improve water quality, forest health, air quality and fish and wildlife habitat around Lake Tahoe.

Authorizes $135 million over ten years to reduce the threat of wildfire in Lake Tahoe. These funds will finance hazardous fuels reduction projects including grants to local fire agencies, who must contribute at least 25 percent of project costs.

The bill also authorizes important restoration work related to the devastating 2007 Angora fire, which destroyed 242 residences and 67 commercial structures. Fuels treatment on Washoe Tribal lands, wildfire prevention planning, and improvements to

local water district infrastructure to fight wildfires that reach urban areas are eligible for grant funding.

The bill also creates incentives for local communities to have dedicated funding for defensible space inspections and enforcement.

Protecting Lake Tahoe from the threat of quagga mussels and other invasive aquatic species. Protecting Lake Tahoe from the threat of quagga mussels and other invasive aquatic species is a major priority because of the serious threats posed to Lake Tahoe.

University of California, Davis and University of Nevada, Reno scientists report that they have found up to 3,000 Asian clams per square meter at spots between Zephyr Point and Elk Point in Lake Tahoe. The spreading Asian clam population could put sharp shells and rotting algae on the Lake's beaches and help spread other invasive species such as quagga mussels.

The bill would authorize $30 million for watercraft inspections and removal of existing invasive species. It would require all watercraft to be inspected and decontaminated if they are determined to be a risk to the lake.

These invasive species threats are serious. For example, one quagga or zebra mussel can lay 1 million eggs in a year. This means that a single boat carrying quagga could devastate the lake's biology, local infrastructure, and the local economy.

The threat to Lake Tahoe cannot be overstated. In 2007 quagga mussels were discovered in Lake Mead. In the 6 years since, there population has swelled exponentially. Today there are more than 3 trillion. The infestation is probably irreversible.

There is good news. There is promising news on this front. Scientists have begun testing a new strategy by placing long rubber mats across the bottom of Lake Tahoe to cut off the oxygen to the Asian clams. Early research suggests that these mats were very effective at killing the clams. We continue to learn from this important research about how best to manage invasive species.

We can fight off these invaders. But it will require drive and imagination and the help authorized within this bill.

Supports reintroduction of the Lahontan Cutthroat Trout. The legislation authorizes $20 million over 10 years for the Lahontan Cutthroat Trout Recovery Plan. The Lahontan Cutthroat Trout is an iconic species that has an important historic legacy in Lake Tahoe.

When John C. Fremont first explored the Truckee River in January of 1844, he called it the Salmon Trout River because he found the Pyramid Lake Lahontan Cutthroat Trout. The trout relied on the Truckee River and its tributaries for their spawning runs in spring, traveling up the entire river's length as far as Lake Tahoe and Donner Lake, where they used the cool, pristine waters and clean gravel beds to lay their eggs. But dams, pollution and overfishing caused the demise of the Lahontan Cutthroat Trout.

Lake Tahoe is one of the historic 11 lakes where Lahontan Cutthroat Trout flourished in the past, and it's a critical part of the strategy to recover the species.

Funds scientific research. The legislation authorizes $30 million over ten years for scientific programs and research which will produce information on long-term trends in the Basin and inform the most cost-effective projects.

Prohibiting mining operations in the Tahoe Basin. This legislation would prohibit new mining operations in the Basin, ensuring that the fragile watershed and Lake Tahoe's water clarity are not threatened by pollution from mining operations.

Increases accountability and oversight. Every project funded by this legislation will have monitoring and assessment to determine the most cost-effective projects and best management practices for future projects.

The legislation also requires the Chair of the Federal Partnership to work with the Forest Service, Environmental Protection Agency, Fish and Wildlife Service and regional and state agencies, to prepare an annual report to Congress detailing the status of all projects undertaken, including project scope, budget and justification and overall expenditures and accomplishments.

This will ensure that Congress can have oversight on the progress of environmental restoration in Lake Tahoe.

Provides for public outreach and education. The Forest Service, Environmental Protection Agency, Fish and Wildlife Service and Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will implement new public outreach and education programs including encouraging Basin residents and visitors to implement defensible space, conducting best management practices for water quality and preventing the introduction and proliferation of invasive species. In addition, the legislation requires signage on federally financed projects to improve public awareness of restoration efforts.

Allows for increased efficiency in the management of public land. Under this legislation, the Forest Service would have increased flexibility to exchange land with state agencies which will allow for more cost-efficient management of public land. There is currently a checkerboard pattern of ownership in some areas of the Basin.

Under this new authority, the Forest Service could exchange land with the California Tahoe Conservancy and the California Department of Parks and Recreation of approximately equal value without going through a lengthy process to assess the land.

For example, if there are several plots of Forest Service land that surround or are adjacent to Tahoe Conservancy or California State Parks land, the state could transfer that land to the Forest Service so that it can be managed more efficiently.

This legislation is needed because the ''Jewel of the Sierra'' is in big trouble. If we don't act now, we could lose Lake Tahoe, lose it with stunning speed, to several devastating threats.

Anyone doubting that climate change poses a severe threat to Lake Tahoe should read an alarming recent report by the UC Davis Tahoe Environmental Research Center.

It was written for the U.S. Forest Service by scientists who have devoted their professional careers to studying Lake Tahoe. And it paints a distinctly bleak picture of the future for the ''Jewel of the Sierra.''

Among its findings are the Tahoe Basin's regional snowpack could decline by as much as 60 percent in the next century, with increased floods likely by 2050 and prolonged droughts by 2100.

Even ''under the most optimistic projections,'' average snowpack in the Sierra Nevada around Tahoe will decline by 40 to 60 percent by 2100, according to the report.

This would likely bankrupt Tahoe's ski industry, threaten the water supply of Reno and other communities, and degrade the lake's fabled water clarity. It is devastating.

According to the UC Davis report, an all-out attack on pollution and sedimentation may be the lake's last best hope.

Geoff Schladow, director of the UC Davis Tahoe Environmental Research Center and one of the report's authors, noted the need to restore short-term water quality in Lake Tahoe—while there's still time to do it.

''Reducing the load of external nutrients entering the lake in the coming decades may be the only possible mitigation measure to reduce the impact of climate change on lake clarity . . . ,'' the report said.

Without such an effort, the ''internal loading of nutrients'' could fundamentally change the lake and fuel algal growth, creating a downward spiral in water quality and clarity.

Water clarity is one of the central problems the legislation would address.

Pollution and sedimentation have threatened Lake Tahoe's water clarity for years now. In 1968, the first year UC Davis scientists made measurements using a device called a Secchi disk, clarity was measured at an average depth of 102.4 feet. Clarity declined over the next three decades, hitting a low of 64 feet in 1997.

There has been some improvement in this decade. Last year scientists recorded average clarity at 75.3 feet—the clearest readings in a decade. But it is a fragile gain. Sedimentation and stormwater runoff pose a persistent threat.

Climate change has already made itself apparent at Lake Tahoe. It makes the basin dry and tinder-hot, raising the risks of catastrophic wildfire. Daily air temperatures have increased 4 degrees since 1911. Snow has

declined as a fraction of total precipitation, from an average of 52 percent in 1910 to just 36 percent in recent years.

Climate change has caused Lake Tahoe's surface water temperature to rise over 2 degrees in 44 years. That means the cyclical deep-water mixing of the lake's waters will occur less frequently, and this could significantly disrupt Lake Tahoe's ecosystem.

This legislation is intended to address these problems.

Last year, the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee reported out the bill favorably, but there was not enough time for a floor vote. It is my hope that this legislation can move through committee quickly and be passed later this year.

A lot of good work has been done. But there's a lot more work to do, and time is running out.

Mark Twain called Lake Tahoe ''the fairest picture the whole world affords.'' We must not be the generation who lets this picture fall into ruin. We must rise to the challenge, and do all we can to preserve this ''noble sheet of water.''

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. 1451

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 ''Lake Tahoe Restoration Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

The Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (Public Law 106–506; 114 Stat. 2351) is amended by striking section 2 and inserting the following:

''SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

''(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

''(1) Lake Tahoe—

''(A) is 1 of the largest, deepest, and clearest lakes in the world;

''(B) has a cobalt blue color, a biologically diverse alpine setting, and remarkable water clarity; and

''(C) is recognized nationally and worldwide as a natural resource of special significance;

''(2) in addition to being a scenic and ecological treasure, the Lake Tahoe Basin is 1 of the outstanding recreational resources of the United States, which—

''(A) offers skiing, water sports, biking, camping, and hiking to millions of visitors each year; and

''(B) contributes significantly to the economies of California, Nevada, and the United States;

''(3) the economy in the Lake Tahoe Basin is dependent on the protection and restoration of the natural beauty and recreation opportunities in the area;

''(4) the Lake Tahoe Basin continues to be threatened by the impacts of land use and transportation patterns developed in the last century that damage the fragile watershed of the Basin;

''(5) the water clarity of Lake Tahoe declined from a visibility level of 105 feet in 1967 to only 70 feet in 2008;

''(6) the rate of decline in water clarity of Lake Tahoe has decreased in recent years;

''(7) a stable water clarity level for Lake Tahoe could be achieved through feasible control measures for very fine sediment particles and nutrients;

''(8) fine sediments that cloud Lake Tahoe, and key nutrients such as phosphorus and nitrogen that support the growth of algae and invasive plants, continue to flow into the lake from stormwater runoff from developed areas, roads, turf, other disturbed land, and streams;

''(9) the destruction and alteration of wetland, wet meadows, and stream zone habitat have compromised the natural capacity of the watershed to filter sediment, nutrients, and pollutants before reaching Lake Tahoe;

''(10) approximately 25 percent of the trees in the Lake Tahoe Basin are either dead or dying;

''(11) forests in the Tahoe Basin suffer from over a century of fire suppression and periodic drought, which have resulted in—

''(A) high tree density and mortality;

''(B) the loss of biological diversity; and

''(C) a large quantity of combustible forest fuels, which significantly increases the threat of catastrophic fire and insect infestation;

''(12) the establishment of several aquatic and terrestrial invasive species (including perennial pepperweed, milfoil, and Asian clam) threatens the ecosystem of the Lake Tahoe Basin;

''(13) there is an ongoing threat to the Lake Tahoe Basin of the introduction and establishment of other invasive species (such as yellow starthistle, New Zealand mud snail, and quagga mussel);

''(14) the report prepared by the University of California, Davis, entitled the 'State of the Lake Report', found that conditions in the Lake Tahoe Basin had changed, including—

''(A) the average surface water temperature of Lake Tahoe has risen by more than 1.2 degrees Fahrenheit in the past 43 years;

''(B) since 1910, the percent of precipitation that has fallen as snow in the Lake Tahoe Basin decreased from 51 percent to 35.5 percent; and

''(C) daily air temperatures have increased by more than 4 degrees Fahrenheit and the trend in daily maximum temperature has risen by approximately 2 degrees Fahrenheit;

''(15) 75 percent of the land in the Lake Tahoe Basin is owned by the Federal Government, which makes it a Federal responsibility to restore environmental health to the Basin;

''(16) the Federal Government has a long history of environmental preservation at Lake Tahoe, including—

''(A) congressional consent to the establishment of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency with—

''(i) the enactment in 1969 of Public Law 91–148 (83 Stat. 360); and

''(ii) the enactment in 1980 of Public Law 96–551 (94 Stat. 3233);

''(B) the establishment of the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit in 1973;

''(C) the enactment of Public Law 96–586 (94 Stat. 3381) in 1980 to provide for the acquisition of environmentally sensitive land and erosion control grants in the Lake Tahoe Basin;

''(D) the enactment of sections 341 and 342 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108–108; 117 Stat. 1317), which amended the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–263; 112 Stat. 2346) to provide payments for the environmental restoration projects under this Act; and

''(E) the enactment of section 382 of the Tax Relief and Health Care Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–432; 120 Stat. 3045), which amended the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–263; 112 Stat. 2346) to authorize development and implementation of a comprehensive 10-year hazardous fuels and fire prevention plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin;

''(17) the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works was an original signatory in 1997 to the Agreement of Federal Departments on Protection of the Environment and Economic Health of the Lake Tahoe Basin;

''(18) the Chief of Engineers, under direction from the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, has continued to be a significant contributor to Lake Tahoe Basin restoration, including—

''(A) stream and wetland restoration;

''(B) urban stormwater conveyance and treatment; and

''(C) programmatic technical assistance;

''(19) at the Lake Tahoe Presidential Forum in 1997, the President renewed the commitment of the Federal Government to Lake Tahoe by—

''(A) committing to increased Federal resources for environmental restoration at Lake Tahoe; and

''(B) establishing the Federal Interagency Partnership and Federal Advisory Committee to consult on natural resources issues concerning the Lake Tahoe Basin;

''(20) at the 2011 and 2012 Lake Tahoe Forums, Senator Reid, Senator Feinstein, Senator Heller, Senator Ensign, Governor Gibbons, Governor Sandoval, and Governor Brown—

''(A) renewed their commitment to Lake Tahoe; and

''(B) expressed their desire to fund the Federal and State shares of the Environmental Improvement Program through 2022;

''(21) since 1997, the Federal Government, the States of California and Nevada, units of local government, and the private sector have contributed more than $1,620,000,000 to the Lake Tahoe Basin, including—

''(A) $521,100,000 from the Federal Government;

''(B) $636,200,000 from the State of California;

''(C) $101,400,000 from the State of Nevada;

''(D) $68,200,000 from units of local government; and

''(E) $299,600,000 from private interests;

''(22) significant additional investment from Federal, State, local, and private sources is necessary—

''(A) to restore and sustain the environmental health of the Lake Tahoe Basin;

''(B) to adapt to the impacts of changing water temperature and precipitation; and

''(C) to protect the Lake Tahoe Basin from the introduction and establishment of invasive species; and

''(23) the Secretary has indicated that the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit has the capacity for at least $10,000,000 for the Fire Risk Reduction and Forest Management Program.

''(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

''(1) to enable the Chief of the Forest Service, the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in cooperation with the Planning Agency and the States of California and Nevada, to fund, plan, and implement significant new environmental restoration activities and forest management activities to address in the Lake Tahoe Basin the issues described in paragraphs (4) through (14) of subsection (a);

''(2) to ensure that Federal, State, local, regional, tribal, and private entities continue to work together to manage land in

the Lake Tahoe Basin and to coordinate on other activities in a manner that supports achievement and maintenance of—

''(A) the environmental threshold carrying capacities for the region; and

''(B) other applicable environmental standards and objectives;

''(3) to support local governments in efforts related to environmental restoration, stormwater pollution control, fire risk reduction, and forest management activities; and

''(4) to ensure that agency and science community representatives in the Lake Tahoe Basin work together—

''(A) to develop and implement a plan for integrated monitoring, assessment, and applied research to evaluate the effectiveness of the Environmental Improvement Program; and

''(B) to provide objective information as a basis for ongoing decisionmaking, with an emphasis on decisionmaking relating to public and private land use and resource management in the Basin.''.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

The Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (Public Law 106–506; 114 Stat. 2351) is amended by striking section 3 and inserting the following:

''SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

''In this Act:

''(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term 'Administrator' means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

''(2) ASSISTANT SECRETARY.—The term 'Assistant Secretary' means the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works.

''(3) CHAIR.—The term 'Chair' means the Chair of the Federal Partnership.

''(4) COMPACT.—The term 'Compact' means the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact included in the first section of Public Law 96–551 (94 Stat. 3233).

''(5) DIRECTORS.—The term 'Directors' means—

''(A) the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service; and

''(B) the Director of the United States Geological Survey.

''(6) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.—The term 'Environmental Improvement Program' means—

''(A) the Environmental Improvement Program adopted by the Planning Agency; and

''(B) any amendments to the Program.

''(7) ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD CARRYING CAPACITY.—The term 'environmental threshold carrying capacity' has the meaning given the term in article II of the compact.

''(8) FEDERAL PARTNERSHIP.—The term 'Federal Partnership' means the Lake Tahoe Federal Interagency Partnership established by Executive Order 13957 (62 Fed. Reg. 41249) (or a successor Executive order).

''(9) FOREST MANAGEMENT ACTIVITY.—The term 'forest management activity' includes—

''(A) prescribed burning for ecosystem health and hazardous fuels reduction;

''(B) mechanical and minimum tool treatment;

''(C) road decommissioning or reconstruction;

''(D) stream environment zone restoration and other watershed and wildlife habitat enhancements;

''(E) nonnative invasive species management; and

''(F) other activities consistent with Forest Service practices, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

''(10) MAPS.—The term 'Maps' means the maps—

''(A) entitled—

''(i) 'LTRA USFS-CA Land Exchange/North Shore';

''(ii) 'USFS-CA Land Exchange/West Shore'; and

''(iii) 'USFS-CA Land Exchange/South Shore'; and

''(B) dated April 12, 2013, and on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of—

''(i) the Forest Service;

''(ii) the California Tahoe Conservancy; and

''(iii) the California Department of Parks and Recreation.

''(11) NATIONAL WILDLAND FIRE CODE.—The term 'national wildland fire code' means—

''(A) the most recent publication of the National Fire Protection Association codes numbered 1141, 1142, 1143, and 1144;

''(B) the most recent publication of the International Wildland-Urban Interface Code of the International Code Council; or

''(C) any other code that the Secretary determines provides the same, or better, standards for protection against wildland fire as a code described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

''(12) PLANNING AGENCY.—The term 'Planning Agency' means the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency established under Public Law 91–148 (83 Stat. 360) and Public Law 96–551 (94 Stat. 3233).

''(13) PRIORITY LIST.—The term 'Priority List' means the environmental restoration priority list developed under section 8.

''(14) SECRETARY.—The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service.

''(15) STREAM ENVIRONMENT ZONE.—The term 'Stream Environment Zone' means an area that generally owes the biological and physical characteristics of the area to the presence of surface water or groundwater.

''(16) TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD.—The term 'total maximum daily load' means the total maximum daily load allocations adopted under section 303(d) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1313(d)).

''(17) WATERCRAFT.—The term 'watercraft' means motorized and non-motorized watercraft, including boats, seaplanes, personal watercraft, kayaks, and canoes.''.

SEC. 4. ADMINISTRATION OF THE LAKE TAHOE BASIN MANAGEMENT UNIT.

Section 4 of the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (Public Law 106–506; 114 Stat. 2353) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(3), by striking ''basin'' and inserting ''Basin''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(c) TRANSIT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit shall, consistent with the regional transportation plan adopted by the Planning Agency, manage vehicular parking and traffic in the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, with priority given—

''(A) to improving public access to the Lake Tahoe Basin, including the prioritization of alternatives to the private automobile, consistent with the requirements of the Compact;

''(B) to coordinating with the Nevada Department of Transportation, Caltrans, State parks, and other entities along Nevada Highway 28 and California Highway 89; and

''(C) to providing support and assistance to local public transit systems in the management and operations of activities under this subsection.

''(2) NATIONAL FOREST TRANSIT PROGRAM.—Consistent with the support and assistance provided under paragraph (1)(C), the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, may enter into a contract, cooperative agreement, interagency agreement, or other agreement with the Department of Transportation to secure operating and capital funds from the National Forest Transit Program.

''(d) FOREST MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES.—

''(1) COORDINATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In conducting forest management activities in the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, the Secretary shall, as appropriate, coordinate with the Administrator and State and local agencies and organizations, including local fire departments and volunteer groups.

''(B) GOALS.—The coordination of activities under subparagraph (A) should aim to increase efficiencies and maximize the compatibility of management practices across public property boundaries.

''(2) MULTIPLE BENEFITS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In conducting forest management activities in the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, the Secretary shall conduct the activities in a manner that—

''(i) except as provided in subparagraph (B), attains multiple ecosystem benefits, including—

''(I) reducing forest fuels;

''(II) maintaining or restoring biological diversity;

''(III) improving wetland and water quality, including in Stream Environment Zones; and

''(IV) increasing resilience to changing water temperature and precipitation; and

''(ii) helps achieve and maintain the environmental threshold carrying capacities established by the Planning Agency.

''(B) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding clause (A)(i), the attainment of multiple ecosystem benefits shall not be required if the Secretary determines that management for multiple ecosystem benefits would excessively increase the cost of a project in relation to the additional ecosystem benefits gained from the management activity.

''(3) GROUND DISTURBANCE.—Consistent with applicable Federal law and Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit land and resource management plan direction, the Secretary shall—

''(A) establish post-project ground condition criteria for ground disturbance caused by forest management activities; and

''(B) provide for monitoring to ascertain the attainment of the post-project conditions.

''(e) WITHDRAWAL OF FEDERAL LAND.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights and paragraph (2), the Federal land located in the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit is withdrawn from—

''(A) all forms of entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

''(B) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

''(C) disposition under all laws relating to mineral and geothermal leasing.

''(2) EXCEPTIONS.—A conveyance of land shall be exempt from withdrawal under this subsection if carried out under—

''(A) the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (Public Law 106–506; 114 Stat. 2351); or

''(B) the Santini-Burton Act (Public Law 96–586; 94 Stat. 3381).

''(f) ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD CARRYING CAPACITY.—The Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit shall support the attainment of the environmental threshold carrying capacities.

''(g) COOPERATIVE AUTHORITIES.—During the 4 fiscal years following the date of enactment of the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act of 2013, the Secretary, in conjunction with land adjustment projects or programs, may enter into contracts and cooperative agreements with States, units of local government, and other public and private entities to provide for fuel reduction, erosion control, reforestation, Stream Environment Zone restoration, and similar management activities on Federal land and non-Federal land within the projects or programs.''.

SEC. 5. CONSULTATION.

The Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (Public Law 106–506; 114 Stat. 2351) is amended by striking section 5 and inserting the following:

''SEC. 5. CONSULTATION.

''In carrying out this Act, the Secretary, the Administrator, and the Directors shall, as appropriate and in a timely manner, consult with the heads of the Washoe Tribe, applicable Federal, State, regional, and local governmental agencies, and the Lake Tahoe Federal Advisory Committee.''.

SEC. 6. AUTHORIZED PROJECTS.

The Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (Public Law 106–506; 114 Stat. 2351) is amended by striking section 6 and inserting the following:

''SEC. 6. AUTHORIZED PROJECTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, the Assistant Secretary, the Directors, and the Administrator, in coordination with the Planning Agency and the States of California and Nevada, may carry out or provide financial assistance to any project or program that—

''(1) is described in subsection (d);

''(2) is included in the Priority List under section 8; and

''(3) furthers the purposes of the Environmental Improvement Program if the project has been subject to environmental review and approval, respectively, as required under Federal law, article 7 of the Compact, and State law, as applicable.

''(b) RESTRICTION.—The Administrator shall use not more than 3 percent of the funds provided under subsection (a) for administering the projects or programs described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (d).

''(c) MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT.—All projects authorized under subsection (d) shall—

''(1) include funds for monitoring and assessment of the results and effectiveness at the project and program level consistent with the program developed under section 11; and

''(2) use the integrated multiagency performance measures established under section 13.

''(d) DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES.—

''(1) STORMWATER MANAGEMENT, EROSION CONTROL, AND TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD IMPLEMENTATION.—Of the amounts made available under section 17(a), $75,000,000 shall be made available—

''(A) to the Secretary or the Administrator for the Federal share of stormwater management and related projects and programs consistent with the adopted Total Maximum Daily Load and near-shore water quality goals; and

''(B) for grants by the Secretary and the Administrator to carry out the projects and programs described in subparagraph (A).

''(2) STREAM ENVIRONMENT ZONE AND WATERSHED RESTORATION.—Of the amounts made available under section 17(a), $38,000,000 shall be made available—

''(A) to the Secretary or the Assistant Secretary for the Federal share of the Upper Truckee River restoration projects and other watershed restoration projects identified in the priority list established under section 8; and

''(B) for grants by the Administrator to carry out the projects described in subparagraph (A).

''(3) FIRE RISK REDUCTION AND FOREST MANAGEMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Of the amounts made available under section 17(a), $135,000,000 shall be made available to the Secretary to carry out, including by making grants, the following projects:

''(i) Projects identified as part of the Lake Tahoe Basin Multi-Jurisdictional Fuel Reduction and Wildfire Prevention Strategy 10-Year Plan.

''(ii) Competitive grants for fuels work to be awarded by the Secretary to communities that have adopted national wildland fire codes to implement the applicable portion of the 10-year plan described in clause (i).

''(iii) Biomass projects, including feasibility assessments and transportation of materials.

''(iv) Angora Fire Restoration projects under the jurisdiction of the Secretary.

''(v) Washoe Tribe projects on tribal lands within the Lake Tahoe Basin.

''(vi) Development of an updated Lake Tahoe Basin multijurisdictional fuel reduction and wildfire prevention strategy, consistent with section 4(d).

''(vii) Development of updated community wildfire protection plans by local fire districts.

''(viii) Municipal water infrastructure that significantly improves the firefighting capability of local government within the Lake Tahoe Basin.

''(B) MINIMUM ALLOCATION.—Of the amounts made available to the Secretary to carry out subparagraph (A), at least $80,000,000 shall be used by the Secretary for projects under subparagraph (A)(i).

''(C) PRIORITY.—Units of local government that have dedicated funding for inspections and enforcement of defensible space regulations shall be given priority for amounts provided under this paragraph.

''(D) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—As a condition on the receipt of funds, communities or local fire districts that receive funds under this paragraph shall provide a 25 percent match.

''(ii) FORM OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—The non-Federal share required under clause (i) may be in the form of cash contributions or in-kind contributions, including providing labor, equipment, supplies, space, and other operational needs.

''(II) CREDIT FOR CERTAIN DEDICATED FUNDING.—There shall be credited toward the non-Federal share required under clause (i) any dedicated funding of the communities or local fire districts for a fuels reduction management program, defensible space inspections, or dooryard chipping.

''(III) DOCUMENTATION.—Communities and local fire districts shall—

''(aa) maintain a record of in-kind contributions that describes—

''(AA) the monetary value of the in-kind contributions; and

''(BB) the manner in which the in-kind contributions assist in accomplishing project goals and objectives; and

''(bb) document in all requests for Federal funding, and include in the total project budget, evidence of the commitment to provide the non-Federal share through in-kind contributions.

''(4) INVASIVE SPECIES MANAGEMENT.—Of the amounts to be made available under section 17(a), $30,000,000 shall be made available to the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for the Aquatic Invasive Species Program and the watercraft inspections described in section 9.

''(5) SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES MANAGEMENT.—Of the amounts to be made available under section 17(a), $20,000,000 shall be made available to the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for the Lahontan Cutthroat Trout Recovery Program.

''(6) LAKE TAHOE BASIN SCIENCE PROGRAM.—Of the amounts to be made available under section 17(a), $30,000,000 shall be made available to the Chief of the Forest Service to develop and implement, in coordination with the Tahoe Science Consortium, the Lake Tahoe Basin Science Program established under section 11.

''(7) PROGRAM PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Of the amounts to be made available under section 17(a), $5,000,000 shall be made available to the Secretary to carry out sections 12, 13, and 14.

''(B) PLANNING AGENCY.—Of the amounts described in subparagraph (A), not less than 50 percent shall be made available to the Planning Agency to carry out the program oversight, coordination, and outreach activities established under sections 12, 13, and 14.

''(8) LAND CONVEYANCE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount made available under section 17(a), $2,000,000 shall be made available to the Secretary to carry out the activities under section 3(b)(2) of Public Law 96–586 (94 Stat. 3384) (commonly known as the 'Santini-Burton Act').

''(B) OTHER FUNDS.—Of the amounts available to the Secretary under subparagraph (A), not less than 50 percent shall be provided to the California Tahoe Conservancy to facilitate the conveyance of land described in section 3(b)(2) of Public Law 96–586 (94 Stat. 3384) (commonly known as the 'Santini-Burton Act').''.

SEC. 7. ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION PRIORITY LIST.

The Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (Public Law 106–506; 114 Stat. 2351) is amended—

(1) by striking sections 8 and 9;

(2) by redesignating sections 10, 11, and 12 as sections 15, 16, and 17, respectively; and

(3) by inserting after section 7 the following:

''SEC. 8. ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION PRIORITY LIST.

''(a) DEADLINE.—Not later than February 15 of the year after the date of enactment of the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act of 2013, the Chair, in consultation with the Secretary, the Administrator, the Directors, the Planning Agency, the States of California and Nevada, the Federal Partnership, the Washoe Tribe, the Lake Tahoe Federal Advisory Committee, and the Tahoe Science Consortium shall submit to Congress a prioritized list of all Environmental Improvement Program projects for the Lake Tahoe Basin for each program category described in section 6(d).

''(b) CRITERIA.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The priority of projects included in the Priority List shall be based on the best available science and the following criteria:

''(A) The 5-year threshold carrying capacity evaluation.

''(B) The ability to measure progress or success of the project.

''(C) The potential to significantly contribute to the achievement and maintenance of the environmental threshold carrying capacities identified in the Compact for—

''(i) air quality;

''(ii) fisheries;

''(iii) noise;

''(iv) recreation;

''(v) scenic resources;

''(vi) soil conservation;

''(vii) forest health;

''(viii) water quality; and

''(ix) wildlife.

''(D) The ability of a project to provide multiple benefits.

''(E) The ability of a project to leverage non-Federal contributions.

''(F) Stakeholder support for the project.

''(G) The justification of Federal interest.

''(H) Agency priority.

''(I) Agency capacity.

''(J) Cost-effectiveness.

''(K) Federal funding history.

''(2) SECONDARY FACTORS.—In addition to the criteria under paragraph (1), the Chair

shall, as the Chair determines to be appropriate, give preference to projects in the Priority List that benefit existing neighborhoods in the Basin that are at or below regional median income levels, based on the most recent census data available.

''(c) REVISIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Priority List submitted under subsection (b) shall be revised—

''(A) every 2 years; or

''(B) on a finding of compelling need under paragraph (2).

''(2) FINDING OF COMPELLING NEED.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary, the Administrator, or the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service makes a finding of compelling need justifying a priority shift and the finding is approved by the Secretary, the Executive Director of the Planning Agency, the California Natural Resources Secretary, and the Director of the Nevada Department of Conservation, the Priority List shall be revised in accordance with this subsection.

''(B) INCLUSIONS.—A finding of compelling need includes—

''(i) major scientific findings;

''(ii) results from the threshold evaluation of the Planning Agency;

''(iii) emerging environmental threats; and

''(iv) rare opportunities for land acquisition.

''(d) FUNDING.—Of the amount made available under section 17(a), $80,000,000 shall be made available to the Secretary to carry out this section.

''SEC. 9. AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES PREVENTION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, in coordination with the Planning Agency, the California Department of Fish and Game, and the Nevada Department of Wildlife, shall deploy strategies consistent with the Lake Tahoe Aquatic Invasive Species Management Plan to prevent the introduction of aquatic invasive species into the Lake Tahoe Basin.

''(b) CRITERIA.—The strategies referred to in subsection (a) shall provide that—

''(1) combined inspection and decontamination stations be established and operated at not less than 2 locations in the Lake Tahoe Basin; and

''(2) watercraft not be allowed to launch in waters of the Lake Tahoe Basin if the watercraft has not been inspected in accordance with the Lake Tahoe Aquatic Invasive Species Management Plan.

''(c) CERTIFICATION.—The Planning Agency may certify State and local agencies to perform the decontamination activities described in subsection (b)(3) at locations outside the Lake Tahoe Basin if standards at the sites meet or exceed standards for similar sites in the Lake Tahoe Basin established under this section.

''(d) APPLICABILITY.—The strategies and criteria developed under this section shall apply to all watercraft to be launched on water within the Lake Tahoe Basin.

''(e) FEES.—The Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service may collect and spend fees for decontamination only at a level sufficient to cover the costs of operation of inspection and decontamination stations under this section.

''(f) CIVIL PENALTIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Any person that launches, attempts to launch, or facilitates launching of watercraft not in compliance with strategies deployed under this section shall be liable for a civil penalty in an amount not to exceed $1,000 per violation.

''(2) OTHER AUTHORITIES.—Any penalties assessed under this subsection shall be separate from penalties assessed under any other authority.

''(g) LIMITATION.—The strategies and criteria under subsections (a) and (b), respectively, may be modified if the Secretary of the Interior, in a nondelegable capacity and in consultation with the Planning Agency and State governments, issues a determination that alternative measures will be no less effective at preventing introduction of aquatic invasive species into Lake Tahoe than the strategies and criteria.

''(h) SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITY.—The authority under this section is supplemental to all actions taken by non-Federal regulatory authorities.

''(i) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this title shall be construed as restricting, affecting, or amending any other law or the authority of any department, instrumentality, or agency of the United States, or any State or political subdivision thereof, respecting the control of invasive species.

''SEC. 10. CORPS OF ENGINEERS; INTERAGENCY AGREEMENTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Assistant Secretary may enter into interagency agreements with non-Federal interests in the Lake Tahoe Basin to use Lake Tahoe Partnership-Miscellaneous General Investigations funds to provide programmatic technical assistance for the Environmental Improvement Program.

''(b) LOCAL COOPERATION AGREEMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Before providing technical assistance under this section, the Assistant Secretary shall enter into a local cooperation agreement with a non-Federal interest to provide for the technical assistance.

''(2) COMPONENTS.—The agreement entered into under paragraph (1) shall—

''(A) describe the nature of the technical assistance;

''(B) describe any legal and institutional structures necessary to ensure the effective long-term viability of the end products by the non-Federal interest; and

''(C) include cost-sharing provisions in accordance with paragraph (3).

''(3) FEDERAL SHARE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Federal share of project costs under each local cooperation agreement under this subsection shall be 65 percent.

''(B) FORM.—The Federal share may be in the form of reimbursements of project costs.

''(C) CREDIT.—The non-Federal interest may receive credit toward the non-Federal share for the reasonable costs of related technical activities completed by the non-Federal interest before entering into a local cooperation agreement with the Assistant Secretary under this subsection.

''SEC. 11. LAKE TAHOE BASIN SCIENCE PROGRAM.

''The Secretary (acting through the Station Director of the Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Research Station), the Administrator, the Planning Agency, the States of California and Nevada, and the Tahoe Science Consortium, shall develop and implement the Lake Tahoe Basin Science Program that—

''(1) develops and regularly updates an integrated multiagency programmatic assessment and monitoring plan—

''(A) to evaluate the effectiveness of the Environmental Improvement Program;

''(B) to evaluate the status and trends of indicators related to environmental threshold carrying capacities; and

''(C) to assess the impacts and risks of changing water temperature, precipitation, and invasive species;

''(2) produces and synthesizes scientific information necessary for—

''(A) the identification and refinement of environmental indicators for the Lake Tahoe Basin; and

''(B) the evaluation of standards and benchmarks;

''(3) conducts applied research, programmatic technical assessments, scientific data management, analysis, and reporting related to key management questions;

''(4) develops new tools and information to support objective assessments of land use and resource conditions;

''(5) provides scientific and technical support to the Federal Government and State and local governments in—

''(A) reducing stormwater runoff, air deposition, and other pollutants that contribute to the loss of lake clarity; and

''(B) the development and implementation of an integrated stormwater monitoring and assessment program;

''(6) establishes and maintains independent peer review processes—

''(A) to evaluate the Environmental Improvement Program; and

''(B) to assess the technical adequacy and scientific consistency of central environmental documents, such as the 5-year threshold review; and

''(7) provides scientific and technical support for the development of appropriate management strategies to accommodate changing water temperature and precipitation in the Lake Tahoe Basin.

''SEC. 12. PUBLIC OUTREACH AND EDUCATION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, the Administrator, and the Directors will coordinate with the Planning Agency to conduct public education and outreach programs, including encouraging—

''(1) owners of land and residences in the Lake Tahoe Basin—

''(A) to implement defensible space; and

''(B) to conduct best management practices for water quality; and

''(2) owners of land and residences in the Lake Tahoe Basin and visitors to the Lake Tahoe Basin, to help prevent the introduction and proliferation of invasive species as part of the private share investment in the Environmental Improvement Program.

''(b) SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL GUIDANCE.—The Director of the United States Geological Survey shall provide scientific and technical guidance to public outreach and education programs conducted under this section.

''(c) REQUIRED COORDINATION.—Public outreach and education programs for aquatic invasive species under this section shall—

''(1) be coordinated with Lake Tahoe Basin tourism and business organizations; and

''(2) include provisions for the programs to extend outside of the Lake Tahoe Basin.

''SEC. 13. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

''Not later than February 15 of each year, the Secretary, in cooperation with the Chair, the Administrator, the Directors, the Planning Agency, and the States of California and Nevada, consistent with section 6(d)(6), shall submit to Congress a report that describes—

''(1) the status of all Federal, State, local, and private projects authorized under this Act, including to the maximum extent practicable, for projects that will receive Federal funds under this Act during the current or subsequent fiscal year—

''(A) the project scope;

''(B) the budget for the project; and

''(C) the justification for the project, consistent with the criteria established in section 8(b)(1);

''(2) Federal, State, local, and private expenditures in the preceding fiscal year to implement the Environmental Improvement Program and projects otherwise authorized under this Act;

''(3) accomplishments in the preceding fiscal year in implementing this Act in accordance with the performance measures and

other monitoring and assessment activities; and

''(4) public education and outreach efforts undertaken to implement programs and projects authorized under this Act.

''SEC. 14. ANNUAL BUDGET PLAN.

''As part of the annual budget of the President, the President shall submit information regarding each Federal agency involved in the Environmental Improvement Program (including the Forest Service, the Environmental Protection Agency, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service), the United States Geological Survey, and the Corps of Engineers), including—

''(1) an interagency crosscut budget that displays the proposed budget for use by each Federal agency in carrying out restoration activities relating to the Environmental Improvement Program for the following fiscal year;

''(2) a detailed accounting of all amounts received and obligated by Federal agencies to achieve the goals of the Environmental Improvement Program during the preceding fiscal year; and

''(3) a description of the Federal role in the Environmental Improvement Program, including the specific role of each agency involved in the restoration of the Lake Tahoe Basin.''.

SEC. 8. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAWS.

Section 16 of The Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (Public Law 106–506; 114 Stat. 2358) (as redesignated by section 7(2)) is amended by inserting '', Director, or Administrator'' after ''Secretary''.

SEC. 9. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

The Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (Public Law 106–506; 114 Stat. 2351) is amended by striking section 17 (as redesignated by section 7(2)) and inserting the following:

''SEC. 17. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act $415,000,000 for a period of 10 fiscal years beginning the first fiscal year after the date of enactment of the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act of 2013.

''(b) EFFECT ON OTHER FUNDS.—Amounts authorized under this section and any amendments made by this Act—

''(1) shall be in addition to any other amounts made available to the Secretary, the Administrator, or the Directors for expenditure in the Lake Tahoe Basin; and

''(2) shall not reduce allocations for other Regions of the Forest Service, Environmental Protection Agency, or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

''(c) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT.—Except as provided in subsection (d) and section 6(d)(3)(D), the States of California and Nevada shall pay 50 percent of the aggregate costs of restoration activities in the Lake Tahoe Basin funded under section 6.

''(d) RELOCATION COSTS.—Notwithstanding subsection (c), the Secretary shall provide to local utility districts two-thirds of the costs of relocating facilities in connection with—

''(1) environmental restoration projects under sections 6 and 8; and

''(2) erosion control projects under section 2 of Public Law 96–586 (94 Stat. 3381).

''(e) SIGNAGE.—To the maximum extent practicable, a project provided assistance under this Act shall include appropriate signage at the project site that—

''(1) provides information to the public on—

''(A) the amount of Federal funds being provided to the project; and

''(B) this Act; and

''(2) displays the visual identity mark of the Environmental Improvement Program.''.

SEC. 10. ADMINISTRATION OF ACQUIRED LAND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3(b) of Public Law 96–586 (94 Stat. 3384) (commonly known as the ''Santini-Burton Act'') is amended—

(1) by striking ''(b) Lands'' and inserting the following:

''(b) ADMINISTRATION OF ACQUIRED LAND.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Land''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) CONVEYANCE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If the State of California (acting through the California Tahoe Conservancy and the California Department of Parks and Recreation) offers to donate to the United States acceptable title to the non-Federal land described in subparagraph (B)(i), the Secretary—

''(i) may accept the offer; and

''(ii) not later than 180 days after the date on which the Secretary receives acceptable title to the non-Federal land described in subparagraph (B)(i), convey to the State of California, subject to valid existing rights and for no consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land that is acceptable to the State of California.

''(B) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—

''(i) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The non-Federal land referred to in subparagraph (A) includes—

''(I) the approximately 1,981 acres of land administered by the Conservancy and identified on the Maps as 'Conservancy to the United States Forest Service'; and

''(II) the approximately 187 acres of land administered by California State Parks and identified on the Maps as 'State Parks to the U.S. Forest Service'.

''(ii) FEDERAL LAND.—The Federal land referred to in subparagraph (A) includes the approximately 1,995 acres of Forest Service land identified on the Maps as 'U.S. Forest Service to Conservancy and State Parks'.

''(C) CONDITIONS.—Any land conveyed under this paragraph shall—

''(i) be for the purpose of consolidating Federal and State ownerships and improving management efficiencies;

''(ii) not result in any significant changes in the uses of the land; and

''(iii) be subject to the condition that the applicable deed include such terms , restrictions, covenants, conditions, and reservations as the Secretary determines necessary to—

''(I) ensure compliance with this Act; and

''(II) ensure that the development rights associated with the conveyed parcels shall not be recognized or available for transfer under section 90.2 of the Code of Ordinances for the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency.''.

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. PAUL):

S. 1457. A bill to exempt the aging process of distilled spirits from the production period for purposes of capitalization of interest costs; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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. 1457

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 ''Aged Distilled Spirits Competitiveness Act''.

SEC. 2. PRODUCTION PERIOD OF DISTILLED SPIRITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 263A(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5), and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

''(4) EXEMPTION FOR AGING PROCESS OF DISTILLED SPIRITS.—For purposes of this subsection, the production period shall not include the aging period for distilled spirits (as described in section 5002(a)(8)).''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to the production of distilled spirits that begins on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. HARKIN):

S. 1465. A bill to ensure that persons who form corporations in the United States disclose the beneficial owners of those corporations, in order to prevent the formation of corporations with hidden owners, stop the misuse of United States corporations by wrongdoers, and assist law enforcement in detecting, preventing, and punishing terrorism, money laundering, tax evasion, and other criminal and civil misconduct involving United States corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, today, along with my colleagues, Senator GRASSLEY, Senator FEINSTEIN, and Senator HARKIN, I am reintroducing the Incorporation Transparency and Law Enforcement Assistance Act, a bill designed to combat terrorism, money laundering, tax evasion, and other wrongdoing facilitated by U.S. corporations with hidden owners. This commonsense bill would end the practice of our States forming about 2 million new corporations each year for unidentified persons, and instead require a list of the real owners to be submitted so that, if misconduct later occurred, law enforcement could access the owners list and have a trail to chase, instead of confronting what has all too often been a dead end.

Our bill is supported by key law enforcement organizations, including the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Association of Assistant United States Attorneys, and the Society of Former Special Agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, as well as by Manhattan District Attorney Cyrus Vance. It is also endorsed by a number of small business, public interest, and good government groups, including the Main Street Alliance, American Sustainable Business Council, National Money Transmitters Association, AFL–CIO, SEIU, Global Financial Integrity, Global Witness, U.S. Public Interest Research Group, Transparency International, Public Citizen, Project on Government Oversight, Jubilee USA Network, Tax Justice Network USA, Human Rights Watch, Friends of the Earth, Open Society Policy Center, Revenue Watch Institute, the FACT Coalition, and more. .

This is the fourth Congress in which this bill has been introduced to provide a solution to a problem that has gained only more urgency with time. In 2008,

when the bill was first introduced, President Obama was a member of the U.S. Senate and an original cosponsor. In 2013, President Obama stood with other international leaders at a G8 summit in June to condemn corporations with hidden owners who commit crimes, tax evasion, and other wrongdoing. The G8 leaders made a joint commitment to combat that problem. President Obama immediately responded with a U.S. action plan that, among other measures, calls for enacting legislation to end the shameful practice in this country of forming U.S. corporations with unnamed owners and unleashing them on, not only our own communities, but the international community as well.

A World Bank study found that the United States forms more corporations per year than all the rest of the countries in the world put together. Under current law, those U.S. corporations can be established anonymously, by hidden owners who don't reveal their identity. According to another recent study by Griffith University examining multiple jurisdictions, it is easier to obtain an anonymous shell company in the United States than almost anywhere else in the world. That study also found that ''only a tiny portion of U.S. providers of any kind met the international standard of requiring notarized identity documents.''

Right now, in the United States, it takes more information to get a driver's license or to open a U.S. bank account than to form a U.S. corporation. Our bill would change that by requiring any State that accepts crime-fighting grants from the Department of Justice to add one new question to their existing incorporation forms asking applicants to identify the company's true owners.

That is it. One new question on an existing form. It is not a complicated question, yet the answer could play a key role in helping law enforcement do their jobs. Our bill would not require States to verify the information, but penalties would apply to persons who submit false information. States, or licensed formation agents if a State has delegated the task to them, would supply the ownership information to law enforcement upon receipt of a subpoena or summons.

The Problem. We have all seen the news reports about U.S. corporations involved in wrongdoing—from facilitating terrorism to money laundering, financial fraud, tax evasion, corruption, and more. Let me give you a few examples that indicate the scope of the problem.

We now know that some terrorists use U.S. corporations to carry out their activities. Viktor Bout, an arms dealer who was found guilty in November 2011 of conspiring to kill U.S. nationals and selling weapons to a terrorist organization, used corporations around the world in his work, including a dozen formed in Texas, Delaware, and Florida. At the time of Mr. Bout's extradition to face justice here in America, Attorney General Eric Holder stated: ''Long considered one of the world's most prolific arms traffickers, Mr. Bout will now appear in federal court in Manhattan to answer to charges of conspiring to sell millions of dollars worth of weapons to a terrorist organization for use in trying to kill Americans.'' It is unacceptable that Mr. Bout was able to set up corporations in three of our States and use them in illicit activities without ever being asked for the names of the corporate owners.

In another case, a New York company called the Assa Corporation owned a Manhattan skyscraper and, in 2007, wire transferred about $4.5 million in rental payments to a bank in Iran. U.S. law enforcement tracking the funds had no idea who was behind that corporation, until another government disclosed that it was owned by the Alavi Foundation which had known ties to the Iranian military. In other words, a New York corporation was being used to ship millions of U.S. dollars to Iran, a notorious supporter of terrorism.

U.S. corporations with hidden owners have also been involved in financial crimes. In 2011, a former Russian military officer, Victor Kaganov, pled guilty to operating an illegal money transmitter business from his home in Oregon, and using Oregon shell corporations to wire more than $150 million around the world on behalf of Russian clients. U.S. Attorney Dwight Holton of the District of Oregon used stark language when describing the case: ''When shell corporations are illegally manipulated in the shadows to hide the flow of tens of millions of dollars overseas, it threatens the integrity of our financial system.''

Another financial fraud case involves Florida attorney Scott Rothstein who, in 2010, pled guilty to fraud and money laundering in connection with a $1.2 billion Ponzi investment scheme, in which he used 85 U.S. limited liability companies to conceal his participation and ownership stake in various business ventures. In still another case earlier this year, the Securities and Exchange Commission suspended trading in 61 shell corporations suspected of being misused to defraud investors.

Shell corporations are also notorious for their role in health care fraud. One example involves an individual named Michel Huarte who formed 29 shell companies in several states including Florida, Louisiana, and North Carolina, used them to make fraudulent health care claims, and bilked Medicare out of more than $50 million. In 2010, he was sentenced to 22 years in prison. He is one in a long line of fraudsters who have hidden behind U.S. corporations to defraud Medicare and Medicaid.

Tax evasion is another type of misconduct which all too often involves the use of U.S. corporations with hidden owners. One Subcommittee investigation showed, for example, how Kurt Greaves, a Michigan businessman, worked with Terry Neal, an offshore promoter, to form shell corporations in Nevada, Canada, and offshore secrecy jurisdictions, to hide more than $400,000 in untaxed business income. Both Mr. Greaves and Mr. Neal later pled guilty to federal tax evasion. The Subcommittee also showed how two brothers from Texas, Sam and Charles Wyly, created a network of 58 trusts and shell corporations to dodge the payment of U.S. taxes, including using a set of Nevada corporations to move offshore over $190 million in stock options without paying taxes on that compensation.

Still another area of abuse involves corrupt foreign officials using U.S. corporations to hide and spend their illicit funds. One example involves Teodoro Obiang, who is the son of the President of Equatorial Guinea, holds office in that country, and has purchased luxury homes, cars, and even a personal jet here in the United States. A Subcommittee investigation disclosed that, as part of his actions, Mr. Obiang used U.S. lawyers to form several California shell corporations with names like Beautiful Vision, Unlimited Horizon, and Sweet Pink to open bank accounts in the names of those corporations, move millions of dollars in suspect funds into the United States, and use those funds to support an affluent lifestyle. The Department of Justice has since filed suit to seize his U.S. property, alleging that Mr. Obiang acquired it through corruption and money laundering.

One last example involves 800 U.S. corporations whose hidden owners have stumped U.S. law enforcement trying to investigate their suspect conduct. In October 2004, the Homeland Security Department's division of Immigration and Customs Enforcement or ICE identified a single Utah corporation that had engaged in $150 million in suspicious transactions. ICE found that the corporation had been formed in Utah and was owned by two Panamanian entities which, in turn, were owned by a group of Panamanian holding corporations, all located at the same Panama City office. By 2005, ICE had located 800 U.S. corporations in nearly all 50 states associated with the same shadowy group in Panama, but was unable to obtain the name of a single natural person who owned any one of the corporations. ICE had learned that the 800 corporations were associated with multiple U.S. investigations into tax fraud and other wrongdoing, but no one had been able to find the corporate owners. The trail went cold, and ICE closed the case. Yet it may be that many of those U.S. corporations are still enaged in wrongdoing.

These examples of U.S. corporations with hidden owners facilitating terrorism, financial crime, health care fraud, tax evasion, corruption, and other misconduct provide ample evidence of the need for legislation to find out who is behind the mayhem. That's

why law enforcement officials are among the bill's strongest supporters.

The Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association or FLEOA, which represents more than 26,000 Federal law enforcement officers, has explained its strong support for the bill as follows:

Suspected terrorists, drug trafficking organizations and other criminal enterprises continue to exploit the anonymity afforded to them through the current corporate filing process in a few states. Hiding behind a registered agent, these criminals are able to incorporate without disclosing who the beneficial owners are for their company(s). This enables them to establish corporate flow-through entities, otherwise known as shell companies,' to facilitate money laundering and narcoterrorist financing.

Even through the due process of proper service of a court order, law enforcement officers are unable to determine who the beneficial owners are of these entities. This has to stop. While we fully recognize and respect the privacy concerns of law abiding citizens, we need to install a baseline of checks and balances to deter the criminal exploitation of our corporate filing process.

The Fraternal Order of Police, which has 330,000 members across the country, offers a similar explanation for its support of the bill:

For years corporations have been used as front organizations by criminals conducting illegal activity such as money laundering, fraud, and tax evasion. . . . This bill is critical to our work because, all too often, investigations are stymied when we encounter a company with hidden ownership. . . . [T]he sharing of beneficial ownership information with law enforcement will greatly assist our investigations. When we are able to expose the link between shell companies and drug trafficking, corruption, organized crime and terrorist finance, the law enforcement community is better able to keep America safe from these illegal activities and keep the proceeds of these crimes out of the U.S. financial system.

The National Association of Assistant United States Attorneys, which represents more than 1,500 federal prosecutors, has urged Congress to take legislative action to strengthen inadequate state incorporation practices: ''[M]indful of the ease with which criminals establish 'front organizations' to assist in money laundering, terrorist financing, tax evasion and other misconduct, it is shocking and unacceptable that many State laws permit the creation of corporations without asking for the identity of the corporation's beneficial owners. The legislation will guard against that and no longer permit criminals to exploit the lack of transparency in the registration of corporations.''

Manhattan District Attorney Cyrus Vance Jr. has publicly urged Congress to enact this bill. He wrote: ''I have spoken with many colleagues in the law enforcement community, and every one of us supports the bill as a simple and common sense movement to help prevent white collar crime. . . . Because there is no national standard requiring disclosure of beneficial ownership, criminals can set up U.S. corporations anonymously and use them as fronts for all kinds of illicit activity without having to identify who actually controls and profits from the activity. In a simple stroke, the proposed bill would eliminate this needless barrier to the detection and prosecution of financial crimes.''

Some members of the U.S. financial industry with obligations under U.S. anti-money laundering laws to know their customers, including when doing business with a shell corporation, support the legislation because it will help them know who is behind U.S. corporations seeking to open accounts with them. The National Money Transmitters Association, NMTA, for example, which represents state-licensed money transmitters, has written in support of the bill, explaining: ''The NMTA urges you to give us the KYC, know-your-customer, tools we need to do our job efficiently and make sure that our nation's standards are brought up to a level equal to that of other advanced countries.''

We need legislation not only to stop the abuses being committed by U.S. corporations with hidden owners, but also to meet our international commitments. In 2006, the leading international anti-money laundering body in the world, the Financial Action Task Force on Money Laundering—known as FATF—issued a report criticizing the United States for its failure to comply with a FATF standard requiring countries to obtain beneficial ownership information for the corporations formed under their laws. This standard is one of 40 FATF standards that this country has publicly committed itself to implementing as part of its efforts to promote strong anti-money laundering laws around the world.

FATF gave the United States two years, until 2008, to make progress toward complying with the FATF standard on beneficial ownership information. But that deadline passed five years ago, with no real progress. Enacting the bill we are introducing today would help bring the United States into compliance with the FATF standard by requiring the States to obtain beneficial ownership information for the corporations formed under their laws. It would help ensure that the United States meets its international anti-money laundering commitments.

Combating the misuse of corporations with hidden owners has increasingly become a global priority. In a letter to President Obama earlier this year, prominent prosecutors and corruption hunters from across the globe urged the United States to collect company beneficial ownership information to fight wrongdoing. According to the letter: ''Grand corruption would not be possible without the help of the global financing system—in particular, banks that accept corrupt assets and secrecy rules that allow money launderers to disguise their activity. . . . We believe that part of the solution is for governments to require existing company registers to collect information on the ultimate owners of companies.''

As I mentioned earlier, countries around the world have begun to take action to tackle the problem. Just last month, during the G8 summit in Northern Ireland, leaders announced their commitment to ending the practice of establishing anonymous shell companies and declared: ''Companies should know who really owns them and tax collectors and law enforcers should be able to obtain this information easily.'' To implement that principle, the G8 leaders pledged to publish national Action Plans outlining the concrete steps each country will take to ensure that law enforcement and tax authorities have ready access to information on who owns and controls the companies formed under their laws.

In announcing the U.S. Action Plan, the White House expressed its commitment to ensuring that law enforcement and tax authorities have access to ownership information for companies formed within U.S. borders. The Plan explicitly calls for enactment of legislation that meets certain principles, all of which are met by the bill introduced today. Those principles are the following:

''Requirements for covered legal entities to disclose beneficial ownership to states or regulated corporate formation agents at the time of company formation.

''Requirements for verification of the identity of the beneficial owner.

''Options for covering legal entities depending on whether the applicant forms the legal entity directly or uses a regulated company formation agent.

''Requirements for law enforcement authorities, including tax authorities, to be able to access beneficial ownership information upon appropriate request through a central registry at the state level.

''An extension of anti-money laundering obligations to company formation agents, including an obligation to identify and verify beneficial ownership information.

''A mandate that entities provide updated information when changes of beneficial ownership occur within 60 days; and

''The imposition of civil and criminal penalties for knowingly providing false information.''

The White House and the international community have made the collection of beneficial ownership information for corporations a global priority this year. It is time for Congress to step up to the plate and take the necessary action.

The bill introduced today is the product of years of work by the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, which I chair. Over twelve years ago, in 2000, the Government Accountability Office, at my request, conducted an investigation and released a report entitled, ''Suspicious Banking

Activities: Possible Money Laundering by U.S. Corporations Formed for Russian Entities.'' That report revealed that one person was able to set up more than 2,000 Delaware shell corporations and, without disclosing the identity of any of the beneficial owners, open U.S. bank accounts for those corporations, which then collectively moved about $1.4 billion through the accounts. It is one of the earliest government reports to give some sense of the law enforcement problems caused by U.S. corporations with hidden owners. The alarm it sounded years ago is still ringing.

In April 2006, in response to a second Subcommittee request, GAO released a report entitled, ''Corporation Formations: Minimal Ownership Information Is Collected and Available,'' which reviewed the corporate formation laws in all 50 States. GAO disclosed that the vast majority of the States do not collect any information at all on the beneficial owners of the corporations and limited liability companies, or LLCs, formed under their laws. The report also found that several States had established automated procedures that allow a person to form a new corporation or LLC in the State within 24 hours of filing an online application without any prior review of that application by State personnel. In exchange for a substantial fee, at least two States will form a corporation or LLC within one hour of a request. After examining these State incorporation practices, the GAO report described the problems that the lack of beneficial ownership information caused for a range of law enforcement investigations.

In November 2006, our Subcommittee held a hearing on the problem. At that hearing, representatives of the U.S. Department of Justice, the Internal Revenue Service, and the Department of Treasury's Financial Crimes Enforcement Network or FinCEN testified that the failure of States to collect adequate information on the beneficial owners of the legal entities they form had impeded federal efforts to investigate and prosecute criminal acts such as terrorism, money laundering, securities fraud, and tax evasion. At the hearing, the Justice Department testified: ''We had allegations of corrupt foreign officials using these [U.S.] shell accounts to launder money, but were unable—due to lack of identifying information in the corporate records—to fully investigate this area.'' The IRS testified: ''Within our own borders, the laws of some states regarding the formation of legal entities have significant transparency gaps which may even rival the secrecy afforded in the most attractive tax havens.'' As part of its testimony, FinCEN described identifying 768 incidents of suspicious international wire transfer activity involving U.S. shell corporations.

The next year, in 2007, in a ''Dirty Dozen'' list of tax scams active that year, the IRS highlighted shell corporations with hidden owners as number four on the list. It wrote:

> 4. Disguised Corporate Ownership: Domestic shell corporations and other entities are being formed and operated in certain states for the purpose of disguising the ownership of the business or financial activity. Once formed, these anonymous entities can be, and are being, used to facilitate underreporting of income, non-filing of tax returns, listed transactions, money laundering, financial crimes and possibly terrorist financing. The IRS is working with state authorities to identify these entities and to bring their owners into compliance.

In 2008, we first introduced our bipartisan legislation to stop the formation of U.S. corporations with hidden owners. It was a Levin-Coleman-Obama bill, S. 2956, back then. When asked about the bill in 2008, then DHS Secretary Michael Chertoff wrote: ''In countless investigations, where the criminal targets utilize shell corporations, the lack of law enforcement's ability to gain access to true beneficial ownership information slows, confuses or impedes the efforts by investigators to follow criminal proceeds.''

In 2009, the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee held two hearings which examined not only the problem, but also possible solutions, including our revised bill, S. 569. At the first hearing entitled, ''Examining State Business Incorporation Practices: A Discussion of the Incorporation Transparency and Law Enforcement Assistance Act,'' held in June 2009, DHS testified that ''shell corporations established in the United States have been utilized to commit crimes against individuals around the world.'' The Manhattan District Attorney's office testified: ''For those of us in law enforcement, these issues with shell corporations are not some abstract idea. This is what we do and deal with every day. We see these shell corporations being used by criminal organizations, and the record is replete with examples of their use for money laundering, for their use in tax evasion, and for their use in securities fraud.''

At the second hearing, ''Business Formation and Financial Crime: Finding a Legislative Solution,'' held in November 2009, the Justice Department again testified about criminals using U.S. shell corporations. It noted that ''each of these examples involves the relatively rare instance in which law enforcement was able to identify the perpetrator misusing U.S. shell corporations. Far too often, we are unable to do so.'' The Treasury Department testified that ''the ability of illicit actors to form corporations in the United States without disclosing their true identity presents a serious vulnerability and there is ample evidence that criminal organizations and others who threaten our national security exploit this vulnerability.''

The 2009 hearings also presented evidence of dozens of Internet websites advertising corporate formation services that highlighted the ability of corporations to be formed in the United States without asking for the identity of the beneficial owners. Those websites explicitly pointed to anonymous ownership as a reason to incorporate within the United States, and often listed certain States alongside notorious offshore jurisdictions as preferred locations in which to form new corporations, essentially providing an open invitation for wrongdoers to form entities within the United States.

One website, for example, set up by an international incorporation firm, advocated setting up corporations in Delaware by saying: ''DELAWARE—An Offshore Tax Haven for Non US Residents.'' It cited as one of Delaware's advantages that: ''Owners' names are not disclosed to the state.'' Another website, from a U.K. firm called ''formacorporation-offshore.com,'' listed the advantages to incorporating in Nevada. Those advantages included: ''Stockholders are not on Public Record allowing complete anonymity.''

During the 2009 hearings, I presented evidence of how one Wyoming outfit was selling so-called shelf corporations—corporations formed and then left ''on the shelf'' for later sale to purchasers who could then pretend the corporations had been in operation for years. A June 2011 Reuters news article wrote a detailed expose of how that same outfit, Wyoming Corporate Services, had formed thousands of U.S. corporations all across the country, all with hidden owners. The article quoted the website as follows: ''A corporation is a legal person created by state statute that can be used as a fall guy, a servant, a good friend or a decoy. A person you control . . . yet cannot be held accountable for its actions. Imagine the possibilities!''

The article described a small house in Cheyenne, Wyoming, which Wyoming Corporate Services used to provide a U.S. address for more than 2,000 corporations that it had helped to form. The article described ''the walls of the main room'' as ''covered floor to ceiling with numbered mailboxes labeled as corporate suites.'' The article reported that among the corporations using the address was a shell corporation controlled by a former Ukranian prime minister who had been convicted of money laundering and extortion; a corporation indicted for helping online-poker operators evade a U.S. ban on Internet gambling; and two corporations barred from U.S. federal contracting for selling counterfeit truck parts to the Pentagon. The article observed that Wyoming Corporate Services continued to sell shelf corporations that existed solely on paper but could show a history of regulatory and tax filings, despite having had no real U.S. operations. That's the type of deceptive conduct going on right now, here in our own backyard, with respect to U.S. corporations with hidden owners.

Despite the evidence of U.S. corporations being misused by organized

crime, terrorists, tax evaders, and other wrongdoers, and despite years of law enforcement complaints, many of our States are reluctant to admit there is a problem in establishing U.S. corporations and LLCs with hidden owners. Too many of our States are eager to explain how quick and easy it is to set up corporations within their borders, without acknowledging that those same quick and easy procedures enable wrongdoers to utilize U.S. corporations in a variety of crimes and tax dodges both here and abroad.

Beginning in 2006, the Subcommittee worked with the States to encourage them to recognize the law enforcement and national security problem they'd created and to come up with their own solution. After the Subcommittee's 2006 hearing on this issue, for example, the National Association of Secretaries of State or NASS convened a 2007 task force to examine state incorporation practices. At the request of NASS and several States, I delayed introducing legislation while they worked on a proposal to require the collection of beneficial ownership information. My Subcommittee staff participated in multiple conferences, telephone calls, and meetings on the issue.

In July 2007, the NASS task force issued a proposal. Rather than cure the problem, however, the proposal had multiple serious deficiencies, leading the Treasury Department to state in a letter that the NASS proposal ''falls short'' and ''does not fully address the problem of legal entities masking the identity of criminals.''

Among other shortcomings, the NASS proposal would not require States to obtain the names of the natural individuals who would be the beneficial owners of a U.S. corporation or LLC. Instead, it would allow States to obtain a list of a corporation's ''owners of record'' who can be, and often are, offshore corporations or trusts with their own hidden owners. The NASS proposal also did not require the States to maintain the beneficial ownership information, or to supply it to law enforcement upon receipt of a subpoena or summons. Instead, law enforcement would have to get the information from the suspect corporation or one of its agents, thereby tipping off the corporation to the investigation. The proposal also failed to require the beneficial ownership information to be updated over time. These and other flaws in the proposal were identified by the Treasury Department, the Department of Justice, and others, but NASS continued on the same course.

NASS enlisted the help of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws or NCCUSL, which produced a proposed model law for States that wanted to adopt the NASS approach. NCCUSL presented its proposal at the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee's June 2009 hearing, where it was subjected to significant criticism. The Manhattan District Attorney's office, for example, testified: ''I say without hesitation or reservation—that from a law enforcement perspective, the bill proposed by NCCUSL would be worse than no bill at all. And there are two very basic reasons for this. It eliminates the ability of law enforcement to get corporate information without alerting the target of the investigation that the investigation is ongoing. That is the primary reason. It also sets up a system that is time-consuming and complicated.''

The Department of Justice testified: ''Senator, I would submit to you that in a criminal organization everyone knows who is in control and this will not be an issue of determining who is in control. What we are concerned about here from the law enforcement perspective are the criminals and the criminal organizations and so what we are asking is that when criminals use shell companies, they provide the name of the beneficial owner. That is the person who is in control, the criminal in control, as opposed to the NCCUSL proposal where they are suggesting that instead two nominees are provided—two nominees between law enforcement and the criminal in control.''

Despite these criticisms, NCCUSL finalized its model law in July 2009, issuing it under the title, ''Uniform Law Enforcement Access to Entity Information Act.'' At the November 2009 hearing, law enforcement again criticized the NCCUSL model for failing to provide the names of the true owners of the corporations being formed. The Justice Department testified: ''To allow companies to provide anything less than the beneficial owner information merely provides criminals with an opportunity to evade responsibility and put nominees between themselves and the true perpetrator.'' With regard to NCCUSL's proposal, Treasury testified: ''[T]here is not an obligation for that live person to not be a nominee. And what I think is important in the legislation is that we get at the true beneficial owner and not someone who may be a nominee.''

In addition to its flaws, the NCCUSL model law has proven unpopular with the States for whom it was written. Despite the effort and fanfare attached to the uniform model, after four years of sitting on the books, not a single State has adopted it or given any indication of doing so.

It is deeply disappointing that the States, despite the passage of many years, have been unable to devise an effective proposal to stop the formation of corporations with hidden owners. One key difficulty is that the States are competing against each other to attract persons who want to set up U.S. corporations. That competition creates pressure for each individual State to favor procedures that allow quick and easy incorporations, with no questions asked. It's a classic case of competition causing a race to the bottom, making it difficult for any one State to do the right thing and ask for the identity of the persons behind the corporations being formed.

That is why Federal legislation in this area is critical. Federal legislation is needed to level the playing field among the States, set minimum standards for obtaining beneficial ownership information, put an end to the practice of States forming millions of legal entities each year without knowing who is behind them, and bring the United States into compliance with its international commitments.

The bill's provisions would require the States to ask incorporation applicants for a list of the beneficial owners of each corporation or LLC formed under their laws, to maintain this information for a period of years after a corporation is terminated, and to provide the information to law enforcement upon receipt of a subpoena or summons. The bill would also require corporations and LLCs to update their beneficial ownership information on a regular basis. The ownership information would be kept by the State or, if a State maintains a formation agent licensing system and delegates this task, by a State's licensed formation agents.

The particular information that would have to be provided for each beneficial owner is the owner's name, address, and a unique identifying number from a State driver's license or a U.S. passport. The bill would not require States to verify this information, but penalties would apply to persons who submit false information.

In the case of U.S. corporations formed by individuals who do not possess a driver's license or passport from the United States, the bill would permit them to submit their names, addresses, and identifying information from a non-U.S. passport to a formation agent residing within the State. They would have to include a copy of a passport photograph. The incorporation application would have to include a written certification that the formation agent had obtained the information and verified the identity of the non-U.S. corporate owners. The formation agent would have to retain the information in the State for a specified period of time and produce it upon receipt of a subpoena or summons from law enforcement.

To ensure that its provisions are tightly targeted, the bill would exempt a wide range of corporations from the disclosure obligation. It would exempt, for example, virtually all highly regulated corporations, because we already know who owns them. That includes all publicly-traded corporations, banks, broker-dealers, commodity brokers, registered investment funds, registered accounting firms, insurers, and utilities. The bill would also exempt corporations with a substantial U.S. presence, including at least 20 employees physically located in the United States, since those individuals could provide law enforcement with the leads needed to trace a corporation's true

owners. In addition, the bill would exempt businesses set up by governments, churches, charities, and nonprofit corporations, since disclosure of their beneficial ownership information would not advance the public interest or assist law enforcement. These exemptions dramatically reduce the number of corporations who would actually have to file beneficial ownership information on state incorporation forms in order to ensure that the bill's disclosure obligations focus only on owners whose identities are currently hidden.

The bill does not take a position on the issue of whether the States should make beneficial ownership information available to the public. Instead, the bill leaves it entirely up to the States to decide whether, under what circumstances, and to what extent to make beneficial ownership information available to the public. The bill explicitly permits the States to place restrictions on providing beneficial ownership information to persons other than government officials. The bill focuses instead on ensuring that law enforcement with a subpoena or summons is given ready access to the beneficial ownership information.

Relative to the costs of compliance, the bill provides States with access to two separate funding sources, neither of which involves appropriated funds. For the first three years after the bill's enactment, the bill requires both the Justice and Treasury Departments to make funds available from their individual forfeiture programs to States incurring reasonable expenses to comply with the Act. These forfeiture funds do not contain taxpayer dollars; instead they contain the proceeds of forfeiture actions taken against persons involved in money laundering, drug trafficking, or other wrongdoing. The bill would direct a total of $40 million over 3 years to be provided to the States from the two funds to carry out the Act. These provisions would ensure that States have adequate funds for the modest compliance costs involved with adding a new question to their incorporation forms requesting the names of the covered corporations' beneficial owners.

The compliance costs would be modest, because the bill does not require any State to change its laws, set up new forms, create new databases of information, or verify the information provided. To the contrary, the only steps that a State would need to take would be to add one question to its existing incorporation form asking for the corporation's beneficial owners, keep that incorporation application on file which all States do already, and make the ownership information available to law enforcement upon receipt of a subpoena or summons.

It is common for bills establishing minimum Federal standards to seek to ensure State action by making some Federal funding dependent upon a State's meeting the specified standards. Our bill, however, states explicitly that nothing in its provisions authorizes the withholding of federal funds from a State for failing to modify its incorporation practices to meet the beneficial ownership information requirements of the act. Instead, the bill calls for a GAO report within 5 years of enactment to identify any States that had failed to strengthen their incorporation practices as required by the act. After getting this status report, a future Congress can decide what steps to take in the event there are any noncompliant States.

The bill also contains a provision that would require corporations bidding on federal contracts to provide the same beneficial ownership information to the federal government as provided to the relevant State. The Subcommittee has become aware of instances in which the federal government has found itself doing business with U.S. corporations whose owners are hidden, including owners under investigation for suspect conduct. It is important that when the federal government contracts to do business with someone, it knows who it is dealing with.

Finally, the bill would require the Treasury Department to issue a rule requiring U.S. formation agents to establish anti-money laundering programs to ensure they are not forming U.S. corporations or LLCs for wrongdoers. The bill requires the programs to be risk based so that formation agents can target their preventative efforts toward persons who pose a high risk of being involved with wrongdoing. GAO would also be asked to conduct a study of existing State formation procedures for partnerships, trusts, and charitable organizations to see if additional ownership disclosure requirements are warranted.

We have worked with the Departments of Justice, Treasury, and Homeland Security to craft a bill that would address, in a fair and reasonable way, the significant law enforcement problems created by States allowing the formation of millions of U.S. corporations and LLCs with hidden owners. When those corporations commit crimes, they affect not only interstate commerce with U.S. victims, but also our relationships with other countries whose citizens may become victims of U.S. corporate wrongdoing. What the bill comes down to is a simple requirement that States strengthen their incorporation applications to add a single question requesting identifying information for the true owners of the corporations they form. That is not too much to ask to protect this country and the international community from wrongdoers misusing U.S. corporations.

For those who say that, if the United States tightens its incorporation rules, new corporations will be formed elsewhere, it is appropriate to ask exactly where they will go. A recent report found that virtually every other country is already tougher than the United States in terms of demanding and verifying beneficial ownership information. Most offshore tax havens, for example, already require this information to be collected, including the Bahamas, Cayman Islands, and the Channel Islands. Countries around the world already request beneficial ownership information, in part because of their commitment to FATF's international anti-money laundering standards. Our 50 States should be meeting the same standards, but there is no indication that they will, unless required to do so.

I wish Federal legislation weren't necessary. I wish the States could solve this law enforcement problem on their own, but ongoing competitive pressures make it unlikely that the States will do the right thing. It's been nearly seven years since our 2006 hearing on this issue and more than four years since the States came up with a model law on the subject, with no progress to speak of, despite repeated pleas from law enforcement.

Federal legislation is necessary to reduce the vulnerability of the United States to wrongdoing by U.S. corporations with hidden owners, to protect interstate and international commerce from criminals misusing U.S. corporations, to strengthen the ability of law enforcement to investigate suspect U.S. corporations, to level the playing field among the States, and to bring the United States into compliance with its international anti-money laundering obligations.

There is also an issue of consistency. For years, I have been fighting offshore corporate secrecy laws and practices that enable wrongdoers to secretly control offshore corporations involved in money laundering, tax evasion, and other misconduct. I have pointed out on more than one occasion that corporations were not created to hide ownership, but to protect owners from personal liability for corporate acts. Unfortunately, today, the corporate form has too often been corrupted into serving those who wish to conceal their identities. It is past time to stop this misuse of the corporate form. But if we want to stop inappropriate corporate secrecy offshore, we need to stop it here at home as well.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this legislation and putting an end to incorporation practices that promote corporate secrecy and render the United States and other countries vulnerable to abuse by U.S. corporations with hidden owners.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

SUMMARY OF INCORPORATION TRANSPARENCY AND LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ACT

To protect the United States from U.S. corporations being misused to support terrorism, money laundering, tax evasion, and other misconduct, the Levin-Grassley-Feinstein-Harkin Incorporation Transparency and Law Enforcement Assistance Act would:

Beneficial Ownership Information. Require the States directly or through licensed formation agents to obtain the names of beneficial owners of the corporations or limited liability companies (LLCs) formed under State law, ensure this information is updated, and provide the information to law enforcement upon receipt of a subpoena or summons.

Shelf Corporations. Require formation agents who sell ''shelf corporations''—corporations formed for later sale to third parties—to identify the beneficial owners who buy them.

Federal Contractors. Require corporations or LLCs bidding on federal contracts to provide beneficial ownership information to the federal government.

Identifying Information. Require the provision of beneficial owners' names, addresses, and a U.S. drivers license or passport number, or information from a non-U.S. passport.

Penalties for False Information. Establish penalties for persons who knowingly provide false information, or willfully fail to provide required information, on beneficial ownership.

Exemptions. Exempt from the disclosure obligation regulated corporations, including publicly traded companies, banks, broker-dealers, insurers, and accounting firms; corporations with a substantial U.S. presence; and corporations whose beneficial ownership information would not benefit the public interest or assist law enforcement.

Funding. Provide $40 million over three years to States from existing Justice and Treasury Department forfeiture funds to pay for the costs of complying with the Act.

State Compliance Report. Specify that funds may not be withheld from any State for failure to comply with the Act, but also require a GAO report in five years identifying any States not in compliance so a future Congress can determine if additional steps are needed.

Transition Period. Give the States two years to begin requiring existing corporations and LLCs to provide beneficial ownership information.

Anti-Money Laundering Safeguards. Require paid formation agents to establish anti-money laundering programs to guard against supplying U.S. corporations or LLCs to wrongdoers. Attorneys using paid formation agents would be exempt from this requirement.

GAO Study. Require GAO to complete a study of existing beneficial ownership information requirements for partnerships, charities, and trusts.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1470. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act with respect to the guidelines for specification of certain disposal sites for dredged or fill material; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, today, my colleague Senator MARK WARNER and I are introducing the Commonsense Permitting for Job Creation Act of 2013, a bipartisan, bicameral piece of legislation to address an aspect of water permitting law that has touched several economic development projects.

In my home State of Virginia, there is a county that has been working on securing a permit for the proposed site of a business center, where one or multiple firms could establish job-creating manufacturing plants. This area—Henry County, on the North Carolina border, has seen profound economic challenges in recent years. The county's 5-year average unemployment rate is 11 percent. In the county's largest city, Martinsville, the 5-year average unemployment rate is over 17 percent. This part of Virginia would benefit greatly from the jobs this site could bring.

Henry County has worked with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers on site preparation. However, the Corps has been reluctant to issue the permit because no company has yet committed to the site and prepared detailed blueprints. The problem is that a company will not relocate to the site without an approved permit, but a permit cannot be approved without a company willing to relocate.

Henry County, the Martinsville-Henry Co. Economic Development Corp., and the Commonwealth of Virginia have together devoted more than $16 million to this project. They have worked in good faith, at great cost in money and personnel hours, to promote economic development in line with environmental protection and all requirements of the law. Yet due to this regulatory ambiguity, this process is unable to move forward.

Our legislation clarifies that ambiguity. It specifies that the lack of a committed end-user shall not be a reason to deny a Corps permit that meets all other legal requirements. I believe this bill will allow the site in Henry County, and similar sites elsewhere, to move forward, while maintaining all environmental protections.

Senator WARNER and I have introduced this legislation in partnership with our friends and Virginia colleagues in the House, U.S. Representatives ROBERT HURT and MORGAN GRIFFITH. We believe this will expedite the approval of important economic development projects, and we are proud to be able to work across the aisle and with state and local officials on this commonsense, bipartisan solution.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1476. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the denial of deduction for certain excessive employee remuneration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I am introducing, along with Senator BLUMENTHAL, the Stop Subsidizing Multimillion Dollar Corporate Bonuses Act. This bill closes a loophole that allows publicly traded corporations to deduct an executive's pay over $1 million from their tax bill.

Under current tax law, when a public corporation calculates its taxable income, generally it is permitted to deduct the cost of compensation from its revenues, with limits up to $1 million for some of the firm's most senior executives. However, a loophole has allowed many public corporations to avoid such limits and freely deduct excessive executive compensation. For example, because of this loophole, if a CEO receives $15 million in compensation in a given year, that amount can cause the corporation's taxable income to decline by $15 million. With the current corporate tax rate at 35 percent, the corporation in this case would pay less tax to the U.S. Treasury, up to 35 percent of $15 million, leaving the corporation's shareholders to bear only $9.75 million of the $15 million cost of executive pay, while U.S. taxpayers foot the remaining $5.25 million.

The Stop Subsidizing Multimillion Dollar Corporate Bonuses Act would allow a public corporation to deduct compensation up to only $1 million. Using the same example, this would mean that corporate shareholders would bear $14.65 million of the $15 million in compensation.

Over a ten-year window, the Joint Committee on Taxation has estimated this legislation would close a loophole that costs U.S. taxpayers over $50 billion by making some simple changes to existing law.

First, our legislation extends section 162(m) of the tax code to all employees of publicly traded corporations so that all compensation is subject to a deductibility cap of $1 million. Publicly traded corporations would still be permitted to pay their executives as much as they want, but compensation above and beyond $1 million would no longer be bankrolled, in part, through our tax code.

Second, our bill removes the exemption for performance-based compensation, which currently permits compensation deductions above and beyond $1 million when executives have met performance benchmarks set by the corporation's Board of Directors. As a result, publicly traded corporations would still be able to incentivize their executives, but all such incentives would be subject to a corporate deductibility cap of $1 million.

Finally, our legislation makes a technical correction to ensure that all publicly traded corporations that are required to provide quarterly and annual reports to their investors under Securities and Exchange Commission rules and regulations are subject to section 162(m). Currently, this section of the tax code only covers some publicly traded corporations who are required to provide these periodic reports to their shareholders. Discouraging unrestrained compensation packages shouldn't hinge on whether a publicly traded corporation falls into one SEC reporting requirement or another, and my bill closes this technical loophole.

With this legislation, we aim to put an end to some of the extravagant tax breaks that exclusively benefit public corporations. This is simply a matter of fairness at a time of fiscal belt tightening, when so many of our constituents have already sacrificed.

I want to thank Senator BLUMENTHAL and his staff for working with me on this issue, and I urge our colleagues to

join us by cosponsoring this legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 212—COMMENDING DAVID J. SCHIAPPA

Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. REID of Nevada, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CHIESA, Mr. COATS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 212

Whereas, David Schiappa has loyally served the Senate for 29 years, his entire professional career, starting in the Senate in December 1984;

Whereas, David Schiappa grew up in Maryland and graduated from DeMatha Catholic High School, the University of Maryland, and Johns Hopkins University;

Whereas, David Schiappa rose through all the positions in the Republican Cloakroom finally serving as either Secretary for the Majority or Secretary for the Minority for the last three Republican Leaders;

Whereas, David Schiappa has at all times discharged the duties of his office with great dedication, diligence, and sense of service, thus earning the respect of Republican and Democratic Senators alike, as well as their staffs; and

Whereas, his good humor, storytelling ability, and easy-going manner have made him an invaluable member of the Senate family. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate expresses its appreciation to David Schiappa and his family and commends him for his outstanding and faithful service to the Senate.

The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to David J. Schiappa.

SENATE RESOLUTION 213—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE FREE AND PEACEFUL EXERCISE OF REPRESENTATIVE DEMOCRACY IN VENEZUELA AND CONDEMNING VIOLENCE AND INTIMIDATION AGAINST THE COUNTRY'S POLITICAL OPPOSITION

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. NELSON, Mr. KAINE, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. KIRK) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 213

Whereas the National Electoral Council (CNE) of Venezuela declared Nicolás Maduro to be the winner of Venezuela's April 14, 2013, presidential election, after crediting him with receiving 50.6 percent of votes cast;

Whereas Venezuela's political opposition has highlighted widespread incidents of potential electoral irregularities, voter intimidation, and other abuses perpetrated by the Government of Venezuela in favor of the candidacy of Nicolás Maduro;

Whereas the Organization of American States and other multilateral institutions called for a full recount and audit that addresses all claims by participants in the electoral process in Venezuela;

Whereas the Senate of the Republic of Chile, the Christian Democratic Organization of the Americas, the Socialist International, the Union of Latin American parties, and other political organizations in the region have issued declarations recognizing the alleged irregularities documented by the opposition in Venezuela and urged a complete audit of the election results;

Whereas the CNE has denied the political opposition's request for a full and comprehensive audit of the election results that includes the review and comparison of voter registry log books, vote tallies produced by electronic voting machines, and the paper receipts printed by electronic voting machines;

Whereas the Preamble of the Charter of the Organization of American States affirms that ''representative democracy is an indispensable condition for the stability, peace and development of the region,'' and Article 1 of the Inter-American Democratic Charter recognizes that ''the people of the Americas have a right to democracy and their governments have an obligation to promote and defend it'';

Whereas the republican form of government prescribed in the Constitution of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela has its legislative branch in the National Assembly, where the free participation and deliberation of its democratically elected representatives is essential to legislate and check the powers of the executive branch;

Whereas the President of the National Assembly denied opposition parties the right to speak in the legislature from April 16 to May 21, 2013, and removed them from key committees in response to their refusal to recognize Nicolás Maduro as president;

Whereas members of the ruling United Socialist Party of Venezuela (PSUV) violently assaulted opposition legislators on April 16 and April 30, 2013, in the National Assembly, causing lacerations, broken bones, and other injuries to members of the political opposition;

Whereas the Department of State responded to the violence against opposition legislators in Venezuela by declaring that ''violence has no place in a representative and democratic system, and is particularly inappropriate in the National Assembly'';

Whereas the Secretary General of the Organization of American States (OAS) has repudiated the incident by stating that it ''reflects, in a dramatic manner, the absence of a political dialogue that can bring tranquility to the citizens and to the members of the different public powers to resolve in a peaceful climate and with everybody's participation the pending matters of the country'';

Whereas the Congress of the Republic of Peru passed a resolution rejecting the use of violence against opposition parties in the Venezuelan National Assembly and expressing solidarity with those injured by the events of April 2013; and

Whereas, as a member of the Organization of American States and signatory to the Inter-American Democratic Charter, the Bolivarian Government of Venezuela has agreed to abide by the principles of constitutional, representative democracy, which include free and fair elections and adherence to its own constitution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the people of Venezuela in their pursuit of the free exercise of representative democracy in Venezuela;

(2) calls for greater dialogue between all political actors in Venezuela and strongly deplores the undemocratic denial of legitimate parliamentary rights to members of opposition parties in the National Assembly and the inexcusable violence perpetrated against opposition legislators inside the legislative chambers of Venezuela;

(3) commends legislators from other nations in the Americas who have declared their opposition to political irregularities and the use of violence against opposition parliamentarians in Venezuela;

(4) urges the Organization of American States to issue a detailed report on any and all irregularities resulting from the April 14, 2013, presidential election in Venezuela;

(5) urges the United States Ambassador to the Organization of American States to work in concert with other member states to use the full power of the organization in support of meaningful steps to ensure full parliamentary democracy and the rule of law in Venezuela in accordance with the Inter-American Democratic Charter, including invoking articles related to unconstitutional interruptions of the democratic order in a member state; and

(6) urges the United States Ambassador to the Organization of American States to work in concert with other member states to strengthen the ability of the Organization to protect democratic institutions and to respond to the erosion of democracy in member states.

SENATE RESOLUTION 214—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF OCTOBER 13, 2013, THROUGH OCTOBER 19, 2013, AS ''NATIONAL CASE MANAGEMENT WEEK'' TO RECOGNIZE THE VALUE OF CASE MANAGEMENT IN IMPROVING HEALTHCARE OUTCOMES FOR PATIENTS

Mr. PRYOR (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 214

Whereas case management is a collaborative process of assessment, education, planning, facilitation, care coordination, evaluation, and advocacy;

Whereas the goal of case management is to meet the health needs of the patient and the

family of the patient, while respecting and assuring the right of the patient to self determination, through communication and available resources in order to promote quality, cost-effective outcomes;

Whereas case managers are advocates who help patients understand their current health status and ways to improve their health, and in this way serve as catalysts who guide patients and provide cohesion with other professionals in the healthcare delivery team;

Whereas case managers are an important link to quality healthcare;

Whereas the American Case Management Association and the Case Management Society of America work diligently to bring awareness to the broad range of services case managers offer and to educate providers, payers, and regulators on the improved patient outcomes that case management services can provide;

Whereas, through National Case Management Week, the American Case Management Association and the Case Management Society of America hope to continue to educate providers, payers, regulators, and consumers about the value case managers bring to the successful delivery of healthcare;

Whereas the American Case Management Association and the Case Management Society of America will celebrate National Case Management Week during the week of October 13, 2013, through October 19, 2013, in order to recognize case managers as an essential link to quality healthcare; and

Whereas it is appropriate at that time to recognize the many achievements of case managers in improving healthcare outcomes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of October 13, 2013, through October 19, 2013, as ''National Case Management Week'';

(2) recognizes the value of case management in providing successful and cost-effective healthcare; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe National Case Management Week and learn about the field of case management.

SENATE RESOLUTION 215—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD NOT BAIL OUT ANY STATE

Mr. KIRK (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. COATS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. SHELBY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

S. RES. 215

Whereas every State in the United States is a sovereign entity with a constitution and the authority to issue sovereign debt;

Whereas the legislature of every State in the United States has the authority to reduce spending or raise taxes to pay the obligations owed by the State;

Whereas officials in every State in the United States have the legal obligation to fully disclose the financial condition of the State to investors who purchase the debt of the State;

Whereas Congress has rejected prior requests from creditors of a State for payment of the defaulted debt of a State; and

Whereas, during the financial crisis in 1842, the Senate requested that the Secretary of the Treasury report any negotiations with creditors of a State to assume or guaranty any debt of a State, to ensure that promises of Federal Government support were not proffered: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the Federal Government should take no action to redeem, assume, or guarantee any debt of a State; and

(2) the Secretary of the Treasury should report to Congress any negotiations to engage in actions that would result in an outlay of Federal funds on behalf of creditors of a State.

SENATE RESOLUTION 216—ELECTING LAURA C. DOVE, OF VIRGINIA, AS SECRETARY FOR THE MINORITY OF THE SENATE

Mr. MCCONNELL submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 216

Resolved, That Laura C. Dove of Virginia be, and she is hereby, elected Secretary for the Minority of the Senate, effective Friday, August 2, 2013.

SENATE RESOLUTION 217—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR DESIGNATION OF OCTOBER 6, 2013, THROUGH OCTOBER 10, 2013, AS ''AMERICAN COLLEGE OF SURGEONS DAYS'' AND RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE ORGANIZATION

Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. DURBIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to.:

S. RES. 217

Whereas the American College of Surgeons is the largest surgical organization in the world and remains steadfast in its mission to improve the care of the surgical patient and to safeguard standards of care in an optimal and ethical practice environment;

Whereas the American College of Surgeons continues its work into the 21st century to sustain and develop relevant programs that are inspired by quality;

Whereas the 100th anniversary celebrations serve as a testament that the American College of Surgeons is fulfilling its mission of engaging surgeons as leaders and educators, and developing initiatives that improve surgery and the quality of care for surgical patients;

Whereas the 2013 American College of Surgeons Clinical Congress is the most prestigious international surgical conference, bringing together thousands of Fellows of the College and other health care professionals who each year rely on the Clinical Congress to learn about the latest surgical advances, practice management methods, and health policy issues; and

Whereas October 6, 2013, through October 10, 2013, would be appropriate dates to designate as ''American College of Surgeons Days'' to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the founding of the American College of Surgeons, the achievements of which continue to significantly influence the course of surgery in the United States and around the world, and which was established as an advocate for all surgical patients: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of ''American College of Surgeons Days'';

(2) recognizes the 100th anniversary of the founding of the American College of Surgeons; and

(3) recognizes the many important contributions of the American College of Surgeons to the welfare of surgical patients and the health care system of the United States.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 22—PROVIDING FOR A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE SENATE AND AN ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. REID of Nevada submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 22

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Thursday, August 1, 2013, through Sunday, August 11, 2013, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until 12:00 noon on Monday, August 12, 2013, or such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns on Monday, August 12, 2013, it stand adjourned until 12:00 noon on Monday, September 9, 2013, or such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House adjourns on any legislative day from Friday, August 2, 2013, through Friday, September 6, 2013, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Monday, September 9, 2013, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the Senate and House, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate if, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 23—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE SHOULD ISSUE A COMMEMORATIVE POSTAGE STAMP HONORING THE REVEREND DOCTOR LEON SULLIVAN AND THAT THE CITIZENS' STAMP ADVISORY COMMITTEE SHOULD RECOMMEND TO THE POSTMASTER GENERAL THAT SUCH A STAMP BE ISSUED

Mr. CASEY submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.:

S. CON. RES. 23

Whereas the Reverend Doctor Leon Sullivan impacted millions of people throughout the world, particularly throughout the United States and in Africa, by advocating self-help principles of empowerment, community development, and self-reliance;

Whereas the Reverend Dr. Sullivan founded the Opportunities Industrialization Centers

(commonly referred to as the ''OIC''), a skills training program providing training and retraining on a massive scale;

Whereas the Reverend Dr. Sullivan founded Opportunities Industrialization Centers International (commonly referred to as ''OICI'') and the International Foundation for Education and Self-Help (commonly referred to as ''IFESH'');

Whereas the Reverend Dr. Sullivan made a substantial impact on the lives of the people in Africa through the actions of OICI and IFESH;

Whereas the Reverend Dr. Sullivan founded the Progress Investment Associates (commonly referred to as the ''PIA'') and the Zion Nonprofit Charitable Trust (commonly referred to as the ''ZNCT''), which was established to fund housing, shopping, human services, educational, and other nonprofit ventures for inner-city dwellers;

Whereas the Reverend Dr. Sullivan established inner-city retirement and assisted living complexes for the elderly and disabled in Philadelphia and other cities throughout the United States, named Opportunities Towers;

Whereas the Reverend Dr. Sullivan was able, as the first African-American member on the board of General Motors Corporation, to secure the support of the other board members to back him in the development of the unprecedented Global Sullivan Principles, a code of conduct written in 1977, for United States businesses operating in South Africa;

Whereas the Reverend Dr. Sullivan has been the recipient of the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the Notre Dame Award, the Eleanor Roosevelt Human Rights Award, the NAACP Spingarn Award, the Kappa Alpha Psi Laurel Wreath, and more than 50 doctoral degrees;

Whereas the Reverend Dr. Sullivan economically empowered individuals and combated poverty wherever he implemented programs;

Whereas the Reverend Dr. Sullivan established the African-African American summits to bring together the leaders of African countries, the United States, and other countries; and

Whereas the Reverend Dr. Sullivan established the Global Sullivan Principles (for Corporate Social Responsibility) in the late 1990s to apply the same type of principles for countries and businesses throughout the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States Postal Service should issue a commemorative postage stamp honoring the Reverend Doctor Leon Sullivan; and

(2) the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee should recommend to the Postmaster General that such a stamp be issued.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1840. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1841. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1842. Mr. COONS (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. REED) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1843. Mr. WICKER 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 1844. Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1845. Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1846. Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1847. Mr. BENNET (for himself and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1848. Mr. REID (for Mr. PRYOR (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. COBURN)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1344, to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to provide expedited air passenger screening to severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1840. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. USE OF ENERGY AND WATER EFFICIENCY MEASURES IN FEDERAL BUILDINGS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Private sector funding and expertise can help address the energy efficiency challenges facing the United States.

(2) The Federal Government spends more than $6 billion annually in energy costs.

(3) Reducing Federal energy costs can help save money, create jobs, and reduce waste.

(4) Energy savings performance contracts and utility energy savings contracts are tools for utilizing private sector investment to upgrade Federal facilities without any upfront cost to the taxpayer.

(5) Performance contracting is a way to retrofit Federal buildings using private sector investment in the absence of appropriated dollars. Retrofits seek to reduce energy use, improve infrastructure, protect national security, and cut facility operations and maintenance costs.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION OF IDENTIFIED ENERGY AND WATER EFFICIENCY MEASURES.—Section 543(f)(4) of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8253(f)(4)) is amended to read as follows:

''(4) IMPLEMENTATION OF IDENTIFIED ENERGY AND WATER EFFICIENCY MEASURES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the completion of each evaluation under paragraph (3), each energy manager shall consider—

''(i) implementing any energy- or water-saving or conservation measure that the Federal agency identified in the evaluation conducted under paragraph (3) that is life cycle cost-effective; and

''(ii) bundling individual measures of varying paybacks together into combined projects.

''(B) MEASURES NOT IMPLEMENTED.—The energy manager, as part of the certification system under paragraph (7) and using guidelines developed by the Secretary, shall provide reasons for not implementing any life cycle cost-effective measures under subparagraph (A).''.

(c) ANNUAL CONTRACTING GOAL.—Section 543(f)(10)(C) of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8253(f)(10)(C)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Each Federal agency'' and inserting the following:

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Each Federal agency''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new clauses:

''(ii) TRACKING.—Each Federal agency shall use the benchmarking systems selected or developed for the agency under paragraph (8) to track energy savings realized by the agency through the implementation of energy- or water-saving or conservation measures pursuant to paragraph (4), and shall submit information regarding such savings to the Secretary to be published on a public website of the Department of Energy.

''(iii) CONSIDERATION.—Each Federal agency shall consider using energy savings performance contracts or utility energy service contracts to implement energy- or water-saving or conservation measures pursuant to paragraph (4).

''(iv) CONTRACTING GOAL.—It shall be the goal of the Federal Government, in the implementation of energy- or water-saving or conservation measures pursuant to paragraph (4), to enter into energy savings performance contracts or utility energy service contracts equal to $1,000,000,000 in each year during the 5-year period beginning on January 1, 2014.

''(v) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than September 30 of each year during the 5-year period referred to in clause (iv), each Federal agency shall submit to the Secretary information regarding progress made by the agency towards achieving the goal described in such clause. Not later than 60 days after each such September 30, the Secretary, acting through the Federal Energy Management Program, shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report describing the progress made by the Federal Government towards achieving such goal.''.

SA 1841. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 401, insert the following:

SEC. ___. EXTENSION OF PUBLICLY TRADED PARTNERSHIP OWNERSHIP STRUCTURE TO ENERGY POWER GENERATION PROJECTS, TRANSPORTATION FUELS, AND RELATED ENERGY ACTIVITIES.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Master Limited Partnerships Parity Act''.

(b) GENERAL RULE.—Subparagraph (E) of section 7704(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''income and gains derived from the exploration'' and inserting ''income and gains derived from the following:

''(i) MINERALS, NATURAL RESOURCES, ETC.—The exploration'',

(2) by inserting ''or'' before ''industrial source'',

(3) by inserting a period after ''carbon dioxide'', and

(4) by striking '', or the transportation or storage'' and all that follows and inserting the following:

''(ii) RENEWABLE ENERGY.—The generation of electric power exclusively utilizing any resource described in section 45(c)(1) or energy property described in section 48 (determined without regard to any termination date), or in the case of a facility described in paragraph (3) or (7) of section 45(d) (determined without regard to any placed in service date or date by which construction of the facility is required to begin), the accepting or processing of such resource.

''(iii) ELECTRICITY STORAGE DEVICES.—The receipt and sale of electric power that has been stored in a device directly connected to the grid.

''(iv) COMBINED HEAT AND POWER.—The generation, storage, or distribution of thermal energy exclusively utilizing property described in section 48(c)(3) (determined without regard to subparagraphs (B) and (D) thereof and without regard to any placed in service date).

''(v) RENEWABLE THERMAL ENERGY.—The generation, storage, or distribution of thermal energy exclusively using any resource described in section 45(c)(1) or energy property described in clause (i) or (iii) of section 48(a)(3)(A).

''(vi) WASTE HEAT TO POWER.—The use of recoverable waste energy, as defined in section 371(5) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6341(5)) (as in effect on the date of the enactment of the Master Limited Partnerships Parity Act).

''(vii) RENEWABLE FUEL INFRASTRUCTURE.—The storage or transportation of any fuel described in subsection (b), (c), (d), or (e) of section 6426.

''(viii) RENEWABLE FUELS.—The production, storage, or transportation of any renewable fuel described in section 211(o)(1)(J) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(1)(J)) (as in effect on the date of the enactment of the Master Limited Partnerships Parity Act) or section 40A(d)(1).

''(ix) RENEWABLE CHEMICALS.—The production, storage, or transportation of any renewable chemical (as defined in paragraph (6)).

''(x) ENERGY EFFICIENT BUILDINGS.—The audit and installation through contract or other agreement of any energy efficient building property described in section 179D(c)(1).

''(xi) GASIFICATION WITH SEQUESTRATION.—The production of any product from a project that meets the requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 48B(c)(1) and that separates and sequesters in secure geological storage (as determined under section 45Q(d)(2)) at least 75 percent of such project's total qualified carbon dioxide (as defined in section 45Q(b)).

''(xii) CARBON CAPTURE AND SEQUESTRATION.—The generation or storage of electric power produced from any facility which is a qualified facility described in section 45Q(c) and which disposes of any captured qualified carbon dioxide (as defined in section 45Q(b)) in secure geological storage (as determined under section 45Q(d)(2)).''.

(c) RENEWABLE CHEMICAL.—Section 7704(d) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) RENEWABLE CHEMICAL.—The term 'renewable chemical' means a monomer, polymer, plastic, formulated product, or chemical substance produced from renewable biomass (as defined in section 9001(12) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8101(12)), as in effect on the date of the enactment of the Master Limited Partnerships Parity Act).''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, in taxable years ending after such date.

SA 1842. Mr. COONS (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. REED) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

Subtitle B—Weatherization Enhancement and Local Energy Efficiency Investment and Accountability

SEC. 411. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the State energy program established under part D of title III of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6321 et seq.) (referred to in this section as ''SEP'') and the Weatherization Assistance Program for Low-Income Persons established under part A of title IV of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6861 et seq.) (referred to in this section as ''WAP'') have proven to be beneficial, long-term partnerships among Federal, State, and local partners;

(2) the SEP and the WAP have been reauthorized on a bipartisan basis over many years to address changing national, regional, and State circumstances and needs, especially through—

(A) the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.);

(B) the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6801 et seq.);

(C) the State Energy Efficiency Programs Improvement Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–440; 104 Stat. 1006);

(D) the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13201 et seq.);

(E) the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15801 et seq.); and

(F) the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17001 et seq.);

(3) the SEP, also known as the ''State energy conservation program''—

(A) was first created in 1975 to implement a State-based, national program in support of energy efficiency, renewable energy, economic development, energy emergency preparedness, and energy policy; and

(B) has come to operate in every sector of the economy in support of the private sector to improve productivity and has dramatically reduced the cost of government through energy savings at the State and local levels;

(4) Federal laboratory studies have concluded that, for every Federal dollar invested through the SEP, more than $7 is saved in energy costs and almost $11 in non-Federal funds is leveraged;

(5) the WAP—

(A) was first created in 1976 to assist low-income families in response to the first oil embargo;

(B) has become the largest residential energy conservation program in the United States, with more than 7,100,000 homes weatherized since the WAP was created;

(C) saves an estimated 35 percent of consumption in the typical weatherized home, yielding average annual savings of $437 per year in home energy costs;

(D) has created thousands of jobs in both the construction sector and in the supply chain of materials suppliers, vendors, and manufacturers who supply the WAP;

(E) returns $2.51 in energy savings for every Federal dollar spent in energy and nonenergy benefits over the life of weatherized homes;

(F) serves as a foundation for residential energy efficiency retrofit standards, technical skills, and workforce training for the emerging broader market and reduces residential and power plant emissions of carbon dioxide by 2.65 metric tons each year per home; and

(G) has decreased national energy consumption by the equivalent of 24,100,000 barrels of oil annually;

(6) the WAP can be enhanced with the addition of a targeted portion of the Federal funds through an innovative program that supports projects performed by qualified nonprofit organizations that have a demonstrated capacity to build, renovate, repair, or improve the energy efficiency of a significant number of low-income homes, building on the success of the existing program without replacing the existing WAP network or creating a separate delivery mechanism for basic WAP services;

(7) the WAP has increased energy efficiency opportunities by promoting new, competitive public-private sector models of retrofitting low-income homes through new Federal partnerships;

(8) improved monitoring and reporting of the work product of the WAP has yielded benefits, and expanding independent verification of efficiency work will support the long-term goals of the WAP;

(9) reports of the Government Accountability Office in 2011, Inspector General's of the Department of Energy, and State auditors have identified State-level deficiencies in monitoring efforts that can be addressed in a manner that will ensure that WAP funds are used more effectively;

(10) through the history of the WAP, the WAP has evolved with improvements in efficiency technology, including, in the 1990s, many States adopting advanced home energy audits, which has led to great returns on investment; and

(11) as the home energy efficiency industry has become more performance-based, the WAP should continue to use those advances in technology and the professional workforce.

PART I—WEATHERIZATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

SEC. 421. REAUTHORIZATION OF WEATHERIZATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 422 of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6872) is amended by striking ''appropriated—'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''appropriated $450,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 422. GRANTS FOR NEW, SELF-SUSTAINING LOW-INCOME, SINGLE-FAMILY AND MULTIFAMILY HOUSING ENERGY RETROFIT MODEL PROGRAMS TO ELIGIBLE MULTISTATE HOUSING AND ENERGY NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.

The Energy Conservation and Production Act is amended by inserting after section 414B (42 U.S.C. 6864b) the following:

''SEC. 414C. GRANTS FOR NEW, SELF-SUSTAINING LOW-INCOME, SINGLE-FAMILY AND MULTIFAMILY HOUSING ENERGY RETROFIT MODEL PROGRAMS TO ELIGIBLE MULTISTATE HOUSING AND ENERGY NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.

''(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

''(1) to expand the number of low-income, single-family and multifamily homes that receive energy efficiency retrofits;

''(2) to promote innovation and new models of retrofitting low-income homes through new Federal partnerships with covered organizations that leverage substantial donations, donated materials, volunteer labor,

homeowner labor equity, and other private sector resources;

''(3) to assist the covered organizations in demonstrating, evaluating, improving, and replicating widely the model low-income energy retrofit programs of the covered organizations; and

''(4) to ensure that the covered organizations make the energy retrofit programs of the covered organizations self-sustaining by the time grant funds have been expended.

''(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) COVERED ORGANIZATION.—The term 'covered organization' means an organization that—

''(A) is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from taxation under 501(a) of that Code; and

''(B) has an established record of constructing, renovating, repairing, or making energy efficient a total of not less than 250 owner-occupied, single-family or multifamily homes per year for low-income households, either directly or through affiliates, chapters, or other direct partners (using the most recent year for which data are available).

''(2) LOW-INCOME.—The term 'low-income' means an income level that is not more than 200 percent of the poverty level (as determined in accordance with criteria established by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget) applicable to a family of the size involved, except that the Secretary may establish a higher or lower level if the Secretary determines that a higher or lower level is necessary to carry out this section.

''(3) WEATHERIZATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR LOW-INCOME PERSONS.—The term 'Weatherization Assistance Program for Low-Income Persons' means the program established under this part (including part 440 of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations).

''(c) COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall make grants to covered organizations through a national competitive process for use in accordance with this section.

''(d) AWARD FACTORS.—In making grants under this section, the Secretary shall consider—

''(1) the number of low-income homes the applicant—

''(A) has built, renovated, repaired, or made more energy efficient as of the date of the application; and

''(B) can reasonably be projected to build, renovate, repair, or make energy efficient during the 10-year period beginning on the date of the application;

''(2) the qualifications, experience, and past performance of the applicant, including experience successfully managing and administering Federal funds;

''(3) the number and diversity of States and climates in which the applicant works as of the date of the application;

''(4) the amount of non-Federal funds, donated or discounted materials, discounted or volunteer skilled labor, volunteer unskilled labor, homeowner labor equity, and other resources the applicant will provide;

''(5) the extent to which the applicant could successfully replicate the energy retrofit program of the applicant and sustain the program after the grant funds have been expended;

''(6) regional diversity;

''(7) urban, suburban, and rural localities; and

''(8) such other factors as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

''(e) APPLICATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall request proposals from covered organizations.

''(2) ADMINISTRATION.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an applicant shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

''(3) AWARDS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of issuance of a request for proposals, the Secretary shall award grants under this section.

''(f) ELIGIBLE USES OF GRANT FUNDS.—A grant under this section may be used for—

''(1) energy efficiency audits, cost-effective retrofit, and related activities in different climatic regions of the United States;

''(2) energy efficiency materials and supplies;

''(3) organizational capacity—

''(A) to significantly increase the number of energy retrofits;

''(B) to replicate an energy retrofit program in other States; and

''(C) to ensure that the program is self-sustaining after the Federal grant funds are expended;

''(4) energy efficiency, audit and retrofit training, and ongoing technical assistance;

''(5) information to homeowners on proper maintenance and energy savings behaviors;

''(6) quality control and improvement;

''(7) data collection, measurement, and verification;

''(8) program monitoring, oversight, evaluation, and reporting;

''(9) management and administration (up to a maximum of 10 percent of the total grant);

''(10) labor and training activities; and

''(11) such other activities as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

''(g) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—The amount of a grant provided under this section shall not exceed—

''(1) if the amount made available to carry out this section for a fiscal year is $225,000,000 or more, $5,000,000; and

''(2) if the amount made available to carry out this section for a fiscal year is less than $225,000,000, $1,500,000.

''(h) GUIDELINES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall issue guidelines to implement the grant program established under this section.

''(2) ADMINISTRATION.—The guidelines—

''(A) shall not apply to the Weatherization Assistance Program for Low-Income Persons, in whole or major part; but

''(B) may rely on applicable provisions of law governing the Weatherization Assistance Program for Low-Income Persons to establish—

''(i) standards for allowable expenditures;

''(ii) a minimum savings-to-investment ratio;

''(iii) standards—

''(I) to carry out training programs;

''(II) to conduct energy audits and program activities;

''(III) to provide technical assistance;

''(IV) to monitor program activities; and

''(V) to verify energy and cost savings;

''(iv) liability insurance requirements; and

''(v) recordkeeping requirements, which shall include reporting to the Office of Weatherization and Intergovernmental Programs of the Department of Energy applicable data on each home retrofitted.

''(i) REVIEW AND EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall review and evaluate the performance of any covered organization that receives a grant under this section (which may include an audit), as determined by the Secretary.

''(j) COMPLIANCE WITH STATE AND LOCAL LAW.—Nothing in this section or any program carried out using a grant provided under this section supersedes or otherwise affects any State or local law, to the extent that the State or local law contains a requirement that is more stringent than the applicable requirement of this section.

''(k) ANNUAL REPORTS.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress annual reports that provide—

''(1) findings;

''(2) a description of energy and cost savings achieved and actions taken under this section; and

''(3) any recommendations for further action.

''(l) FUNDING.—Of the amount of funds that are made available to carry out the Weatherization Assistance Program for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018 under section 422, the Secretary shall use to carry out this section—

''(1) for fiscal year 2014—

''(A) 1 percent of the amount if the amount is less than $200,000,000;

''(B) 2 percent of the amount if the amount is $200,000,000 or more but less than $225,000,000;

''(C) 5 percent of the amount if the amount is $225,000,000 or more but less than $260,000,000;

''(D) 10 percent of the amount if the amount is $260,000,000 or more but less than $400,000,000; and

''(E) 20 percent of the amount if the amount is $400,000,000 or more; and

''(2) for each of fiscal year 2015 through 2018—

''(A) 2 percent of the amount if the amount is less than $225,000,000;

''(B) 5 percent of the amount if the amount is $225,000,000 or more but less than $260,000,000;

''(C) 10 percent of the amount if the amount is $260,000,000 or more but less than $400,000,000; and

''(D) 20 percent of the amount if the amount is $400,000,000 or more.''.

SEC. 423. STANDARDS PROGRAM.

Section 415 of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6865) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) STANDARDS PROGRAM.—

''(1) CONTRACTOR QUALIFICATION.—Effective beginning January 1, 2015, to be eligible to carry out weatherization using funds made available under this part, a contractor shall be selected through a competitive bidding process and be—

''(A) accredited by the Building Performance Institute;

''(B) an Energy Smart Home Performance Team accredited under the Residential Energy Services Network; or

''(C) accredited by an equivalent accreditation or program accreditation-based State certification program approved by the Secretary.

''(2) GRANTS FOR ENERGY RETROFIT MODEL PROGRAMS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive a grant under section 414C, a covered organization (as defined in section 414C(b)) shall use a crew chief who—

''(i) is certified or accredited in accordance with paragraph (1); and

''(ii) supervises the work performed with grant funds.

''(B) VOLUNTEER LABOR.—A volunteer who performs work for a covered organization that receives a grant under section 414C shall not be required to be certified under this subsection if the volunteer is not directly installing or repairing mechanical equipment or other items that require skilled labor.

''(C) TRAINING.—The Secretary shall use training and technical assistance funds available to the Secretary to assist covered organizations under section 414C in providing

training to obtain certification required under this subsection, including provisional or temporary certification.

''(3) MINIMUM EFFICIENCY STANDARDS.—Effective beginning October 1, 2015, the Secretary shall ensure that—

''(A) each retrofit for which weatherization assistance is provided under this part meets minimum efficiency and quality of work standards established by the Secretary after weatherization of a dwelling unit; and

''(B) at least 10 percent of the dwelling units are randomly inspected by a third party accredited under this subsection to ensure compliance with the minimum efficiency and quality of work standards established under subparagraph (A); and

''(C) the standards established under this subsection meet or exceed the industry standards for home performance work that are in effect on the date of enactment of this subsection, as determined by the Secretary.''.

PART II—STATE ENERGY PROGRAM

SEC. 431. REAUTHORIZATION OF STATE ENERGY PROGRAM.

Section 365(f) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6325(f)) is amended by striking ''$125,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2012'' and inserting ''$75,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018''.

SA 1843. Mr. WICKER 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. 422. Funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for grants to be awarded by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development or the Secretary of Transportation shall be subject to the following accountability provisions:

(1) AUDIT REQUIREMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of the enactment of this title, and in each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector Generals of the Department of Transportation and the Department of Housing and Development shall conduct audits of any grant amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds by grantees. The Inspectors General shall determine the appropriate number of such audits to be conducted each year.

(B) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term ''unresolved audit finding'' means a finding in the final audit report of the Inspectors General of the Department of Transportation and the Department of Housing and Urban Development that the grantee has utilized grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved within 12 months from the date when the final audit report is issued.

(C) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—A recipient of grant amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive grant amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under this title during the following 2 fiscal years beginning after the end of the 12-month period described under subparagraph (A).

(D) PRIORITY.—In awarding amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act, the Secretary of Transportation or the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall give priority to eligible entities that did not have an unresolved audit finding during the 3 fiscal years prior to submitting an application for grant amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act.

(E) REIMBURSEMENT.—If an entity is awarded grant amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act during the 2-fiscal-year period in which the entity is barred from receiving grants under subparagraph (B), the Secretary of Transportation or the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall recoup the costs of the repayment to the fund from the grant recipient that was erroneously awarded grant funds.

(2) NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this paragraph and any grant programs described in this Act, the term ''nonprofit organization'' means an organization that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

(B) PROHIBITION.—The Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may not award any grant amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act to a nonprofit organization that holds money in offshore accounts for the purpose of avoiding paying the tax described in section 511(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(C) DISCLOSURE.—Each nonprofit organization that is a recipient of grant amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act and uses the procedures prescribed in regulations to create a rebuttable presumption of reasonableness for the compensation of its officers, directors, trustees and key employees, shall disclose to the Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, in the application for the grant, the process for determining such compensation, including the independent persons involved in reviewing and approving such compensation, the comparability data used, and contemporaneous substantiation of the deliberation and decision. Upon request, the Secretary of Transportation or the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall make the information disclosed under this paragraph available for public inspection.

SA 1844. Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4____. ENHANCED ENERGY EFFICIENCY UNDERWRITING.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED AGENCY.—The term ''covered agency''—

(A) means—

(i) an executive agency, as that term is defined in section 102 of title 31, United States Code; and

(ii) any other agency of the Federal Government; and

(B) includes any enterprise, as that term is defined under section 1303 of the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4502).

(2) COVERED LOAN.—The term ''covered loan'' means a loan secured by a home that is issued, insured, purchased, or securitized by a covered agency.

(3) HOMEOWNER.—The term ''homeowner'' means the mortgagor under a covered loan.

(4) MORTGAGEE.—The term ''mortgagee'' means—

(A) an original lender under a covered loan or the holder of a covered loan at the time at which that mortgage transaction is consummated;

(B) any affiliate, agent, subsidiary, successor, or assignee of an original lender under a covered loan or the holder of a covered loan at the time at which that mortgage transaction is consummated;

(C) any servicer of a covered loan; and

(D) any subsequent purchaser, trustee, or transferee of any covered loan issued by an original lender.

(5) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

(6) SERVICER.—The term ''servicer'' means the person or entity responsible for the servicing of a covered loan, including the person or entity who makes or holds a covered loan if that person or entity also services the covered loan.

(7) SERVICING.—The term ''servicing'' has the meaning given the term in section 6(i) of the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 (12 U.S.C. 2605(i)).

(b) FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(A) energy costs for homeowners are a significant and increasing portion of their household budgets;

(B) household energy use can vary substantially depending on the efficiency and characteristics of the house;

(C) expected energy cost savings are important to the value of the house;

(D) the current test for loan affordability used by most covered agencies, commonly known as the ''debt-to-income'' test, is inadequate because it does not take into account the expected energy cost savings for the homeowner of an energy efficient home; and

(E) another loan limitation, commonly known as the ''loan-to-value'' test, is tied to the appraisal, which often does not adjust for efficiency features of houses.

(2) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are to—

(A) improve the accuracy of mortgage underwriting by Federal mortgage agencies by ensuring that energy cost savings are included in the underwriting process as described below, and thus to reduce the amount of energy consumed by homes and to facilitate the creation of energy efficiency retrofit and construction jobs;

(B) require a covered agency to include the expected energy cost savings of a homeowner as a regular expense in the tests, such as the debt-to-income test, used to determine the ability of the loan applicant to afford the cost of homeownership for all loan programs; and

(C) require a covered agency to include the value home buyers place on the energy efficiency of a house in tests used to compare the mortgage amount to home value, taking precautions to avoid double-counting and to support safe and sound lending.

(c) ENHANCED ENERGY EFFICIENCY UNDERWRITING CRITERIA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall, in consultation with the advisory group established in subsection (f)(2), develop and issue guidelines for a covered agency to implement enhanced loan eligibility requirements, for use when testing the ability of a loan applicant to repay a covered loan, that account for the expected energy cost savings for a loan applicant at a subject property, in the manner set forth in paragraphs (2) and (3).

(2) REQUIREMENTS TO ACCOUNT FOR ENERGY COST SAVINGS.—The enhanced loan eligibility requirements under paragraph (1) shall require that, for all covered loans for which an energy efficiency report is voluntarily provided to the mortgagee by the mortgagor, the covered agency and the mortgagee shall take into consideration the estimated energy cost savings expected for the owner of the subject property in determining whether the loan applicant has sufficient income to service the mortgage debt plus other regular expenses. To the extent that a covered agency uses a test such as a debt-to-income test that includes certain regular expenses, such as hazard insurance and property taxes, the expected energy cost savings shall be included as an offset to these expenses. Energy costs to be assessed include the cost of electricity, natural gas, oil, and any other fuel regularly used to supply energy to the subject property.

(3) DETERMINATION OF ESTIMATED ENERGY COST SAVINGS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The guidelines to be issued under paragraph (1) shall include instructions for the covered agency to calculate estimated energy cost savings using—

(i) the energy efficiency report;

(ii) an estimate of baseline average energy costs; and

(iii) additional sources of information as determined by the Secretary.

(B) REPORT REQUIREMENTS.—For the purposes of subparagraph (A), an energy efficiency report shall—

(i) estimate the expected energy cost savings specific to the subject property, based on specific information about the property;

(ii) be prepared in accordance with the guidelines to be issued under paragraph (1); and

(iii) be prepared—

(I) in accordance with the Residential Energy Service Network's Home Energy Rating System (commonly known as ''HERS'') by an individual certified by the Residential Energy Service Network, unless the Secretary finds that the use of HERS does not further the purposes of this section; or

(II) by other methods approved by the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy and the advisory group established in subsection (f)(2), for use under this section, which shall include a third-party quality assurance procedure.

(C) USE BY APPRAISER.—If an energy efficiency report is used under paragraph (2), the energy efficiency report shall be provided to the appraiser to estimate the energy efficiency of the subject property and for potential adjustments for energy efficiency.

(4) REQUIRED DISCLOSURE TO CONSUMER FOR A HOME WITH AN ENERGY EFFICIENCY REPORT.—If an energy efficiency report is used under paragraph (2), the guidelines to be issued under paragraph (1) shall require the mortgagee to—

(A) inform the loan applicant of the expected energy costs as estimated in the energy efficiency report, in a manner and at a time as prescribed by the Secretary, and if practicable, in the documents delivered at the time of loan application; and

(B) include the energy efficiency report in the documentation for the loan provided to the borrower.

(5) REQUIRED DISCLOSURE TO CONSUMER FOR A HOME WITHOUT AN ENERGY EFFICIENCY REPORT.—If an energy efficiency report is not used under paragraph (2), the guidelines to be issued under paragraph (1) shall require the mortgagee to inform the loan applicant in a manner and at a time as prescribed by the Secretary, and if practicable, in the documents delivered at the time of loan application of—

(A) typical energy cost savings that would be possible from a cost-effective energy upgrade of a home of the size and in the region of the subject property;

(B) the impact the typical energy cost savings would have on monthly ownership costs of a typical home;

(C) the impact on the size of a mortgage that could be obtained if the typical energy cost savings were reflected in an energy efficiency report; and

(D) resources for improving the energy efficiency of a home.

(6) LIMITATIONS.—A covered agency shall not—

(A) modify existing underwriting criteria or adopt new underwriting criteria that intentionally negate or reduce the impact of the requirements or resulting benefits that are set forth or otherwise derived from the enhanced loan eligibility requirements required under this subsection; or

(B) impose greater buy back requirements, credit overlays, insurance requirements, including private mortgage insurance, or any other material costs, impediments, or penalties on covered loans merely because the loan uses an energy efficiency report or the enhanced loan eligibility requirements required under this subsection.

(7) APPLICABILITY AND IMPLEMENTATION DATE.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and before December 31, 2016, the enhanced loan eligibility requirements required under this subsection shall be implemented by each covered agency to—

(A) apply to any covered loan for the sale, or refinancing of any loan for the sale, of any home;

(B) be available on any residential real property (including individual units of condominiums and cooperatives) that qualifies for a covered loan; and

(C) provide prospective mortgagees with sufficient guidance and applicable tools to implement the required underwriting methods.

(d) ENHANCED ENERGY EFFICIENCY UNDERWRITING VALUATION GUIDELINES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(A) in consultation with the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council and the advisory group established in subsection (f)(2), develop and issue guidelines for a covered agency to determine the maximum permitted loan amount based on the value of the property for all covered loans made on properties with an energy efficiency report that meets the requirements of subsection (c)(3)(B); and

(B) in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, issue guidelines for a covered agency to determine the estimated energy savings under paragraph (3) for properties with an energy efficiency report.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The enhanced energy efficiency underwriting valuation guidelines required under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) a requirement that if an energy efficiency report that meets the requirements of subsection (c)(3)(B) is voluntarily provided to the mortgagee, such report shall be used by the mortgagee or covered agency to determine the estimated energy savings of the subject property; and

(B) a requirement that the estimated energy savings of the subject property be added to the appraised value of the subject property by a mortgagee or covered agency for the purpose of determining the loan-to-value ratio of the subject property, unless the appraisal includes the value of the overall energy efficiency of the subject property, using methods to be established under the guidelines issued under paragraph (1).

(3) DETERMINATION OF ESTIMATED ENERGY SAVINGS.—

(A) AMOUNT OF ENERGY SAVINGS.—The amount of estimated energy savings shall be determined by calculating the difference between the estimated energy costs for the average comparable houses, as determined in guidelines to be issued under paragraph (1), and the estimated energy costs for the subject property based upon the energy efficiency report.

(B) DURATION OF ENERGY SAVINGS.—The duration of the estimated energy savings shall be based upon the estimated life of the applicable equipment, consistent with the rating system used to produce the energy efficiency report.

(C) PRESENT VALUE OF ENERGY SAVINGS.—The present value of the future savings shall be discounted using the average interest rate on conventional 30-year mortgages, in the manner directed by guidelines issued under paragraph (1).

(4) ENSURING CONSIDERATION OF ENERGY EFFICIENT FEATURES.—Section 1110 of the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 (12 U.S.C. 3339) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and'' and inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

''(4) that State certified and licensed appraisers have timely access, whenever practicable, to information from the property owner and the lender that may be relevant in developing an opinion of value regarding the energy- and water-saving improvements or features of a property, such as—

''(A) labels or ratings of buildings;

''(B) installed appliances, measures, systems or technologies;

''(C) blueprints;

''(D) construction costs;

''(E) financial or other incentives regarding energy- and water-efficient components and systems installed in a property;

''(F) utility bills;

''(G) energy consumption and benchmarking data; and

''(H) third-party verifications or representations of energy and water efficiency performance of a property, observing all financial privacy requirements adhered to by certified and licensed appraisers, including section 501 of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6801).

Unless a property owner consents to a lender, an appraiser, in carrying out the requirements of paragraph (4), shall not have access to the commercial or financial information of the owner that is privileged or confidential.''.

(5) TRANSACTIONS REQUIRING STATE CERTIFIED APPRAISERS.—Section 1113 of the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 (12 U.S.C. 3342) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting before the semicolon the following: '', or any real property on which the appraiser makes adjustments using an energy efficiency report''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting after ''atypical'' the following: '', or an appraisal on which the appraiser makes adjustments using an energy efficiency report.''.

(6) PROTECTIONS.—

(A) AUTHORITY TO IMPOSE LIMITATIONS.—The guidelines to be issued under paragraph (1) shall include such limitations and conditions as determined by the Secretary to be necessary to protect against meaningful under or over valuation of energy cost savings or duplicative counting of energy efficiency features or energy cost savings in the

valuation of any subject property that is used to determine a loan amount.

(B) ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY.—At the end of the 7-year period following the implementation of enhanced eligibility and underwriting valuation requirements under this section, the Secretary may modify or apply additional exceptions to the approach described in paragraph (2), where the Secretary finds that the unadjusted appraisal will reflect an accurate market value of the efficiency of the subject property or that a modified approach will better reflect an accurate market value.

(7) APPLICABILITY AND IMPLEMENTATION DATE.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and before December 31, 2016, each covered agency shall implement the guidelines required under this subsection, which shall—

(A) apply to any covered loan for the sale, or refinancing of any loan for the sale, of any home; and

(B) be available on any residential real property, including individual units of condominiums and cooperatives, that qualifies for a covered loan.

(e) MONITORING.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the enhanced eligibility and underwriting valuation requirements are implemented under this section, and every year thereafter, each covered agency with relevant activity shall issue and make available to the public a report that—

(1) enumerates the number of covered loans of the agency for which there was an energy efficiency report, and that used energy efficiency appraisal guidelines and enhanced loan eligibility requirements; and

(2) includes the default rates and rates of foreclosures for each category of loans.

(f) RULEMAKING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall prescribe regulations to carry out this section, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy and the advisory group established in paragraph (2), which may contain such classifications, differentiations, or other provisions, and may provide for such proper implementation and appropriate treatment of different types of transactions, as the Secretary determines are necessary or proper to effectuate the purposes of this section, to prevent circumvention or evasion thereof, or to facilitate compliance therewith.

(2) ADVISORY GROUP.—To assist in carrying out this section, the Secretary shall establish an advisory group, consisting of individuals representing the interests of—

(A) mortgage lenders;

(B) appraisers;

(C) energy raters and residential energy consumption experts;

(D) energy efficiency organizations;

(E) real estate agents;

(F) home builders and remodelers;

(G) State energy officials; and

(H) others as determined by the Secretary.

(g) ADDITIONAL STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall reconvene the advisory group established in subsection (f)(2), in addition to water and locational efficiency experts, to advise the Secretary on the implementation of the enhanced energy efficiency underwriting criteria established in subsections (c) and (d).

(2) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The advisory group established in subsection (f)(2) shall provide recommendations to the Secretary on any revisions or additions to the enhanced energy efficiency underwriting criteria deemed necessary by the group, which may include alternate methods to better account for home energy costs and additional factors to account for substantial and regular costs of homeownership such as location-based transportation costs and water costs. The Secretary shall forward any legislative recommendations from the advisory group to Congress for its consideration.

SA 1845. Mr. UDALL, of Colorado (for himself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. COORDINATION OF ENERGY RETROFITTING ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOLS.

Section 392 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6371a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) COORDINATION OF ENERGY RETROFITTING ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOLS.—

''(1) DEFINITION OF SCHOOL.—In this subsection, the term 'school' means—

''(A) an elementary school or secondary school (as defined in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801));

''(B) an institution of higher education (as defined in section 102(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002(a));

''(C) a school of the defense dependents' education system under the Defense Dependents' Education Act of 1978 (20 U.S.C. 921 et seq.) or established under section 2164 of title 10, United States Code;

''(D) a school operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs;

''(E) a tribally controlled school (as defined in section 5212 of the Tribally Controlled Schools Act of 1988 (25 U.S.C. 2511)); and

''(F) a Tribal College or University (as defined in section 316(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059c(b))).

''(2) DESIGNATION OF LEAD AGENCY.—The Secretary, acting through the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, shall act as the lead Federal agency for coordinating and disseminating information on existing Federal programs and assistance that may be used to help initiate, develop, and finance energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects for schools.

''(3) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out coordination and outreach under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall—

''(A) in consultation and coordination with the appropriate Federal agencies, carry out a review of existing programs and financing mechanisms (including revolving loan funds and loan guarantees) available in or from the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Energy, the Department of Education, the Department of the Treasury, the Internal Revenue Service, the Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate Federal agencies with jurisdiction over energy financing and facilitation that are currently used or may be used to help initiate, develop, and finance energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects for schools;

''(B) establish a Federal cross-departmental collaborative coordination, education, and outreach effort to streamline communication and promote available Federal opportunities and assistance described in subparagraph (A), for energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects that enables States, local educational agencies, and schools—

''(i) to use existing Federal opportunities more effectively; and

''(ii) to form partnerships with Governors, State energy programs, local educational, financial, and energy officials, State and local government officials, nonprofit organizations, and other appropriate entities, to support the initiation of the projects;

''(C) provide technical assistance for States, local educational agencies, and schools to help develop and finance energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects—

''(i) to increase the energy efficiency of buildings or facilities;

''(ii) to install systems that individually generate energy from renewable energy resources;

''(iii) to establish partnerships to leverage economies of scale and additional financing mechanisms available to larger clean energy initiatives; or

''(iv) to promote—

''(I) the maintenance of health, environmental quality, and safety in schools, including the ambient air quality, through energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofit projects; and

''(II) the achievement of expected energy savings and renewable energy production through proper operations and maintenance practices;

''(D) develop and maintain a single online resource Web site with contact information for relevant technical assistance and support staff in the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy for States, local educational agencies, and schools to effectively access and use Federal opportunities and assistance described in subparagraph (A) to develop energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects; and

''(E) establish a process for recognition of schools that—

''(i) have successfully implemented energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects; and

''(ii) are willing to serve as resources for other local educational agencies and schools to assist initiation of similar efforts.

''(4) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report describing the implementation of this subsection.''.

SA 1846. Mr. UDALL, of Colorado (for himself and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 301 and insert the following:

SEC. 301. ENERGY-EFFICIENT AND ENERGY-SAVING INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES.

Section 543 of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8253) is amended—

(1) by redesignating the second subsection (f) (relating to large capital energy investments) as subsection (g); and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(h) FEDERAL IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY FOR ENERGY-EFFICIENT AND ENERGY-SAVING INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, each Federal agency shall collaborate with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (referred to in this subsection as the 'Director') to develop an implementation strategy (including best-practices and measurement and verification techniques) for the maintenance, purchase, and use by the Federal agency of energy-efficient and energy-saving information and communications technologies and practices.

''(2) CONTENT.—Each implementation strategy shall be flexible, cost-effective, and based on the specific operating requirements and statutory mission of the agency.

''(3) ADMINISTRATION.—In developing an implementation strategy, each Federal agency shall—

''(A) consider information and communications technologies (referred to in this subsection as 'ICT') and related infrastructure and practices, such as—

''(i) advanced metering infrastructure;

''(ii) ICT services and products;

''(iii) efficient data center strategies and methods of increasing ICT asset and related infrastructure utilization;

''(iv) ICT and related infrastructure power management;

''(v) building information modeling, including building energy management; and

''(vi) secure telework and travel substitution tools; and

''(B) ensure that the agency realizes the savings and rewards brought about through increased efficiency and utilization.

''(4) PERFORMANCE GOALS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Director, in consultation with the Secretary, shall establish performance goals for evaluating the efforts of Federal agencies in improving the maintenance, purchase, and use of energy-efficient and energy-saving information and communications technology systems and practices.

''(B) BEST PRACTICES.—The Director shall supplement the performance goals established under this paragraph with recommendations on best practices for the attainment of the performance goals, to include a requirement for agencies to evaluate the use of energy savings performance contracting and utility energy services contracting as preferred acquisition methods.

''(C) ADMINISTRATION.—The performance goals established under this paragraph shall—

''(i) measure information technology costs over a specific time period of 3 to 5 years;

''(ii) measure cost savings attained via the use of energy-efficient and energy-saving information and communications solutions during the same time period; and

''(iii) provide, to the maximum extent practicable, a complete picture of all costs and savings, including energy costs and savings.

''(5) REPORTS.—

''(A) AGENCY REPORTS.—Each Federal agency subject to the requirements of this subsection shall include in the report of the agency under section 527 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17143) a description of the efforts and results of the agency under this subsection.

''(B) OMB GOVERNMENT EFFICIENCY REPORTS AND SCORECARDS.—Effective beginning not later than October 1, 2013, the Director shall include in the annual report and scorecard of the Director required under section 528 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17144) a description of the efforts and results of Federal agencies under this subsection.

''(C) USE OF EXISTING REPORTING STRUCTURES.—The Director may require Federal agencies to submit any information required to be submitted under this subsection though reporting structures in use as of the date of enactment of the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2013.''.

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 304. ENERGY EFFICIENT DATA CENTERS.

Section 453 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17112) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2013, the Secretary and the Administrator shall—

''(A) designate an established information technology industry organization to coordinate the program described in subsection (b); and

''(B) make the designation public, including on an appropriate website.'';

(2) by striking subsections (e) and (f) and inserting the following:

''(e) STUDY.—The Secretary, with assistance from the Administrator, shall—

''(1) not later than December 31, 2013, make available to the public an update to the Report to Congress on Server and Data Center Energy Efficiency published on August 2, 2007, under section 1 of Public Law 109–431 (120 Stat. 2920), that provides—

''(A) a comparison and gap analysis of the estimates and projections contained in the original report with new data regarding the period from 2007 through 2012;

''(B) an analysis considering the impact of information and communications technologies asset and related infrastructure utilization solutions, to include virtualization and cloud computing-based solutions, in the public and private sectors; and

''(C) updated projections and recommendations for best practices; and

''(2) collaborate with the organization designated under subsection (c) in preparing the report.

''(f) DATA CENTER ENERGY PRACTITIONER PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in collaboration with the organization designated under subsection (c) and in consultation with the Administrator for the Office of E-Government and Information Technology within the Office of Management and Budget, shall maintain a data center energy practitioner program that leads to the certification of energy practitioners qualified to evaluate the energy usage and efficiency opportunities in data centers.

''(2) EVALUATIONS.—Each Federal agency shall have the data centers of the agency evaluated every 4 years by energy practitioners certified pursuant to the program, whenever practicable using certified practitioners employed by the agency.'';

(3) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (j); and

(4) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

''(g) OPEN DATA INITIATIVE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in collaboration with the organization designated under subsection (c) and in consultation with the Administrator for the Office of E-Government and Information Technology within the Office of Management and Budget, shall establish an open data initiative for Federal data center energy usage data, with the purpose of making the data available and accessible in a manner that empowers further data center innovation while protecting United States national security interests.

''(2) ADMINISTRATION.—In establishing the initiative, the Secretary shall consider use of the online Data Center Maturity Model.

''(h) INTERNATIONAL SPECIFICATIONS AND METRICS.—The Secretary, in collaboration with the organization designated under subsection (c), shall actively participate in efforts to harmonize global specifications and metrics for data center energy efficiency.

''(i) ICT ASSET UTILIZATION METRIC.—The Secretary, in collaboration with the organization designated under subsection (c), shall assist in the development of an efficiency metric that measures the energy efficiency of the overall data center, including information and communications technology systems and related infrastructure.''.

SA 1847. Mr. BENNET (for himself and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

Subtitle C—Energy Efficiency Measures in Commercial Buildings

SEC. 121. SEPARATE SPACES WITH HIGH-PERFORMANCE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURES.

Subtitle B of title IV of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17081 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 424. SEPARATE SPACES WITH HIGH-PERFORMANCE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURES.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) HIGH-PERFORMANCE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURE.—The term 'high-performance energy efficiency measure' means a technology, product, or practice that will result in substantial operational cost savings by reducing energy consumption and utility costs.

''(2) SEPARATE SPACES.—The term 'separate spaces' means areas within a commercial building that are leased or otherwise occupied by a tenant or other occupant for a period of time pursuant to the terms of a written agreement.

''(b) STUDY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary, acting through the Assistant Secretary of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, shall complete a study on the feasibility of—

''(A) significantly improving energy efficiency in commercial buildings through the design and construction, by owners and tenants, of separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures; and

''(B) encouraging owners and tenants to implement high-performance energy efficiency measures in separate spaces.

''(2) SCOPE.—The study shall, at a minimum, include—

''(A) descriptions of—

''(i) high-performance energy efficiency measures that should be considered as part of the initial design and construction of separate spaces;

''(ii) processes that owners, tenants, architects, and engineers may replicate when designing and constructing separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures;

''(iii) standards and best practices to achieve appropriate energy intensities for lighting, plug loads, pipe loads, heating, cooling, cooking, laundry, and other systems to satisfy the needs of the commercial building tenant;

''(iv) return on investment and payback analyses of the incremental cost and projected energy savings of the proposed set of high-performance energy efficiency measures, including consideration of tax and other available incentives;

''(v) models and simulation methods that predict the quantity of energy used by separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures and that compare that predicted quantity to the quantity of energy used by separate spaces without high-performance energy efficiency measures but that otherwise comply with applicable building code requirements;

''(vi) measurement and verification platforms demonstrating actual energy use of

high-performance energy efficiency measures installed in separate spaces, and whether the measures generate the savings intended in the initial design and construction of the separate spaces;

''(vii) best practices that encourage an integrated approach to designing and constructing separate spaces to perform at optimum energy efficiency in conjunction with the central systems of a commercial building; and

''(viii) any impact on employment resulting from the design and construction of separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures; and

''(B) case studies reporting economic and energy saving returns in the design and construction of separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures.

''(3) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall publish a notice in the Federal Register requesting public comments regarding effective methods, measures, and practices for the design and construction of separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures.

''(4) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary shall publish the study on the website of the Department of Energy.''.

SEC. 122. TENANT STAR PROGRAM.

Subtitle B of title IV of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17081 et seq.) (as amended by section 121) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 425. TENANT STAR PROGRAM.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) HIGH-PERFORMANCE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURE.—The term 'high-performance energy efficiency measure' has the meaning given the term in section 424.

''(2) SEPARATE SPACES.—The term 'separate spaces' has the meaning given the term in section 424.

''(b) TENANT STAR.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Secretary shall develop a voluntary program within the Energy Star program established by section 324A of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6294a), which may be known as Tenant Star, to promote energy efficiency in separate spaces leased by tenants or otherwise occupied within commercial buildings.

''(c) AGREEMENTS.—Responsibilities under the program developed under subsection (b) shall be divided between the Secretary and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency in accordance with the terms of applicable agreements between the Secretary and the Administrator.

''(d) EXPANDING SURVEY DATA.—The Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration, shall—

''(1) collect, through each Commercial Building Energy Consumption Survey of the Energy Information Administration that is conducted after the date of enactment of this section, data on—

''(A) categories of building occupancy that are known to consume significant quantities of energy, such as occupancy by law firms, data centers, trading floors, restaurants, retail outlets, and financial services firms; and

''(B) other aspects of the property, building operation, or building occupancy determined by the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration, in consultation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, to be relevant in lowering energy consumption; and

''(2) make data collected under paragraph (1) available to the public in aggregated form and provide the data, and any associated results, to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency for use in accordance with subsection (e).

''(e) RECOGNITION OF OWNERS AND TENANTS.—

''(1) OCCUPANCY-BASED RECOGNITION.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the data described in subsection (d) is received, the Secretary and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall, following an opportunity for public notice and comment—

''(A) in a manner similar to the Energy Star rating system for commercial buildings, develop voluntary policies and procedures to recognize tenants that voluntarily achieve high levels of energy efficiency in separate spaces;

''(B) establish building occupancy categories eligible for Tenant Star recognition based on the data collected under subsection (d)(1) and any associated results; and

''(C) consider other forms of recognition for commercial building tenants or other occupants that lower energy consumption in separate spaces.

''(2) DESIGN- AND CONSTRUCTION-BASED RECOGNITION.—After the study required under section 424(b) is completed and following an opportunity for public notice and comment, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection and the Secretary may develop a voluntary program to recognize commercial building owners and tenants that use high-performance energy efficiency measures in the design and construction of separate spaces.''.

SA 1848. Mr. REID (for Mr. PRYOR (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. COBURN)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1344, to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to provide expedited air passenger screening to severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Helping Heroes Fly Act''.

SEC. 2. OPERATIONS CENTER PROGRAM FOR SEVERELY INJURED OR DISABLED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND SEVERELY INJURED OR DISABLED VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 449 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 44927. Expedited screening for severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans

''(a) PASSENGER SCREENING.—The Assistant Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and organizations identified by the Secretaries of Defense and Veteran Affairs that advocate on behalf of severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans, shall develop and implement a process to support and facilitate the ease of travel and to the extent possible provide expedited passenger screening services for severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans through passenger screening. The process shall be designed to offer the individual private screening to the maximum extent practicable.

''(b) OPERATIONS CENTER.—As part of the process under subsection (a), the Assistant Secretary shall maintain an operations center to provide support and facilitate the movement of severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans through passenger screening prior to boarding a passenger aircraft operated by an air carrier or foreign air carrier in air transportation or intrastate air transportation.

''(c) PROTOCOLS.—The Assistant Secretary shall—

''(1) establish and publish protocols, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and the organizations identified under subsection (a), under which a severely injured or disabled member of the Armed Forces or severely injured or disabled veteran, or the family member or other representative of such member or veteran, may contact the operations center maintained under subsection (b) and request the expedited passenger screening services described in subsection (a) for that member or veteran; and

''(2) upon receipt of a request under paragraph (1), require the operations center to notify the appropriate Federal Security Director of the request for expedited passenger screening services, as described in subsection (a), for that member or veteran.

''(d) TRAINING.—The Assistant Secretary shall integrate training on the protocols established under subsection (c) into the training provided to all employees who will regularly provide the passenger screening services described in subsection (a).

''(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall affect the authority of the Assistant Secretary to require additional screening of a severely injured or disabled member of the Armed Forces, a severely injured or disabled veteran, or their accompanying family members or nonmedical attendants, if intelligence, law enforcement, or other information indicates that additional screening is necessary.

''(f) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, and annually thereafter, the Assistant Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the implementation of this section. Each report shall include each of the following:

''(1) Information on the training provided under subsection (d).

''(2) Information on the consultations between the Assistant Secretary and the organizations identified under subsection (a).

''(3) The number of people who accessed the operations center during the period covered by the report.

''(4) Such other information as the Assistant Secretary determines is appropriate.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter I of chapter 449 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 44926 the following new item:

''44927. Expedited screening for severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans.''.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. SANDERS. 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 August 1, 2013, at 9:30 a.m., in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on August 1, 2013, at 10:15 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on August 1, 2013, at 9:30 a.m. in SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct an executive business meeting.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL AND CONTRACTING OVERSIGHT

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs' Subcommittee on Financial and Contracting Oversight be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on August 1, 2013, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Mismanagement of POW/MIA Accounting.''

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT, FEDERAL RIGHTS, AND AGENCY ACTION

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Oversight, Federal Rights, and Agency Action, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on August 1, 2013, at 2 p.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Justice Delayed: The Human Cost of Regulatory Paralysis.''

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

FOREIGN TRAVEL FINANCIAL REPORTS

In accordance with the appropriate provisions of law, the Secretary of the Senate herewith submits the following reports for standing committees of the Senate, certain joint committees of the Congress, delegations and groups, and select and special committees of the Senate, relating to expenses incurred in the performance of authorized foreign travel:

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION AND FORESTRY FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Jonathan Cordone:									
United States	Dollar				8,641.70				8,641.70
Australia	Dollar		800.00						800.00
New Zealand	Dollar		1,281.64						1,281.64
Vietnam	Dong		1,028.01						1,028.01
* Delegation Expenses:									
Australia	Dollar						576.63		576.63
New Zealand	Dollar						160.65		160.65
Vietnam	Dong						67.32		67.32
Senator William Cowan:									
Israel	New Shekel		476.00						476.00
Turkey	Lira		426.00						426.00
Jordan	Dinar		382.52						382.52
Valerie Young:									
Israel	New Shekel		476.00						476.00
Turkey	Lira		426.00						426.00
Jordan	Dinar		382.52						382.52
* Delegation Expenses:									
Israel	New Shekel						638.20		638.20
Turkey	Lira						1,615.61		1,615.61
Jordan	Dinar						586.70		586.70
Total			5,678.69		8,641.70		3,645.11		17,965.50

* Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State and the Department of Defense under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR DEBBIE STABENOW,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry, July 29, 2013.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator John Hoeven:									
Jordan	Dinar		382.52						382.52
Israel	Shekel		476.00						476.00
Turkey	Lira		426.00						426.00
Don Larson:									
Jordan	Dinar		382.52						382.52
Israel	Shekel		476.00						476.00
Turkey	Lira		426.00						426.00
Timothy Rieser:									
Cuba	Peso				449.00		20.00		469.00
United States	Dollar				599.80		25.00		624.80
Senator Thad Cochran:									
Israel	Shekel		1,092.00						1,092.00
Oman	Rial		837.67						837.67
Azerbaijan	Manat		782.76						782.76
Romania	Leu		286.44						286.44
Czech Republic	Koruna		457.19						457.19
Kay Webber:									
Israel	Shekel		1,092.00						1,092.00
Oman	Rial		837.67						837.67
Azerbaijan	Manat		782.76						782.76
Romania	Leu		286.44						286.44
Czech Republic	Koruna		457.19						457.19
Paul Grove:									
Iraq	Dinar		35.00						35.00
Turkey	Lira		759.30						759.30
United States	Dollar				3,622.00				3,622.00
Adam Yezerski:									
Iraq	Dinar		35.00						35.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Turkey	Lira		759.30						759.30
United States	Dollar				3,976.00				3,976.00
Paul Grove:									
Afghanistan	Afghani		84.00		300.00				384.00
Pakistan	Rupee		200.00						200.00
United States	Dollar				6,860.40				6,860.40
Adam Yezerski:									
Afghanistan	Afghani		84.00		300.00				384.00
Pakistan	Rupee		200.00						200.00
United States	Dollar				6,860.40				6,860.40
Senator Richard Shelby:									
England	Pound Sterling		2,687.10						2,687.10
France	Euro		1,907.74						1,907.74
United States	Dollar				13,114.80				13,114.80
Senator Thad Cochran:									
England	Pound Sterling		1,230.00						1,230.00
France	Euro		1,120.00						1,120.00
United States	Dollar				13,114.80				13,114.80
Stewart Holmes:									
England	Pound Sterling		1,343.56						1,343.56
France	Euro		899.57						899.57
United States	Dollar				13,323.80				13,323.80
William Duhnke:									
England	Pound Sterling		1,395.15						1,395.15
France	Euro		1,747.55						1,747.55
United States	Dollar				13,114.80				13,114.80
Anne Caldwell:									
England	Pound Sterling		1,395.15						1,395.15
France	Euro		1,747.55						1,747.55
United States	Dollar				13,114.80				13,114.80
Kay Webber:									
England	Pound Sterling		1,230.00						1,230.00
France	Euro		1,120.00						1,120.00
United States	Dollar				13,114.80				13,114.80
Senator Richard Shelby:									
France	Euro		4,681.34						4,681.34
United States	Dollar				10,706.10				10,706.10
Senator Thad Cochran:									
France	Euro		4,548.00						4,548.00
United States	Dollar				11,474.10				11,474.10
Senator Barbara Mikulski:									
France	Euro		4,548.00						4,548.00
United States	Dollar				10,706.10				10,706.10
Senator Tom Harkin:									
France	Euro		948.00						948.00
United States	Dollar				11,794.54				11,794.54
Gabrielle Batkin:									
France	Euro		4,548.00						4,548.00
United States	Dollar				10,706.10				10,706.10
Stewart Holmes:									
France	Euro		4,548.00						4,548.00
United States	Dollar				10,706.10				10,706.10
Brian Potts:									
France	Euro		4,548.00						4,548.00
United States	Dollar				11,474.10				11,474.10
Jacqui Russell:									
France	Euro		4,548.00						4,548.00
United States	Dollar				10,706.10				10,706.10
Jeremy Weirich:									
France	Euro		4,548.00						4,548.00
United States	Dollar				10,706.10				10,706.10
Anne Caldwell:									
France	Euro		4,548.00						4,548.00
United States	Dollar				10,722.70				10,722.70
Kay Webber:									
France	Euro		4,548.00						4,548.00
United States	Dollar				10,706.10				10,706.10
*Delegation Expenses:									
France	Euro				21,757.30		22,093.40		43,850.70
Iraq	Dinar				2,050.00				2,050.00
Israel	Shekel				241.70		396.50		638.20
Jordan	Dinar				86.10		70.20		156.30
Turkey	Lira				865.20		1,072.90		1,938.10
Total			76,022.47		247,273.84		23,678.00		346,974.31

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR BARBARA MIKULSKI,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, July 30, 2013.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Michael J. Kuiken:									
United States	Dollar				9,507.72				9,507.72
Germany	Euro		245.00						245.00
Mali	Franc		478.14						478.14
Djibouti	Franc		614.08		8.48		281.21		903.77
Thomas W. Goffus:									
United States	Dollar				9,417.72				9,417.72
Germany	Euro		270.00						270.00
Mali	Franc		498.17						498.17
Djibouti	Franc		614.08						614.08
Senator Kirsten Gillibrand:									
United States	Dollar		111.27				9.60		120.87
Jordan	Dinar		154.35				7.36		161.71

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Israel	Shekel		133.05						133.05
Turkey	Lira		140.37						140.37
Elana Broitman:									
United States	Dollar		111.27				7.36		118.63
Jordan	Dinar		141.09						141.09
Israel	Shekel		133.05						133.05
Turkey	Lira		152.64				10.59		163.23
Jess Fassler:									
United States	Dollar		118.18				7.36		125.54
Jordan	Dinar		133.18						133.18
Israel	Shekel		133.05						133.05
Turkey	Lira		155.87						155.87
Senator Lindsey Graham:									
United States	Dollar		111.27				7.36		118.63
Jordan	Dinar		133.18						133.18
Israel	Shekel		156.77						156.77
Turkey	Lira		130.00						130.00
Matthew Rimkunas:									
United States	Dollar		111.27				22.36		133.63
Jordan	Dinar		133.18						133.18
Israel	Shekel		156.77						156.77
Turkey	Lira		130.00						130.00
Andrew King:									
United States	Dollar		111.27				22.36		133.63
Jordan	Dinar		133.18						133.18
Israel	Shekel		156.77						156.77
Turkey	Lira		130.00						130.00
* Delegation Expenses:									
Jordan	Dinar				258.24		210.67		468.91
Turkey	Lira				900.15		1,384.66		2,284.81
Israel	Shekel				725.09		1,189.51		1,914.60
William G. P. Monahan:									
United States	Dollar				5,497.80				5,497.80
Turkey	Lira		196.31						196.31
Jordan	Dinar		255.69						255.69
Iraq	Dinar		111.00				15.00		126.00
Thomas W. Goffus:									
United States	Dollar				3,155.48				3,155.48
Turkey	Lira		707.86						707.86
Jordan	Dinar		285.96						285.96
Iraq	Dinar		111.00						111.00
Senator Joe Donnelly:									
Turkey	Lira		313.00						313.00
Pakistan	Rupee		180.00						180.00
Afghanistan	Afghani		78.00						78.00
Germany	Euro		194.00						194.00
Marta McLellan Ross:									
Turkey	Lira		313.00						313.00
Pakistan	Rupee		180.00						180.00
Afghanistan	Afghani		78.00						78.00
Germany	Euro		180.00						180.00
* Delegation Expenses:									
Turkey	Lira				181.16		761.13		942.29
Pakistan	Rupee				78.32		167.11		245.43
Senator John McCain:									
United States	Dollar				10,573.20				10,573.20
Germany	Euro		206.00						206.00
Senator Roger Wicker:									
France	Euro		729.91		20.99				750.90
Joseph G. Lai:									
France	Euro		613.10						613.10
Senator James M. Inhofe:									
France	Euro		298.68						298.68
* Delegation Expenses:									
France	Euro				4,242.90		4,588.20		8,831.10
Senator John McCain:									
Jordan	Dinar		25.80						25.80
Turkey	Lira		395.94						395.94
Yemen	Rial		130.00						130.00
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		273.26						273.26
United States	Dollar				20,733.20				20,733.20
Christian D. Brose:									
Jordan	Dinar		897.90						897.90
Turkey	Lira		458.74						458.74
Yemen	Rial		290.00						290.00
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		465.26						465.26
United States	Dollar				18,112.70				18,112.70
Margaret Goodlander:									
Jordan	Dinar		868.83						868.83
Turkey	Lira		458.74						458.74
Yemen	Rial		290.00						290.00
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		431.48						431.48
United States	Dollar				18,112.70				18,112.70
* Delegation Expenses:									
United Arab Emirates	Dirham				209.92		734.00		943.92
Turkey	Lira				350.00		4,876.71		5,226.71
Jordan	Dinar				571.12		4,834.89		5,406.01
Senator John McCain:									
United States	Dollar				11,399.20				11,399.20
Mali	Franc		215.64						215.64
Tunisia	Dinar		445.36						445.36
Christian D. Brose:									
United States	Dollar				12,259.20				12,259.20
Mali	Franc		162.00						162.00
Tunisia	Dinar		149.00						149.00
Libya	Dinar		149.00						149.00
Margaret Goodlander:									
United States	Dollar				11,173.80				11,173.80
Mali	Franc		385.00						385.00
Tunisia	Dinar		220.00						220.00
* Delegation Expenses:									
Tunisia	Dinar				311.60		1,101.67		1,413.27
Mali	Franc				583.79				583.79

Total		17,673.96		138,384.48		20,239.11		176,297.55	

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State and the Department of Defense under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR CARL LEVIN,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, July 25, 2013.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Isaiah Akin:									
Angola	Kwanza		604.00						604.00
Gabon	Dollar		904.79						904.79
Republic of Congo	Dollar		1,070.00						1,070.00
United States	Dollar				16,752.12				16,752.12
John Dickas:									
Angola	Kwanza		476.00						476.00
Gabon	Dollar		787.79						787.79
Republic of Congo	Dollar		971.00						971.00
United States	Dollar				16,752.12				16,752.12
Clayton Allen:									
Angola	Kwanza		614.00						614.00
Gabon	Dollar		805.75						805.75
Republic of Congo	Dollar		1,080.00						1,080.00
United States	Dollar				16,752.12				16,752.12
*Delegation Expenses:									
Gabon	Dollar						352.82		352.82
Republic of Congo	Dollar						540.00		540.00
Total		7,313.33		50,256.36		892.82			58,462.51

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State and the Department of Defense under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR RON WYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, July 18, 2013.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FINANCE FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Bruce Hirsh:									
Australia	Dollar		744.43						744.43
New Zealand	Dollar		553.05						533.05
Vietnam	Dong		1,017.18						1,017.18
United States	Dollar				23,532.20				23,532.20
Hun Quach:									
Australia	Dollar		663.17						663.17
New Zealand	Dollar		636.34						636.34
Vietnam	Dong		904.54						904.54
United States	Dollar				40,427.30				40,427.30
Chelsea Thomas;									
Australia	Dollar		732.05						732.05
New Zealand	Dollar		624.53						624.53
Vietnam	Dong		1,043.00						1,043.00
United States	Dollar				21,666.30				21,666.30
Paul Poteet:									
Australia	Dollar		753.70						753.70
New Zealand	Dollar		504.77						504.77
Vietnam	Dong		876.75						876.75
United States	Dollar				38,792.30				38,792.30
Erin Gulick:									
Australia	Dollar		766.85						766.85
New Zealand	Dollar		568.59						568.59
Vietnam	Dong		993.43						993.43
United States	Dollar				21,857.30				21,857.30
Mark Libell:									
Australia	Dollar		651.78						651.78
New Zealand	Dollar		523.83						523.83
Vietnam	Dong		981.50						981.50
United States	Dollar				23,507.20				23,507.20
Chris Slevin:									
Australia	Dollar		701.31						701.31
New Zealand	Dollar		558.20						558.20
Vietnam	Dong		852.25						852.25
United States	Dollar				33,475.40				33,475.40
Ann Hawks:									
Australia	Dollar		746.19						746.19
New Zealand	Dollar		587.30						587.30
United States	Dollar				5,630.00				5,630.00
Chris Sullivan:									
Australia	Dollar		795.84						795.84
New Zealand	Dollar		479.88						479.88
Vietnam	Dong		951.30						951.30
United States	Dollar				32,562.40				32,562.40
Amber Sechrist:									
Australia	Dollar		744.08						744.08
New Zealand	Dollar		594.54						594.54
Vietnam	Dong		925.29						925.29
United States	Dollar				27,588.20				27,588.20
Eric Toy:									
Australia	Dollar		696.04						696.04
New Zealand	Dollar		524.50						524.50
Vietnam	Dong		984.82						984.82
United States	Dollar				31,324.50				31,324.50
William Ghent:									
Australia	Dollar		682.24						682.24
New Zealand	Dollar		568.81						568.81
Vietnam	Dong		881.58						881.58
United States	Dollar				23,532.20				23,532.20
Katherine Monge:									
Australia	Dollar		757.02						757.02

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FINANCE FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
New Zealand	Dollar		593.20						593.20
Vietnam	Dong		975.80						975.80
United States	Dollar				23,597.30				23,597.30
Gregory Kalbaugh:									
Australia	Dollar		737.14						737.14
New Zealand	Dollar		538.64						538.64
Vietnam	Dong		863.27						863.27
United States	Dollar				34,785.30				34,785.30
Jennifer McClosky:									
Australia	Dollar		759.12						759.12
New Zealand	Dollar		610.17						610.17
Vietnam	Dong		933.85						933.85
United States	Dollar				27,581.50				27,581.50
*Delegation Expenses:									
United States	Dollar				9,506.22		3,299.88		12,806.10
Total			32,581.87		419,365.62		3,299.88		455,247.37

*Delegation expenses include, transportation, security, embassy overtime, official functions, as well as other official expenses in accordance with the responsibilities of the host country.

SENATOR MAX BAUCUS,
Chairman, Committee on Finance, June 17, 2013.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator John Barrasso:									
Israel	Shekel		1,108.29						1,108.29
Oman	Rial		627.36						627.36
Azerbaijan	New Manat		544.63						544.63
Romania	New Leu		151.22						151.22
Republic of Czechoslovakia	Koruna		352.76						352.76
*Delegation Expenses:									
Israel	Shekel						500.63		500.63
Oman	Rial						431.84		431.84
Azerbaijan	New Manat						390.89		390.89
Romania	New Leu						443.84		443.84
Republic of Czechoslovakia	Czech Koruna						294.16		294.16
Senator Benjamin Cardin:									
China	Yuan		1,013.83						1,013.83
Korea	Won		498.52						498.52
Japan	Yen		918.66						918.66
United States	Dollar				17,719.70				17,719.70
Algene Sajery:									
China	Yuan		1,318.20						1,318.20
Korea	Won		651.36						651.36
Japan	Yen		760.86						760.86
United States	Dollar				17,719.70				17,719.70
*Delegation Expenses:									
China	Yuan						3,561.93		3,561.93
Korea	Won						667.71		667.71
Japan	Yen						4,479.69		4,479.69
Senator Robert Casey:									
Turkey	Lira		521.51						521.51
Egypt	Pound		185.88						185.88
Israel	Shekel		824.00						824.00
United States	Dollar				11,591.97				11,591.97
Damian Murphy:									
Turkey	Lira		475.26						475.26
Egypt	Pound		174.00						174.00
Israel	Shekel		824.00						824.00
United States	Dollar				12,763.97				12,763.97
*Delegation Expenses:									
Turkey	Lira						3,132.09		3,132.09
Egypt	Pound						339.00		339.00
Israel	Shekel						6,873.17		6,873.17
Senator Robert Menendez:									
El Salvador	Dollar		341.00						341.00
Honduras	Lempira		273.90						273.90
Guatemala	Quetzal		397.08						397.08
United States	Dollar				2,641.13				2,641.13
Daniel O'Brien:									
El Salvador	Dollar		531.00						531.00
Honduras	Lempira		240.90						240.90
Guatemala	Quetzal		547.57						547.57
United States	Dollar				1,285.13				1,285.13
Jodi Herman:									
El Salvador	Dollar		396.80						396.80
Honduras	Lempira		223.90						223.90
Guatemala	Quetzal		175.93						175.93
United States	Dollar				1,590.13				1,590.13
Emily Mendrala:									
El Salvador	Dollar		411.00						411.00
Honduras	Lempira		273.90						273.90
Guatemala	Quetzal		471.54						471.54
United States	Dollar				1,285.13				1,285.13
*Delegation Expenses:									
El Salvador	Dollar						1,845.61		1,845.61
Honduras	Lempira						1,046.06		1,046.06
Guatemala	Quetzal						2,627.00		2,627.00
Senator Robert Menendez:									
Jordan	Dinar		896.73						896.73
Israel	Shekel		1,950.19						1,950.19
United States	Dollar				9,131.97				9,131.97
Daniel O'Brien:									
Jordan	Dinar		913.42						913.42
Israel	Shekel		2,252.00						2,252.00
United States	Dollar				9,329.97				9,329.97

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Ilan Goldenberg:									
Jordan	Dinar		913.42						913.42
Israel	Shekel		2,049.00						2,049.00
United States	Dollar				9,329.97				9,329.97
Jodi Herman:									
Jordan	Dinar		882.73						882.73
Israel	Shekel		2,014.87						2,014.87
United States	Dollar				9,329.97				9,329.97
*Delegation Expenses:									
Jordan	Dinar						5,406.01		5,406.01
Israel	Shekel						9,701.97		9,701.97
Senator Christopher Murphy:									
Turkey	Lira		340.20						340.20
Afghanistan	Dollar		36.00						36.00
Pakistan	Rupee		36.00						36.00
Germany	Euro		89.25						89.25
Jessica Elledge:									
Turkey	Lira		531.20						531.20
Pakistan	Rupee		127.00						127.00
Afghanistan	Dollar		27.00						27.00
Germany	Euro		180.25						180.25
*Delegation Expenses:									
Turkey	Dollar						942.29		942.29
Pakistan	Rupee						184.51		184.51
Jamil Jaffer:									
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		861.00						861.00
Yemen	Rial		392.00						392.00
Qatar	Riyal		503.62						503.62
United States	Dollar				4,825.10				4,825.10
Tamara Klajn:									
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		748.00						748.00
Yemen	Rial		420.00						420.00
Qatar	Riyal		606.00						606.00
United States	Dollar				4,205.10				4,205.10
*Delegation Expenses:									
Saudi Arabia	Riyal						374.59		374.59
Qatar	Riyal						147.24		147.24
Caleb McCarry:									
Guatemala	Dollar		841.00						841.00
United States	Dollar				754.50				754.50
Caroline Vik:									
Guatemala	Dollar		882.00						882.00
United States	Dollar				754.50				754.50
*Delegation Expenses:									
Guatemala	Dollar						3,248.00		3,248.00
Stacie Oliver:									
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		976.99						976.99
Republic of Czechoslovakia	Dinar		100.00						100.00
United States	Dollar				4,091.40				4,091.40
*Delegation Expenses:									
United Arab Emirates	Dirham						467.31		467.31
Michael Schiffer:									
Taiwan	TWD		596.71						596.71
Philippines	PHP		422.48						422.48
Singapore	Dollar		1,912.13						1,912.13
Indonesia	IDR		773.12						773.12
United States	Dollar				4,922.10				4,922.10
Carolyn Leddy:									
Taiwan	TWD		393.69						393.69
Philippines	PHP		313.74						313.74
Singapore	Dollar		1,602.40						1,602.40
Indonesia	IDR		562.37						562.37
United States	Dollar				6,016.30				6,016.30
*Delegation Expenses:									
Taiwan	TWD						408.08		408.08
Indonesia	IDR						389.00		389.00
Total			41,381.37		129,287.74		47,902.62		218,571.73

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State and the Department of Defense under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR ROBERT MENENDEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, July 25, 2013.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
*Senator Heidi Heitkamp:									
Turkey	Lira		378.20						378.20
Pakistan	Rupee		81.17						81.17
Afghanistan	Afghani		6.00						6.00
Germany	Euro		127.61						127.61
Senator Tammy Baldwin:									
Turkey	Lira		517.20						517.20
Pakistan	Rupee		200.31						200.31
Afghanistan	Afghani		64.00						64.00
Germany	Euro		188.00						188.00
Rory Steele:									
Turkey	Lira		317.20						317.20
Pakistan	Rupee		140.31						140.31
Afghanistan	Afghani		6.00						6.00
Germany	Euro		117.18						117.18
Will Hansen:									
Turkey	Lira		517.20						517.20
Pakistan	Rupee		200.31						200.31
Afghanistan	Afghani		38.00						38.00
Germany	Euro		94.40						94.40

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Total			2,993.09						2,993.09

*The CODEL traveled via military air.

SENATOR THOMAS R. CARPER,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs,
July 29, 2013.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY FOR TRAVEL FROM APRIL 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Amy Klobuchar:									
Jordan	Dinar		355.72						355.72
Israel	Shekel		487.76						487.76
Turkey	Lira		517.73						517.73
Brian Burton:									
Jordan	Dinar		342.46						342.46
Israel	Shekel		449.35						449.35
Turkey	Lira		517.73						517.73
*Delegation Exprenses:									
Jordan	Dinar		156.30						156.30
Israel	Shekel		1,656.86						1,656.86
Turkey	Dinar		652.81						652.81
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse:									
United States	Dollar				12,233.20				12,233.20
Mali	Franc		211.64						211.64
Tunisia	Dinar		751.30						751.30
*Delegation Expenses:									
Mali	Franc		194.60						194.60
Tunisia	Dinar		471.09						471.09
Libya	Dinar		273.01						273.01
Total			7,038.36		12,233.20				19,271.56

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State and the Department of Defense under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR PATRICK J. LEAHY,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, July 25, 2013.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Dianne Feinstein			65.00						65.00
Senator Saxby Chambliss			750.50						750.50
	Dollar				9,126,50				9,126.50
David Grannis			499.30						499.30
	Dollar				11,212,27				11,212.27
Martha Scott Poindexter			1,649.82						1,649.82
	Dollar				10,713,27				10,713.27
Senator Saxby Chambliss			3,456.06						3,456.06
Senator Richard Burr			3,456.06						3,456.06
Martha Scott Poindexter			3,456.06						3,456.06
Kate Vickers			3,456.06						3,456.06
Tyler Stephens			3,456.06						3,456.06
Christian Cook			3,456.06						3,456.06
Brian Miller			1,289.26						1,289.26
Total			24,990.24		31,052.04				56,042.28

SENATOR DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
Chairman, Committee on Intelligence, July 11, 2013.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Shelly Han:									
Australia	Dollar		2,180.00						2,180.00
United States	Dollar				1,907.10				1,907.10
Ukraine	Hryvnia		1,467.35						1,467.35
United States	Dollar				2,474.30				2,474.30
Janice Helwig:									
Austria	Euro		4,580.53						4,580.53
Allison Hollabaugh:									
Ukraine	Hryvnia		926.01						926.01
United States	Dollar				2,481.10				2,481.10
Alex Johnson:									
Albania	Lek		858.00						858.00
United States	Dollar				1,266.90				1,266.90
Albania	Lek		1,340.00						1,340.00
United States	Dollar				1,266.90				1,266.90
Austria	Euro		22,092.71						22,092.71

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
United States	Dollar				3,785.90				3,785.90
Winsome Packer:									
Austria	Euro		2,320.00						2,320.00
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Mark		585.00						585.00
Serbia	Dinar		216.00						216.00
United States	Dollar				3,653.50				3,653.50
France	Euro		1,728.09						1,728.09
United States	Dollar				3,782.10				3,782.10
Erika Schlager:									
Austria	Euro		1,011.24						1,011.24
Bulgaria	Lev		1,012.00						1,012.00
United States	Dollar				3,094.90				3,094.90
Mischa Thompson:									
Belgium	Euro		649.63						649.63
France	Euro		324.82						324.82
United States	Dollar				1,873.80				1,873.80
Total			41,291.38		25,586.50				66,877.88

SENATOR BENJAMIN L. CARDIN,
Chairman, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe,
July 17, 2013.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), OFFICE OF THE REPUBLICAN LEADER FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Thomas Hawkins:									
Israel	Shekel		356.00				720.00		1,076.00
Oman	Rial		261.93				459.64		721.57
Azerbaijan	Manat		278.00				499.87		777.87
Romania	Leu		140.00				148.31		288.31
Czech Republic	Crown		186.00				275.00		461.00
Dr. Brian Monahan:									
Israel	Shekel		69.00				720.00		789.00
Oman	Rial		91.02				459.64		550.66
Azerbaijan	Manat		278.00				499.87		777.87
Romania	Leu		140.00				148.31		288.31
Czech Republic	Crown		186.00				275.00		461.00
Total			1,985.95				4,205.64		6,191.59

SENATOR MITCH McCONNELL,
Republican Leader, July 23, 2013.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, September 9, 2013, at 5 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 184 and 185; that there be 30 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; the motions 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; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

Mr. REID. Madam President, an example of the work done by others, I will read this material—I will read it and people see me making this consent request. But people have spent weeks arriving at this. That is what I talked about a few minutes ago. It is remarkable, the work done for us by others.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 199, 200, 202, 210 through 218, 222, 225 through 240, 243 through 247, 249 through 302, 304, 305, 306, 308 through 326, and all nominations on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force, Army, Navy; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that President Obama be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Janet Lorraine LaBreck, of Massachusetts, to be Commissioner of the Rehabilitation Services Administration, Department of Education.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

Cynthia L. Attwood, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission for a term expiring April 27, 2019.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Stuart F. Delery, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

Richard T. Metsger, of Oregon, to be a Member of the National Credit Union Administration Board for a term expiring August 2, 2017.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Jason Furman, of New York, to be a Member and Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Mary Jo White, of New York, to be Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for a term expiring June 5, 2019.

Kara Marlene Stein, of Maryland, to be Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for a term expiring June 5, 2017.

Michael Sean Piwowar, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for a term expiring June 5, 2018.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Gerald Lyn Early, of Missouri, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2018.

Daniel Iwao Okimoto, of California, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2018.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Daniel Brooks Baer, of Colorado, to be U.S. Representative to the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, with the rank of Ambassador.

Douglas Edward Lute, of Indiana, to be United States Permanent Representative on the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

Catherine M. Russell, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador at Large for Global Women's Issues.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

Katherine H. Tachau, of Iowa, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2018.

UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

Stephen J. Hadley, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States institute of Peace for a term of four years.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

John Unsworth, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2016.

Dorothy Kosinski, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2016.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Davita Vance-Cooks, of Virginia, to be Public Printer.

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

F. Scott Kieff, of Illinois, to be a Member of the United States International Trade Commission for the term expiring June 16, 2020.

UNITED STATES TAX COURT

Joseph W. Nega, of Illinois, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years.

Michael B. Thornton, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Robert Bonnie, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture for Natural Resources and Environment.

Krysta L. Harden, of Georgia, to be Deputy Secretary of Agriculture.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF BUILDING SCIENCES

Timothy Hyungrock Haahs, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the National Institute of Building Sciences for a term expiring September 7, 2014.

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

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.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Mark E. Schaefer, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere.

AMTRAK BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Thomas C. Carper, of Illinois, to be a Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors for a term of five years.

IN THE COAST GUARD

Pursuant to the authority of Section 271(d), Title 14, U.S. Code, the following officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the U.S. Coast Guard:

To be rear admiral

Bruce D. Baffer
Mark E. Butt
David R. Callahan
Stephen P. Metruck
Joseph A. Servidio

Pursuant to the authority of Section 12203(a), Title 10, U.S. Code, the following officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the U.S. Coast Guard Reserve:

To be rear admiral

Kurt B. Hinrichs

The following officer for appointment to the grade indicated in the U.S. Coast Guard pursuant to the authority of Section 271(d), Title 14, U.S. Code:

To be rear admiral

Richard T. Gromlich

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

The following named officer for reappointment as the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and appointment to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 152 and 601:

To be general

Gen. Martin E. Dempsey

NAVY

The following named officer for reappointment as the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and appointment to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., sections 601 and 154:

To be admiral

Adm. James A. Winnefeld, Jr.

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be admiral

Adm. Cecil E.D. Haney

ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Curtis M. Scaparrotti

AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Stephen W. Wilson

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10 U.S.C., section 601:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Robin Rand

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Russell J. Handy

The following Air National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be brigadier general

Col. Roger L. Nye

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C. section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. David L. Mann

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Raymond A. Thomas, III

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Marion Garcia

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be brigadier general

Col. John W. Lathrop

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Edward C. Cardon

The following named officer for appointment as the Deputy Judge Advocate General, United States Army, and for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated in accordance with title 10, U.S.C., sections 3037 and 3064:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Thomas E. Ayres

The following named officer for appointment as the Judge Advocate General, United States Army and for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while serving as the Judge Advocate General in accordance with title 10, U.S.C., sections 3037 and 3064:

To be lieutenant general

Brig. Gen. Flora D. Darpino

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Michael S. Tucker

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade

indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 624, 3037, and 3064:

To be Brigadier General, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Col. Charles N. Pede

The following named officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Army under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Colonel Carl A. Alex
Colonel Christopher F. Bentley
Colonel James R. Blackburn
Colonel William M. Burleson, III
Colonel Christopher G. Cavoli
Colonel Paul A. Chamberlain
Colonel William E. Cole
Colonel Richard B. Dix
Colonel Jeffrey A. Farnsworth
Colonel Bryan P. Fenton
Colonel Patricia A. Frost
Colonel Douglas M. Gabram
Colonel Jeffrey A. Gabbert
Colonel John A. George
Colonel Randy A. George
Colonel Maria R. Gervais
Colonel David P. Glaser
Colonel Thomas C. Graves
Colonel John F. Haley
Colonel Peter L. Jones
Colonel Richard G. Kaiser
Colonel John S. Kem
Colonel Robert L. Marion
Colonel Dennis S. McKean
Colonel Frank M. Muth
Colonel Leopoldo A. Quintas, Jr.
Colonel Kurt J. Ryan
Colonel Mark C. Schwartz
Colonel Scott A. Spellmon
Colonel John P. Sullivan
Colonel Clarence D. Turner
Colonel Michael J. Warmack
Colonel Eric J. Wesley

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Kenneth E. Tovo

The following named officer appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Robert B. Abrams

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Kevin L. McNeely

MARINE CORPS

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Marine Corps to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Thomas D. Waldhauser

NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Deborah P. Haven

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601; and for appointment as a Senior Member of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations under title 10, U.S.C., Section 711:

To be vice admiral

Vice Adm. Frank C. Pandolfe

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be admiral

Vice Adm. Harry B. Harris, Jr.

The following named officer for appointment as Chief of Naval Personnel, United States Navy, and appointment to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., sections 601 and 5141:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. William F. Moran

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. James F. Caldwell, Jr.

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) David F. Baucom
Rear Adm. (lh) Vincent L. Griffith

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Colin G. Chinn
Rear Adm. (lh) Elaine C. Wagner

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Paul B. Becker
Rear Adm. (lh) Matthew J. Kohler
Rear Adm. (lh) Jan E. Tighe

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) David H. Lewis
Rear Adm. (lh) Thomas J. Moore
Rear Adm. (lh) James D. Syring

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) John C. Aquilino
Rear Adm. (lh) Peter J. Fanta
Rear Adm. (lh) David J. Gale
Rear Adm. (lh) Philip G. Howe
Rear Adm. (lh) William K. Lescher
Rear Adm. (lh) Mark C. Montgomery
Rear Adm. (lh) Frank A. Morneau
Rear Adm. (lh) Jeffrey R. Penfield
Rear Adm. (lh) Frederick J. Roegge
Rear Adm. (lh) Phillip G. Sawyer
Rear Adm. (lh) Michael S. White

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Russell E. Allen
Capt. William M. Crane
Capt. Thomas W. Marotta

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Vice Adm. Kurt W. Tidd

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Kenneth J. Iverson

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Morrell John Berry, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Australia.

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.

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.

Daniel A. Clune, of Maryland, 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 Lao People's Democratic Republic.

Patrick Hubert Gaspard, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of South Africa.

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.

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.

Linda Thomas-Greenfield, of Louisiana, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (African Affairs), vice Johnnie Carson.

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.

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.

John B. Emerson, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Republic of Germany.

John Rufus Gifford, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Denmark.

Denise Campbell Bauer, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Belgium.

James Costos, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Spain.

James Costos, of California, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Andorra.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

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.

FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

Robert F. Cohen, Jr., of West Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission for a term of six years expiring August 30, 2018.

William Ira Althen, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission for a term of six years expiring August 30, 2018.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Catherine Elizabeth Lhamon, of California, to be Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, Department of Education.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

John H. Thompson, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of the Census for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 2016.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Harry R. Hoglander, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the National Mediation Board for a term expiring July 1, 2014.

Linda A. Puchala, of Maryland, to be a Member of the National Mediation Board for a term expiring July 1, 2015.

Nicholas Christopher Geale, of Virginia, to be a Member of the National Mediation Board for a term expiring July 1, 2016.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Matthew Winthrop Barzun, of Kentucky, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

David Hale, of New Jersey, 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 Lebanon.

Liliana Ayalde, of Maryland, 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 the Federative Republic of Brazile.

Kirk W.B. Wagar, of Florida, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Singapore.

Terence Patrick McCulley, of Washington, 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 Cote d'Ivoire.

James C. Swan, of California, 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 Democratic Republic of the Congo.

John R. Phillips, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Italian Republic, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of San Marino.

Kenneth Francis Hackett, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Holy See.

Alexa Lange Wesner, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Austria.

Daniel A. Sepulveda, of Florida, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State 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.

BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Ryan Clark Crocker, of Washington, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2013.

Ryan Clark Crocker, of Washington, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2016.

Matthew C. Armstrong, of Illinois, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2015.

Jeffrey Shell, of California, to be Chairman of the Broadcasting Board of Governors.

Jeffrey Shell, of California, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2015.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN278 AIR FORCE nominations (192) beginning WENDY J. BEAL, and ending JARED K. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 9, 2013.

PN617 AIR FORCE nomination of Peter C. Rhee, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 26, 2013.

PN698 AIR FORCE nomination of Joseph M. Markusfeld, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 2013.

PN699 AIR FORCE nominations (15) beginning DEONDRA P. ASIKE, and ending GREGORY C. TROLLEY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 2013.

IN THE ARMY

PN580 ARMY nomination of Ronald E. Beresky, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 20, 2013.

PN581 ARMY nomination of James B. Collins, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 20, 2013.

PN584 ARMY nominations (2) beginning JONATHAN H. CODY, and ending JUSTIN M. MARCHESI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 20, 2013.

PN609 ARMY nominations (4) beginning JOSEPH L. BIEHLER, and ending BIENVENIDO SERRANOCASTRO, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 24, 2013.

PN652 ARMY nomination of Dean C. Anderson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN653 ARMY nomination of Christopher D. Perrin, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN654 ARMY nominations (61) beginning SHEENA L. ALLEN, and ending MIAO X. ZHOU, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN655 ARMY nominations (305) beginning COURTNEY L. ABRAHAM, and ending D011476, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN656 ARMY nominations (309) beginning CHRISTOPHER L. AARON, and ending NATHAN P. ZWINTSCHER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN657 ARMY nominations (333) beginning RICHARD R. ABELKIS, and ending G001407, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN658 ARMY nominations (536) beginning JOSEPH H. ALBRECHT, and ending D011309, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN700 ARMY nomination of Karl F. Meyer, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 2013.

PN701 ARMY nomination of Stephanie M. Price, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 2013.

PN702 ARMY nomination of Gregory C. Pedro, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 2013.

PN703 ARMY nomination of John H. Seok, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 2013.

PN704 ARMY nomination of Frederick C. Lough, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 2013.

PN705 ARMY nominations (2) beginning ADMIRADO A. LUZURIAGA, and ending JON KIEV, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 2013.

PN706 ARMY nominations (5) beginning WILLIAM G. HUBER, and ending MARK L. LEITSCHUH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 2013.

PN707 ARMY nomination of Curtis J. Alitz, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 2013.

PN709 ARMY nominations (5) beginning GUY R. BEAUDOIN, and ending REBECCA A. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 2013.

IN THE NAVY

PN610 NAVY nomination of Jackie S. Fantes, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 24, 2013.

PN625 NAVY nomination of Doran T. Kelvington, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 27, 2013.

PN626 NAVY nominations (30) beginning ORENTHAL G. ADDERSON, and ending JOHN F. WARNER, III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 27, 2013.

PN659 NAVY nominations (17) beginning PHILIP B. BAGROW, and ending DAVID M. TODD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN660 NAVY nominations (20) beginning TANYA CRUZ, and ending JEANINE B. WOMBLE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN661 NAVY nominations (21) beginning RENE J. ALOVA, and ending JOYCE Y. TURNER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN662 NAVY nominations (28) beginning JAMES ALGER, and ending JASON N. WOOD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN663 NAVY nominations (33) beginning CHRISTOPHER W. ABBOTT, and ending LORENZO TARPLEY, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN664 NAVY nominations (46) beginning MARY R. ANKER, and ending GEORGINA L. ZUNIGA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN665 NAVY nominations (47) beginning LILLIAN A. ABUAN, and ending CHRISTOPHER R. ZEGLEY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN666 NAVY nominations (144) beginning ERIN G. ADAMS, and ending LUKE A. ZABROCKI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN710 NAVY nomination of Timothy C. Moore, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 2013.

PN711 NAVY nomination of Pierre A. Pelletier, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 2013.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the Senate consider the following nominations under the Privileged section of the Executive Calendar: Nominations PN 631, PN 632, and PN 667; that the nominations be confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

PRIVILEGED NOMINATIONS

Ellen C. Herbst, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce, vice Scott Boyer Quehl, resigned.

Ellen C, Herbst, of Virginia, to be Chief Financial Officer, Department of Commerce, vice Scott Boyer Quehl, resigned.

Margaret Louise Cummisky, of Hawaii, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce, vice April S. Boyd, resigned.

NOMINATION OF SAMANTHA POWER 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

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 221; that the Senate proceed to vote with no intervening action or debate; 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 to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Nomination of Samantha Power 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Hearing no further debate, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Samantha Power 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?

The nomination was confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

IMPROVE HYDROPOWER ACT AND HYDROPOWER DEVELOPMENT UNDER FEDERAL RECLAMATION

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of the following bills en bloc: Calendar No. 71, H.R. 267, and Calendar No. 72, H.R. 678.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bills by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 267) to approve hydropower, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 678) to authorize all Bureau of Reclamation conduit facilities for hydropower development under Federal Reclamation law, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the bills en bloc.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the bills be read a third time and passed en bloc, and that the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The bills (H.R. 267 and H.R. 678) were ordered to a third reading, were read the third time, and passed.

FOR VETS ACT of 2013

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 155, H.R. 1171.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the title of the bill.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1171) to amend title 40, United States Code, to improve veterans service organizations access to Federal surplus personal property.

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

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that 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. 1171) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

HELPING HEROES FLY ACT

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Commerce Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1344, and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1344) to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to provide expedited air passenger screening to severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. REID. I further ask that the Pryor substitute amendment which is at the desk be agreed to, and the bill, as amended, be read the third time and passed, and that any motions to reconsider be considered made, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The amendment (No. 1848) was agreed to, as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Helping Heroes Fly Act''.

SEC. 2. OPERATIONS CENTER PROGRAM FOR SEVERELY INJURED OR DISABLED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND SEVERELY INJURED OR DISABLED VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 449 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 44927. Expedited screening for severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans

''(a) PASSENGER SCREENING.—The Assistant Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and organizations identified by the Secretaries of Defense and Veteran Affairs that advocate on behalf of severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans, shall develop and implement a process to support and facilitate the ease of travel and to the extent possible provide expedited passenger screening services for severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans through passenger screening. The process shall be designed to offer the individual private screening to the maximum extent practicable.

''(b) OPERATIONS CENTER.—As part of the process under subsection (a), the Assistant Secretary shall maintain an operations center to provide support and facilitate the movement of severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans through passenger screening prior to boarding a passenger aircraft operated by an air carrier or

foreign air carrier in air transportation or intrastate air transportation.

''(c) PROTOCOLS.—The Assistant Secretary shall—

''(1) establish and publish protocols, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and the organizations identified under subsection (a), under which a severely injured or disabled member of the Armed Forces or severely injured or disabled veteran, or the family member or other representative of such member or veteran, may contact the operations center maintained under subsection (b) and request the expedited passenger screening services described in subsection (a) for that member or veteran; and

''(2) upon receipt of a request under paragraph (1), require the operations center to notify the appropriate Federal Security Director of the request for expedited passenger screening services, as described in subsection (a), for that member or veteran.

''(d) TRAINING.—The Assistant Secretary shall integrate training on the protocols established under subsection (c) into the training provided to all employees who will regularly provide the passenger screening services described in subsection (a).

''(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall affect the authority of the Assistant Secretary to require additional screening of a severely injured or disabled member of the Armed Forces, a severely injured or disabled veteran, or their accompanying family members or nonmedical attendants, if intelligence, law enforcement, or other information indicates that additional screening is necessary.

''(f) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, and annually thereafter, the Assistant Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the implementation of this section. Each report shall include each of the following:

''(1) Information on the training provided under subsection (d).

''(2) Information on the consultations between the Assistant Secretary and the organizations identified under subsection (a).

''(3) The number of people who accessed the operations center during the period covered by the report.

''(4) Such other information as the Assistant Secretary determines is appropriate.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter I of chapter 449 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 44926 the following new item:

''44927. Expedited screening for severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans.''.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 1344), as amended, was read the third time and passed.

PIPELINE SAFETY REGULATORY DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2576.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2576) to amend title 49, United States Code, to modify requirements relating to the availability of pipeline safety regulatory documents, and for other purposes.

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

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

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

The bill (H.R. 2576) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ENCOURAGING PEACE AND REUNIFICATION ON THE KOREAN PENINSULA

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to H. Con. Res. 41.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 41) encouraging peace and reunification on the Korean Peninsula.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions 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 concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 41) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

AMENDING PUBLIC LAW 93–435

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 109, S. 256.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 256) to amend Public Law 93–435 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands, providing parity with Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment, as follows:

SECTION 1. AMENDMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The first section and section 2 of Public Law 93–435 (48 U.S.C. 1705, 1706) are amended by inserting ''the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands,'' after ''Guam,'' each place it appears.

Section 8103(b)(1)(B) of the Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2007 (29 U.S.C. 206 note; Public Law 110–28) is amended by striking ''2011'' and inserting ''2011, 2013, and 2015''.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill (S. 256), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 256

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

SECTION 1. AMENDMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The first section and section 2 of Public Law 93–435 (48 U.S.C. 1705, 1706) are amended by inserting ''the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands,'' after ''Guam,'' each place it appears.

(b) REFERENCES TO DATE OF ENACTMENT.—For the purposes of the amendment made by subsection (a), each reference in Public Law 93–435 to the ''date of enactment'' shall be considered to be a reference to the date of the enactment of this section.

SEC. 2. ADJUSTMENT OF SCHEDULED WAGE INCREASES IN THE COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS.

Section 8103(b)(1)(B) of the Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2007 (29 U.S.C. 206 note; Public Law 110–28) is amended by striking ''2011'' and inserting ''2011, 2013, and 2015''.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Madam President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 156 through 160, all post office naming bills en bloc.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bills en bloc.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the bills be read a third time and passed en bloc, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc, with no intervening action or debate.

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

SPECIALIST CHRISTOPHER SCOTT POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (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,'' was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 233

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

SECTION 1. SPECIALIST CHRISTOPHER SCOTT POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 815 County Road 23 in Tyrone, New York, shall be known and designated as the ''Specialist Christopher Scott Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Specialist Christopher Scott Post Office Building''.

SECTION 1. SPECIALIST CHRISTOPHER SCOTT POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 815 County Road 23 in Tyrone, New York, shall be known and designated as the ''Specialist Christopher Scott Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Specialist Christopher Scott Post Office Building''.

STAFF SERGEANT NICHOLAS J. REID POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (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,'' was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 668

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

SECTION 1. STAFF SERGEANT NICHOLAS J. REID POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 Main Street in Brockport, New York, shall be known and designated as the ''Staff Sergeant Nicholas J. Reid Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Staff Sergeant Nicholas J. Reid Post Office Building''.

JAMES R. BURGESS JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (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,'' was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 796

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

SECTION 1. JAMES R. BURGESS JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 302 East Green Street in Champaign, Illinois, shall be known and designated as the ''James R. Burgess Jr. Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''James R. Burgess Jr. Post Office Building''.

THADDEUS STEVENS POST OFFICE

The bill (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,'' was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 885

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

SECTION 1. THADDEUS STEVENS POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 35 Park Street in Danville, Vermont, shall be known and designated as the ''Thaddeus Stevens Post Office''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Thaddeus Stevens Post Office''.

FIRST LIEUTENANT ALVIN CHESTER COCKRELL, JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (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,'' was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1093

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

SECTION 1. FIRST LIEUTENANT ALVIN CHESTER COCKRELL, JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 130 Caldwell Drive in Hazlehurst, Mississippi, shall be known and designated as the ''First Lieutenant Alvin Chester Cockrell, Jr. Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''First Lieutenant Alvin Chester Cockrell, Jr. Post Office Building''.

CELEBRATING THE 200TH AUGUST QUARTERLY FESTIVAL IN WILMINGTON, DELAWARE

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 199, and the Senate proceed to its consideration.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 199) celebrating the 200th August Quarterly Festival taking place from August 18, 2013, through August 25, 2013, in Wilmington, Delaware.

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

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 199) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of July 25, 2013, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ELECTING LAURA C. DOVE AS SECRETARY FOR THE MINORITY OF THE SENATE

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 216.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cherk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 216) electing Laura C. Dove, of Virginia, as Secretary for the Minority of the Senate.

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

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to 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 resolution (S. Res. 216) was agreed to.

(The resolution is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

AMERICAN COLLEGE OF SURGEONS DAYS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 217.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 217) expressing support for the designation of October 6, 2013, through October 10, 2013 as ''American College of Surgeons Days'' and recognizing the 100th anniversary of the founding of the organization.

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

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid on the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 217) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES—H.R. 2642

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I understand the Chair, as previously authorized, is now ready to appoint the conferees to H.R. 2642.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Under the order of July 18, 2013, the Chair appoints Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BROWN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BENNET, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. HOEVEN conferees on the part of the Senate.

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, pursuant to Public Law 99–498, as amended by Public Law 110–315, appoints the following individuals to the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance: Michael Poliakoff of Virginia, vice David Gruen and Andrew Gillen of Washington, DC, vice William Luckey.

APPOINTMENTS AUTHORITY

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the upcoming recess or adjournment of the Senate, the President of the Senate, the President pro tempore and the majority and minority leaders be authorized to make appointments to commissions, committees, boards, conferences or interparliamentary conferences authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses or by order of the Senate.

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

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO REPORT

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the Senate's recess, committees be authorized to report legislative matters and executive matters on Wednesday, September 4, from 11 a.m. to 1 p.m.

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

SIGNING AUTHORITY

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment or recess of the Senate Thursday, August 1, through Monday, September 9, Senators CARDIN and LEVIN be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions.

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

EXPRESSIONS OF APPRECIATION

Mr. REID. Madam President, there are two things I wish to mention before we close.

First, the Presiding Officer has worked for years on an energy efficiency bill. We are finally going to be able to get to that. This is the first Energy bill we have had in, I think, 5 years.

It is a bipartisan piece of legislation, but the impetus behind this legislation is this Presiding Officer. I commend her, applaud her, and recognize how fortunate the people of New Hampshire are to have her as a Senator.

I also wish to mention the pages. This is their last day here. They have done a wonderful job. They do so much for us. There isn't a day goes by that they don't do something for me. I am sure the Senate feels the same way. I hope it has been a good experience for them.

I have had three grandchildren who have been pages, and it a great experience for them. I am confident the others feel the same way.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, AUGUST 2, 2013, THROUGH MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 2013

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn and convene for pro forma sessions only with no business conducted on the following dates and times, and that following each pro forma session the Senate adjourn until the next pro forma session: Friday, August 2 at 11:45 a.m.; Tuesday, August 6 at 10:30 a.m.; Friday, August 9 at 12 p.m.; Tuesday, August 13 at 12 p.m.; Friday, August 16 at 12 p.m.; Tuesday, August 20 at 11:00 a.m.; Friday, August 23 at 12 p.m.; Tuesday, August 27 at 9 a.m.; Friday August 30 at 2 p.m.; Tuesday, September 3 at 9:15 a.m.; and Friday, September 6 at 5 p.m; and that the Senate adjourn on Friday, September 6, until 2 p.m.; that on Monday, September 9, 2013, unless the Senate receives a message from the House that it has adopted S. Con. Res. 22, the adjournment resolution, and that if the Senate receives such a message, the Senate adjourn until 12 p.m. on Monday, August 12, for a pro forma session only with no business conducted, pursuant to S. Con Res. 22, and that following the pro forma session, the Senate adjourn until 2:00 p.m. on Monday, September 9, 2013; that on Monday, 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; and that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until 5 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; that following morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar Nos. 184 and 185, under the previous order.

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

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. The next rollcall vote will be 5:30 p.m. on Monday, September 9, 2013.

CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY, AUGUST 2, 2013, AT 11:45 A.M.

Mr. REID. 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 8:45 p.m., conditionally adjourned until Friday, August 2, at 11:45 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

MICHELLE T. FRIEDLAND, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT, VICE RAYMOND C. FISHER, RETIRED.

NANCY L. MORITZ, OF KANSAS, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT, VICE DEANELL REECE TACHA, RETIRED.

JOHN B. OWENS, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT, VICE STEPHEN S. TROTT, RETIRED.

CHRISTOPHER REID COOPER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, VICE ROYCE C. LAMBERTH, RETIRED.

DANIEL D. CRABTREE, OF KANSAS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS, VICE JOHN W. LUNGSTRUM, RETIRED.

SHERYL H. LIPMAN, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE, VICE JON P. MCCALLA, RETIRED.

GERALD AUSTIN MCHUGH, JR., OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, VICE HARVEY BARTLE, III, RETIRED.

M. DOUGLAS HARPOOL, OF MISSOURI, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI, VICE RICHARD E. DORR, DECEASED.

EDWARD G. SMITH, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, VICE BERLE M. SCHILLER, RETIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

GARY BLANKINSHIP, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE RUBEN MONZON, RESIGNED.

ROBERT L. HOBBS, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE JOHN LEE MOORE, TERM EXPIRED.

AMOS ROJAS, JR., OF FLORIDA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE CHRISTINA PHARO, TERM EXPIRED.

PETER C. TOBIN, OF OHIO, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE CATHY JO JONES, RESIGNED.

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

J. CHRISTOPHER GIANCARLO, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING APRIL 13, 2014, VICE JILL SOMMERS, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

DEBORAH LEE JAMES, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE, VICE MICHAEL BRUCE DONLEY, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

FRANK G. KLOTZ, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR NUCLEAR SECURITY, VICE THOMAS P. D'AGOSTINO, RESIGNED.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

CHRISTOPHER A. HART, OF COLORADO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2017. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEBORAH A. P. HERSMAN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM OF TWO YEARS. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEBORAH A. P. HERSMAN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2018. (REAPPOINTMENT)

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

MICHAEL P. O'RIELLY, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2014, VICE ROBERT M. MCDOWELL, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

KATHRYN D. SULLIVAN, OF OHIO, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR OCEANS AND ATMOSPHERE, VICE JANE LUBCHENCO, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

STEVEN CROLEY, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, VICE GREGORY HOWARD WOODS.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

KAREN DYNAN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, VICE JANICE EBERLY.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

R. GIL KERLIKOWSKE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, VICE ALAN D. BERSIN, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

JOHN ANDREW KOSKINEN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE FOR THE TERM EXPIRING NOVEMBER 12, 2017, VICE DOUGLAS H. SHULMAN, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MATTHEW T. HARRINGTON, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF LESOTHO.

ANNE W. PATTERSON, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER AMBASSADOR, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (NEAR EASTERN AFFAIRS), VICE JEFFERY D. FELTMAN RESIGNED.

PAMELA K. HAMAMOTO, OF HAWAII, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE OFFICE OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS IN GENEVA, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR, VICE BETTY E. KING.

SARAH SEWALL, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE AN UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (CIVILIAN SECURITY, DEMOCRACY, AND HUMAN RIGHTS), VICE MARIA OTERO, RESIGNED.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

RICHARD F. GRIFFIN, JR., OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE RONALD E. MEISBURG, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

STEVAN EATON BUNNELL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, VICE IVAN K. FONG, RESIGNED.

FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY

PATRICK PIZZELLA, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING JULY 1, 2015, VICE THOMAS M. BECK, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

SUZANNE ELEANOR SPAULDING, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, VICE RAND BEERS.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

PETER JOSEPH KADZIK, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, VICE RONALD H. WEICH, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

LINDA A. SCHWARTZ, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, VICE RAUL PEREA–HENZE, RESIGNED.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 1, 2013:

THE JUDICIARY

RAYMOND T. CHEN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

JANET LORRAINE LABRECK, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE COMMISSIONER OF THE REHABILITATION SERVICES ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

CYNTHIA L. ATTWOOD, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING APRIL 27, 2019.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

STUART F. DELERY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL.

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

RICHARD T. METSGER, OF OREGON, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING AUGUST 2, 2017.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

JASON FURMAN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER AND CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

MARY JO WHITE, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JUNE 5, 2019.

KARA MARLENE STEIN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JUNE 5, 2017.

MICHAEL SEAN PIWOWAR, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JUNE 5, 2018.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

GERALD LYN EARLY, OF MISSOURI, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2018.

DANIEL IWAO OKIMOTO, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2018.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DANIEL BROOKS BAER, OF COLORADO, TO BE U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE ORGANIZATION FOR SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.

DOUGLAS EDWARD LUTE, OF INDIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE ON THE COUNCIL OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION, WITH THE RANK AND STATUS OF AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY.

SAMANTHA POWER, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS, WITH THE RANK AND STATUS OF AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY, AND THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN THE SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

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.

CATHERINE M. RUSSELL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR AT LARGE FOR GLOBAL WOMEN'S ISSUES.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

KATHERINE H. TACHAU, OF IOWA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2018.

UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

STEPHEN J. HADLEY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

JOHN UNSWORTH, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2016.

DOROTHY KOSINSKI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2016.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

DAVITA VANCE–COOKS, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE PUBLIC PRINTER.

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

F. SCOTT KIEFF, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION FOR THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 16, 2020.

UNITED STATES TAX COURT

JOSEPH W. NEGA, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES TAX COURT FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS.

MICHAEL B. THORNTON, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES TAX COURT FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

ROBERT BONNIE, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FOR NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT.

KRYSTA L. HARDEN, OF GEORGIA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF BUILDING SCIENCES

TIMOTHY HYUNGROCK HAAHS, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF BUILDING SCIENCES FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 7, 2014.

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

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.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

MARK E. SCHAEFER, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR OCEANS AND ATMOSPHERE.

AMTRAK BOARD OF DIRECTORS

THOMAS C. CARPER, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A DIRECTOR OF THE AMTRAK BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS.

IN THE COAST GUARD

PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF SECTION 271(D), TITLE 14, U.S. CODE, THE FOLLOWING OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE U.S. COAST GUARD:

To be rear admiral

BRUCE D. BAFFER
MARK E. BUTT
DAVID R. CALLAHAN
STEPHEN P. METRUCK
JOSEPH A. SERVIDIO

PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF SECTION 12203(A), TITLE 10, U.S. CODE, THE FOLLOWING OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE U.S. COAST GUARD RESERVE:

To be rear admiral

KURT B. HINRICHS

THE FOLLOWING OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE U.S. COAST GUARD PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF SECTION 271(D), TITLE 14, U.S. CODE:

To be rear admiral

RICHARD T. GROMLICH

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.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REAPPOINTMENT AS THE CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 152 AND 601:

To be general

GEN. MARTIN E. DEMPSEY

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REAPPOINTMENT AS THE VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 154:

To be admiral

ADM. JAMES A. WINNEFELD, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be admiral

ADM. CECIL E.D. HANEY

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. CURTIS M. SCAPARROTTI

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. STEPHEN W. WILSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. ROBIN RAND

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. RUSSELL J. HANDY

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. ROGER L. NYE

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. DAVID L. MANN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. RAYMOND A. THOMAS III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. MARION GARCIA

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. JOHN W. LATHROP

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. EDWARD C. CARDON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE DEPUTY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL, UNITED STATES ARMY, AND FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN ACCORDANCE WITH TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 3037 AND 3064:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. THOMAS E. AYRES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL, UNITED STATES ARMY AND FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE SERVING AS THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL IN ACCORDANCE WITH TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 3037 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant general

BRIG. GEN. FLORA D. DARPINO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. MICHAEL S. TUCKER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624, 3037, AND 3064:

To be brigadier general, judge advocate general's corps

COL. CHARLES N. PEDE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COLONEL CARL A. ALEX
COLONEL CHRISTOPHER F. BENTLEY
COLONEL JAMES R. BLACKBURN
COLONEL WILLIAM M. BURLESON III
COLONEL CHRISTOPHER G. CAVOLI
COLONEL PAUL A. CHAMBERLAIN
COLONEL WILLIAM E. COLE
COLONEL RICHARD B. DIX
COLONEL JEFFREY A. FARNSWORTH
COLONEL BRYAN P. FENTON
COLONEL PATRICIA A. FROST
COLONEL DOUGLAS M. GABRAM
COLONEL JEFFREY A. GABBERT
COLONEL JOHN A. GEORGE
COLONEL RANDY A. GEORGE
COLONEL MARIA R. GERVAIS
COLONEL DAVID P. GLASER
COLONEL THOMAS C. GRAVES
COLONEL JOHN F. HALEY
COLONEL PETER L. JONES
COLONEL RICHARD G. KAISER
COLONEL JOHN S. KEM
COLONEL ROBERT L. MARION
COLONEL DENNIS S. MCKEAN
COLONEL FRANK M. MUTH
COLONEL LEOPOLDO A. QUINTAS, JR.
COLONEL KURT J. RYAN
COLONEL MARK C. SCHWARTZ
COLONEL SCOTT A. SPELLMON
COLONEL JOHN P. SULLIVAN
COLONEL CLARENCE D. TURNER
COLONEL MICHAEL J. WARMACK
COLONEL ERIC J. WESLEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. KENNETH E. TOVO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. ROBERT B. ABRAMS

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. KEVIN L. MCNEELY

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. THOMAS D. WALDHAUSER

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. DEBORAH P. HAVEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601; AND FOR APPOINTMENT AS A SENIOR MEMBER OF THE MILITARY STAFF COMMITTEE OF THE UNITED NATIONS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 711:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. FRANK C. PANDOLFE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be admiral

VICE ADM. HARRY B. HARRIS, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS CHIEF OF NAVAL PERSONNEL, UNITED STATES NAVY, AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 5141:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. WILLIAM F. MORAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. JAMES F. CALDWELL, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) DAVID F. BAUCOM
REAR ADM. (LH) VINCENT L. GRIFFITH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) COLIN G. CHINN
REAR ADM. (LH) ELAINE C. WAGNER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) PAUL B. BECKER
REAR ADM. (LH) MATTHEW J. KOHLER
REAR ADM. (LH) JAN E. TIGHE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) DAVID H. LEWIS
REAR ADM. (LH) THOMAS J. MOORE
REAR ADM. (LH) JAMES D. SYRING

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN C. AQUILINO
REAR ADM. (LH) PETER J. FANTA
REAR ADM. (LH) DAVID J. GALE
REAR ADM. (LH) PHILIP G. HOWE
REAR ADM. (LH) WILLIAM K. LESCHER
REAR ADM. (LH) MARK C. MONTGOMERY
REAR ADM. (LH) FRANK A. MORNEAU
REAR ADM. (LH) JEFFREY R. PENFIELD
REAR ADM. (LH) FREDERICK J. ROEGGE
REAR ADM. (LH) PHILLIP G. SAWYER
REAR ADM. (LH) MICHAEL S. WHITE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. RUSSELL E. ALLEN
CAPT. WILLIAM M. CRANE
CAPT. THOMAS W. MAROTTA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. KURT W. TIDD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. KENNETH J. IVERSON

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MORRELL JOHN BERRY, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO AUSTRALIA.

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.

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.

DANIEL A. CLUNE, OF MARYLAND, 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 LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC.

PATRICK HUBERT GASPARD, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA.

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.

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.

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.

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.

JOHN B. EMERSON, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY.

JOHN RUFUS GIFFORD, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO DENMARK.

DENISE CAMPBELL BAUER, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO BELGIUM.

JAMES COSTOS, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO SPAIN.

JAMES COSTOS, OF CALIFORNIA, TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO ANDORRA.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

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.

FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

ROBERT F. COHEN, JR., OF WEST VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS EXPIRING AUGUST 30, 2018.

WILLIAM IRA ALTHEN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS EXPIRING AUGUST 30, 2018.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

CATHERINE ELIZABETH LHAMON, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CIVIL RIGHTS, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

JOHN H. THOMPSON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE CENSUS FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2016.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

HARRY R. HOGLANDER, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2014.

LINDA A. PUCHALA, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2015.

NICHOLAS CHRISTOPHER GEALE, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2016.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MATTHEW WINTHROP BARZUN, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND.

DAVID HALE, OF NEW JERSEY, 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 LEBANON.

LILIANA AYALDE, OF MARYLAND, 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 THE FEDERATIVE REPUBLIC OF BRAZIL.

KIRK W.B. WAGAR, OF FLORIDA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE.

TERENCE PATRICK MCCULLEY, OF WASHINGTON, 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 COTE D'IVOIRE.

JAMES C. SWAN, OF CALIFORNIA, 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 DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO.

JOHN R. PHILLIPS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE ITALIAN REPUBLIC, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF SAN MARINO.

KENNETH FRANCIS HACKETT, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE HOLY SEE.

ALEXA LANGE WESNER, OF TEXAS, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF AUSTRIA.

DANIEL A. SEPULVEDA, OF FLORIDA, FOR THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR DURING HIS TENURE OF SERVICE AS DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE 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.

BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS

RYAN CLARK CROCKER, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS FOR A TERM EXPIRING AUGUST 13, 2013.

RYAN CLARK CROCKER, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS FOR A TERM EXPIRING AUGUST 13, 2016.

MATTHEW C. ARMSTRONG, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS FOR A TERM EXPIRING AUGUST 13, 2015.

JEFFREY SHELL, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS.

JEFFREY SHELL, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS FOR A TERM EXPIRING AUGUST 13, 2015.

IN THE AIR FORCE

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.

IN THE ARMY

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.

IN THE NAVY

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. ALOVA 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.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

ELLEN C. HERBST, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.

ELLEN C. HERBST, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.

MARGARET LOUISE CUMMISKY, OF HAWAII, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive message transmitted by the President to the Senate on August 1, 2013 withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nomination:

LAFE E. SOLOMON, OF MARYLAND, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE RONALD E. MEISBURG, RESIGNED, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON MAY 23, 2013.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE EXTRAORDINARY LIFE OF ED SIMMONS

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the extraordinary life of Edward S. Simmons, who passed away on July 16, 2013 at the age of 62.

Edward or "Ed" served in Vietnam as a medic where he was injured, and never forgot his fellow soldiers as he spent the rest of his life organizing benefits for unemployed and disabled veterans.

Ed was responsible for organizing and obtaining over 500 job pledges for Veterans from the UAW and United Steelworkers of America during the "Who Dares Win" relay race from Buffalo to Washington, D.C., Baltimore, Boston, Pittsburgh and Philadelphia to call attention to the need for jobs for veterans. The runs concluded in a cross-country relay to San Francisco in 1996.

Ed was the retired deputy director of the New York State Division of Veteran's affairs as well as being one of the founding members and serving on the board of directors as a co-chair at the Veteran's One-Stop Center of Western New York.

This spring, I was proud to join with Ed and many others to officially open the One Stop Center on Main Street in the City of Buffalo. No one fought harder to make the idea of having a single location with many services to help veterans a reality than Ed Simmons and despite his own physical struggle, no one's smile was brighter as he cut the ceremonial ribbon to officially open this comprehensive and caring site.

It was said that the legacy of Western New Yorkers putting veterans first through the Veterans One-stop Center began that day. I would like to add that the legacy of Ed Simmons' vision, commitment and dedication to putting veterans first now lives on everyday.

He is survived by his loving wife, Onda, sisters Dianne, Marie and Mary, and many nieces and nephews as well as beloved by his late sisters Patricia and Kathleen.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a moment to remember the life of this remarkable man. I ask my colleagues to join me in offering our sincere condolences to his family and our deepest gratitude for his service to our country.

TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE OF BORIS WOLPER

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Boris Wolper, a distinguished constituent who died on July 22, 2013, not long after celebrating his 89th birthday. He was born to Marian and Mordecai Wolper on April 8, 1924, in San Francisco, California.

Boris Wolper was a man of many interests. He enjoyed a successful career as a commercial and industrial real estate broker, and served his community as a member of the Woodside Planning Commission. He loved to travel and was a supporter of many causes and institutions. He loved friends, food, wine, sports, and cultural events. He was a proud graduate of Sanford University and its Graduate School of Business, and attended every Big Game from 1942 until 2011. He was a skier and tennis player, and he loved to hike with his friends Howard Eisenberg, Bob Kohn, Dick Zukin, Paul Kaplan, Roy Goldberg and Joe Samson.

Boris leaves his loving wife of sixty-four years, Marilyn; two daughters, Julie Brenner and Andrea Wolper; sons-in-law Ellis Brenner and Ken Filiano; and his grandchildren Sharon and Elliott Brenner. He is also survived by his sister and brother-in-law, Malkah and Don Carothers, and many cousins, nieces and nephews.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in expressing our condolences to Boris Wolper's family and pay tribute to his long and productive life. He will be missed by all who had the good fortune to know him, and those of us who called him friend will never forget him. Our community has lost a favorite son, and our country has lost a model citizen.

ST. MARY OF THE ASSUMPTION CATHOLIC CHURCH

HON. DANIEL T. KILDEE
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to St. Mary of the Assumption Catholic Church in my district. I ask the House of Representative to join me in congratulating the parish on celebrating 140 years of worship and outreach in the Saginaw Bay Region of Michigan. On Saturday, August 3, 2013, the parishioners and community will recognize this milestone during an anniversary program.

St. Mary of the Assumption Parish, under the leadership of Father Henri Nouvel, held their first religious mass in the Saginaw Valley on Christmas Eve in 1675 on the banks of the river near Saginaw. The existing parish, located in Bay County, was built by Father Martin Godfriend Canters and dedicated in 1874.

It is a true honor, Mr. Speaker, that St. Mary of the Assumption has called the Fifth Congressional District home for 140 years. Our community has been very fortunate to have had such an established institution located in the heart of our region.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives join me in applauding the clergy, staff and congregation of St. Mary of the Assumption Catholic Church and wish them continued success for many years to come.

RECOGNIZING JEWISH B2B NETWORKING FOR CONNECTING PEOPLE AND STRENGTHENING OUR COMMUNITY

HON. BRADLEY S. SCHNEIDER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the efforts of Jewish B2B Networking (B2B) and its founder, Shalom Klein, for his tireless work to connect people and promote the benefits of professional networking in the Jewish community.

Still early in his career, Mr. Klein has developed a reputation for bringing people together and forging relationships. B2B began in in 2010 and has achieved great success. Mr. Klein understood that in times of economic contraction, building relationships is just as important as having the rights skills.

By setting out to build powerful professional networks, Mr. Klein has offered help to thousands searching for jobs, employees or new resources.

At any one of the many B2B-sponsored networking events, you may find hundreds of professionals—young and experienced—looking to make meaningful contacts. I am pleased that many of these events take place throughout my district.

Even with B2B's incredible success already, Mr. Klein has not slowed his initiative. He is constantly looking for new ways to expand and new tools and resources to share.

Mr. Klein has worked so hard to ensure that the success of B2B is enjoyed by the entire community.

After all, fostering these connections not only helps the jobseekers and businesses, but strengthens the whole community by bringing all of its members together. I congratulate Shalom Klein and B2B on its success and look forward to following its future.

NUCLEAR IRAN PREVENTION ACT OF 2013

SPEECH OF

HON. BARBARA LEE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the goals of H.R. 850, the Nuclear Iran Prevention Act of 2013, to prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons and establishing clear controls and transparency so that it cannot move toward becoming a nuclear weapon state. Despite that, I have grave concerns with the timing of this vote as well as amendments made to the bill in Committee.

As marked up in Committee, H.R. 850 places inappropriate and counter-effective restrictions on the President's authority to waive sanctions in exchange for Iranian concessions that would be in the national security interest of our Nation and in the security interests of our ally Israel. By attempting to hobble the President's Article II authority to engage in foreign policy on behalf of the United States, the bill would limit the President's negotiating ability and thereby undermine our diplomatic efforts; this is particularly concerning given that the White House has signaled willingness to restart direct negotiations with Iran.

It is especially counterproductive to vote on this measure before Iran's new president is inaugurated on August 4, 2013. In fact, experts have argued a vote on new sanctions ahead of the inauguration would only benefit Iranian hardliners opposed to compromising their goal for a nuclear Iran.

Lastly, this bill should include language explicitly stating that nothing in its provisions is intended to or may be used as a basis for authorization for war with Iran. The bill as currently written is too open to interpretation and I strongly oppose this Congress granting an implicit authorization for war, especially in the wake of the two wars we have so devastatingly waged over the past decade.

Because of these flawed provisions, I voted against H.R. 850. I look forward to working with colleagues to amend it as it moves through conference.

CONGRATULATING EDWARD F. WALSH JR. AS THE RECIPIENT OF THE 2013 RED JACKET AWARD

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate Edward F. Walsh Jr. as he has been named the recipient of the 2013 Red Jacket Award.

A Buffalo native, Ed is devoted to civic progress in his hometown. An active community volunteer for over 35 years, Ed has held leadership positions with various organizations including the United Way of Buffalo and Erie County, Nichols School, Kaleida Health, and the Center for Hospice & Palliative Care.

Ed currently serves as the President and Chief Operating Officer of Walsh Duffield Companies, Inc., a fourth–generation family–owned insurance agency that is based here in Buffalo.

Presented by the Buffalo History Museum, the Red Jacket Awards are based on a medal given by President George Washington to Seneca leader Red Jacket in 1792. The award was established by the museum in 1957 to honor those who exhibit quiet, unbroken devotion to our region's enrichment. Ed will be presented with the Red Jacket Award at the annual Red Jacket Awards Dinner on September 26, 2013 in the History Museum.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me the opportunity to recognize Mr. Edward Walsh's great contributions and admirable generosity. I congratulate him on this incredible honor, thank him for his continued dedication to our community, and wish him the absolute best in all his future endeavors.

A TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE OF KIP TOKUDA

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, we rise today to honor the life of Kip Tokuda, and pay tribute to his leadership, service, and dedication to the citizens of the State of Washington.

Kip was a Seattle native and a graduate of the University of Washington. Following completion of his graduate studies in social work in 1969, Kip entered public service as a social worker with the Washington State Department of Social and Health Services and gained a reputation for being a strong advocate for children and individuals with disabilities. He was later named to the Washington Council for Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect.

The second son of parents who were incarcerated at the Minidoka Relocation Center, Kip possessed an unwavering sense of justice and equality. A prominent figure within the Asian American community, he served as the president of Seattle's chapter of Japanese American Citizens League (JACL)—an organization which is the oldest and largest Asian American civil rights organization. In 1998, Kip went on to found the Asian Pacific Islander Community Leadership Foundation, a non–profit organization that focuses on social justice, community empowerment, and public service.

Beginning in 1994, Kip served as a Representative for Washington State's 37th Legislative District. During his four terms in the Washington State Legislature, he enjoyed many legislative successes. He introduced his first Day of Remembrance resolution in 1997, which has since become an annual tradition in the Legislature. He served as the co–prime sponsor, along with Representative Mike Wensmen of House Bill 1572, which created the Washington Civil Liberties Public Education fund in 2000. Kip also secured passage of the Special Needs Adoption bill, which helped adoption of special–needs children. He was a strong advocate who helped to pass the Homeless Children's Lawsuit legislation, which provided services for over 60,000 homeless families with children.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that we recognize the life of Kip Tokuda—a true trailblazer. We ask our colleagues to join us in honoring a long career of selfless and inspired service to his community, the State of Washington, and our Nation.

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

SPEECH OF

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union 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:

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of Amtrak passenger rail service, which carried 31.2 million riders in 2012 and provides a vital transportation alternative for commuters and travelers in our Nation's busiest corridors.

More people are taking Amtrak today than ever before, a sign that passenger rail is making a comeback. Ridership has grown substantially during the last decade, with another 3.5 percent gain last year. This year, Amtrak had the highest monthly ridership of its 43-year history with 2.9 million riders in March. Amtrak now covers 88 percent of its operating expenses with ticket sales and other revenue, with government funding needed mostly for capital projects.

I represent the southwest side of Chicago and neighboring suburbs where passenger and commuter rail boost our economy. Chicago's Union Station is Amtrak's fourth-busiest station. In Illinois, 56 Amtrak trains run each day carrying 5 million passengers. In addition, the Illinois Department of Transportation has partnered with Amtrak on three corridors between Chicago and downstate Illinois, and has teamed with Wisconsin to support service between Chicago and Milwaukee. Total ridership on these routes has increased 85 percent since the State doubled its investment in Amtrak service in 2006.

In the bustling Northeast Corridor from Washington, DC up to Boston, Amtrak carried a record 11.4 million passengers in fiscal year 2012. That helps keep vehicles off our congested highways and relieves some of the pressure at our busy airports.

Investment in passenger rail also benefits our economy. In 2012, Amtrak spent more than $1.3 billion on domestically-manufactured goods and services in 48 states and the District of Columbia. The vast majority of Amtrak's spending is right here in the U.S.; less than one percent of Amtrak's procurement money is spent to purchase products from foreign countries. In Illinois, Amtrak employs nearly 1,500 residents.

I am encouraged to see Amtrak ridership growing, and I think maintaining our only national intercity passenger rail network will be critical as fuel prices rise and Americans demand more transportation options. I look forward to finding smart ways to improve passenger rail service for my constituents and others.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting Amtrak and opposing the proposed deep cuts to passenger rail funding in the current transportation appropriations bill that was pulled from the floor Wednesday.

HONORING THE SMALL BUSINESS ADVOCACY COUNCIL FOR ITS COMMITMENT TO STRENGTHENING OUR COMMUNITY

HON. BRADLEY S. SCHNEIDER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Small Business Advocacy Council (SBAC) on the occasion of its 4th Annual Golf

Outing, hosted in Riverwoods, IL, in my district.

The SBAC is a strong and clear voice for small businesses in the Chicagoland area and an important advocate for the interests of those companies and the working families they employ. The SBAC has been speaking up for these businesses for almost four years.

In 2010, with the country still mired in an economic downturn, the SBAC was established as a way to buoy many of the smaller businesses that were struggling. By providing advocacy, support services and educational programs, the SBAC has become a critical resource for our small businesses.

Our business community in the Tenth District is strong because it is just that: a community.

Working together and sharing strategies, being inspired by the innovation of fellow small businesses, companies in the Tenth District have fostered a community of mutual success and prosperity. It is this type of activity that the SBAC promotes and is so important to our economic success in the 21st Century.

Through a tightly-knit network of member organizations, the SBAC builds partnerships and facilitates cooperation, making our community stronger.

Mr. Speaker, advocacy organizations like SBAC are integral to driving the success of small businesses throughout our nation, which in turn will lift the rest of our economy. I thank the SBAC for its work, and I wish only great success for this year's golf outing and SBAC's future.

HONORING THE RE–DEDICATION OF THE E.B. GREEN MAUSOLEUM

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of the re-dedication of the E.B. Green Mausoleum on the occasion of its 100th anniversary. Designed by legendary architect Edward Brodhead Green, the mausoleum opened in 1913 in Oakwood Cemetery in Niagara Falls, New York.

E.B. Green, for whom the Mausoleum is named, is one of our Nation's most prolific and admired architects. During his 72-year career, he designed over 360 structures, many of which are listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Over 160 of his Western New York works remain standing, including the Mausoleum which we honor today.

The E.B. Green Mausoleum is an architectural and historical wonder. Stately columns and gray Vermont marble produce its majestic exterior. Inside, the Mausoleum contains white Vermont marble and stained glass windows, one of which is a signed Tiffany. One of the only two Mausoleums designed by E.B. Green, its design evokes the reflective act of remembering our dead.

The Mausoleum magnifies the already significant historical legacy of Oakwood Cemetery. Oakwood was established in 1852, when Lavinia Porter, daughter of Niagara Falls founder Augustus Porter, donated the land that would become the burial site. Theodore Dehone Judah, one of the central figures in the establishment of America's Transcontinental Railroad, designed the cemetery's original landscape. Locally, General Parkhurst Whitney of Niagara Falls and his three daughters were laid to rest at Oakwood. Celinda, Angelina, and Asenath Whitney are the three sisters for which the Three Sisters Islands are named. In 1882, their nephew Drake Whitney engineered improvements to Oakwood Cemetery.

Oakwood Cemetery's historical significance has been regionally recognized. The cemetery has received numerous awards, including the Preservation Buffalo Niagara Award in 2013, a $5000 grant from the Niagara Falls Preservation League in 2011, a City of Niagara Falls Preservation Citation and designation as a Niagara Falls National Heritage Area.

Many programs are in place to educate the public about the history of the Oakwood Cemetery. The cemetery offers community activities such as guided tours, events that are open to the public, and educational workshops for students. The volunteer group ''Friends of Oakwood'' dedicates their efforts to the upkeep, preservation, restoration, and education of the cemetery.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few moments to recognize the historical and architectural significance of the E.B. Green Mausoleum and Oakwood Cemetery. I thank all those who worked to put together this lovely event, and sincerely appreciate their work every day to promote the incredible history and legacy of Oakwood Cemetery.

ENERGY CONSUMERS RELIEF ACT OF 2013

SPEECH OF

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1582) to protect consumers by prohibiting the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating as final certain energy-related rules that are estimated to cost more than $1 billion and will cause significant adverse effects to the economy, with Ms. Ros-Lehtinen in the chair.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Chair, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1582.

This bill would prohibit the Environmental Protection Agency from finalizing any ''energy-related rule'' that is estimated to cost more than $1 billion if the Secretary of Energy determines that the rule will cause ''significant adverse effects to the economy.'' The term ''significant adverse effects to the economy'' is not defined. In addition, the term ''energy-related rule'' is broadly defined to include any rule that ''regulates any aspect of the production, supply, distribution, or use of energy or provides for such regulation by States or other governmental entities.''

Many of the rules that this bill aims to stop are rules that would directly affect my constituent companies—rules that I too have serious concerns about how they were developed.

I could support a bill that would require the Department of Energy to have an official consulting role similar to the Office of Management and Budget in the drafting of EPA rules where appropriate. For example, I was very frustrated to hear that DOE's concerns about grid reliability were not heeded by EPA during the Utility MACT rulemaking.

I am shocked though that my colleagues are okay setting a precedent where one Department has veto power over another Department or Agency's actions. What's next? Are we going to give the Department of Treasury veto power over the Securities and Exchange Commission or give the Department of Defense veto power over the Department of Homeland Security just because we have concerns about their rulemaking processes?

The Environmental Protection Agency is already required to conduct two Regulatory Impact Analyses, once when the rule is proposed and another when the rule is final, and then this analysis is reviewed by the OMB for accuracy.

This Congress should be able to address the core concerns we have about how these rules are developed without completely gutting an agency's statutory responsibilities and independence.

I encourage my colleagues to oppose this bill. This legislation is unprecedented and duplicative.

ENERGY CONSUMERS RELIEF ACT OF 2013

SPEECH OF

HON. JON RUNYAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1582) to protect consumers by prohibiting the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating as final certain energy-related rules that are estimated to cost more than $1 billion and will cause significant adverse effects to the economy, with Ms. Ros-Lehtinen in the chair.

Mr. RUNYAN. Mr. Chair, I rise today to speak in opposition to the proposed cuts to Amtrak in the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development (THUD) Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 2014.

Amtrak is a vital need for constituents from my home state of New Jersey and to people all along the eastern seaboard. Each day, thousands of passengers take to the railways and ridership on Amtrak has continued to grow over the past several years. Now is not the time to cut their funding.

These proposed cuts in THUD could cripple the railroad system, requiring cuts to maintenance and equipment replacement, which could jeopardize the safety of the thousands of Amtrak riders each day.

Once again, I would like to reiterate how heavily my constituents rely on Amtrak for their traveling needs and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to come together and oppose the cuts included in this legislation.

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

SPEECH OF

HON. JOYCE BEATTY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union 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:

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the devastating funding cuts to the Transportation and Housing initiatives in this appropriations bill, and particularly the cuts to the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG).

Established nearly forty years ago, the CDBG program provides State and local governments across the country with the funding and flexibility to most effectively target resources to local community development needs.

The only Federal program of its kind, since 1974, the CDBG program has invested $135 billion in local communities.

And, in addition to being a critical factor in national economic growth, this program has assisted States and local governments in achieving the kinds of infrastructure projects, job creation and poverty elimination that our communities so desperately need.

In this Chamber, there is often talk of the need to make government more efficient, and reduce wasting taxpayer dollars.

Well, I'm happy to report that this program does just that—it continues to be one of HUD's most efficient programs—with grantees devoting on average 94 percent of CDBG funds directly to efforts that provide benefits to low-to moderate-income families.

Within my district in Franklin County Ohio, CDBG funding has been used for housing rehabilitation, micro-enterprise assistance, ADA compliance, and revitalization of downtown Columbus. These developments have made a real difference in my community.

The City of Whitehall has removed and replaced about thirty-three-hundred feet of curb and gutter along Bernhard Road, enhancing water runoff management in the area—preventing pooling water and possible disease or outbreak.

Recent projects have provided 650 households with access to public transit—public transit that many families use to get to and from work and stores all of which improves the local economy as a whole.

And CDBG funds have given 1400 families in Franklin County, Ohio access to clean, safe drinking water—a project that would have been nearly impossible otherwise because local revenues were just not available.

I'm proud to say that Franklin County continues to leverage $5.30 for infrastructure development for every dollar of CDBG funding it receives, but with the draconian cuts to CDBG contained in this bill, there's simply no way that we can make up the difference.

That's why the National Low-Income Housing Coalition, the National Housing Trust, the Community Development Finance Authority, the National Association of Counties, the National Association of Development Organizations, the YWCA, Rebuilding Together, the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, the American Planning Association, and the Council of State Community Development Agencies have all written in strong support of CDBG funding and the programs it sustains.

And yet, here we are considering an appropriations bill that would literally cut the program in half.

The proposed funding level would be less than when CDBG was first authorized in 1974.

This would tip many low- to moderate-income Americans over the brink into poverty and would negatively impact our communities and our country.

So I stand here today—with my colleagues—strongly opposed to the funding level cuts contained in this appropriations bill.

The Chairman of the T-HUD Appropriations Subcommittee, Representative LATHAM, has said "cutting over $7 billion in programs was very challenging."

I say this to my Republican colleagues, if cutting these programs was hard—I can assure you, the children, seniors, and families directly helped by CDBG programs will have a much more challenging time dealing with the effects of over $7 billion in cuts.

I urge opposition to this bill.

NUCLEAR IRAN PREVENTION ACT OF 2013

SPEECH OF

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I have voted for many of the Iran sanctions bills that have to come before this body in the past, and I strongly believe that sanctions are a crucial tool in the extremely important effort to prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons. But I am disappointed that the House took up and passed H.R. 850, the Nuclear Iran Prevention Act, this week. I believe that the timing and substance of this latest sanctions bill are ill-considered and would have the effect of pushing Iran in the opposite direction we seek.

More than 100 Members of Congress from both parties wrote to President Obama just two weeks ago in support of efforts to "utilize all diplomatic tools to reinvigorate ongoing nuclear talks." I signed that letter because I believe that, while we cannot know at this point whether President-elect Rouhani will in fact be willing to negotiate in good faith to end Iran's pursuit of a nuclear weapon, we must do everything in our power to demonstrate to Iran that it will benefit from ending its pursuit of nuclear weapons. Bringing H.R. 850 for a vote this week, just before President-elect Rouhani's inauguration, I believe, does the opposite, as it indicates an unwillingness to adapt to any adjusting circumstances that may occur. Moreover, it strengthens the hands of extremists in Iran who could use this vote to falsely claim that the American government is not interested in pursuing a diplomatic solution.

Additionally, I am concerned that certain provisions in H.R. 850 would unwisely limit President Obama's authority to negotiate as he sees fit. In particular, the bill would impose a total oil embargo, without providing an appropriate exemption for President Obama to utilize if need be. This creates two problems. First, it diminishes President Obama's ability to offer economic benefits to Iran in exchange for an Iranian halt to enrichment of uranium. Second, it makes it substantially more challenging for President Obama to maintain the strong international coalition that he has developed in support of sanctions. Without international support, our sanctions would be for naught, as Iran would be able to simply continue trading with other countries and would not face the economic harms intended by sanctions.

I support a strong sanctions regime as part of an effort to achieve a diplomatic solution that prevents Iran from developing nuclear weapons. I also support some important provisions of H.R. 850, such as those that provide for new sanctions against Iranian officials who are responsible for human rights abuses. Yet, overall, I am concerned that H.R. 850 will not strengthen the effort to utilize sanctions to achieve a diplomatic solution, but will instead be counterproductive to it.

NUCLEAR IRAN PREVENTION ACT OF 2013

SPEECH OF

HON. KEVIN YODER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to enter into the record my support for H.R. 850, the Nuclear Iran Prevention Act. Unfortunately, I was not present for the rollcall vote on this bill. Please let the record show that I am a cosponsor of this legislation and that had I been present I fully intended to vote: "yea."

The message should be heard loud and clear from America: Iran must abandon its nuclear ambition. H.R. 850 is the vital next step in toughening sanctions on this brazen nation. Iran is an existential threat to Israel, our strongest ally in the Middle East, and a threat to peace throughout the world. Our steadfastness and resolve for peace and stability in the world will see this through.

NUCLEAR IRAN PREVENTION ACT OF 2013

SPEECH OF

HON. DARRELL E. ISSA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following exchange of letters.

JULY 30, 2013.

Hon. DARRELL ISSA,

Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN ISSA: I am writing concerning H.R. 2711, the ''Citizen Empowerment Act,'' which your Committee ordered reported on July 24, 2013.

As you know, H.R. 2711 contains provisions within the Committee on the Judiciary's Rule X jurisdiction. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee and in order to expedite the House's consideration of H.R. 2711, the Committee on the Judiciary will not assert is jurisdictional claim over this bill by seeking a sequential referral. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding and agreement that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the Committee Report and in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

JULY 30, 2013.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding the Committee on the Judiciary's jurisdictional interest in H.R. 2711, the ''Citizen Empowerment Act,'' and your willingness to forego consideration of H.R. 2711 by your committee.

I agree that the Committee on the Judiciary has a valid jurisdictional interest in certain provisions of H.R. 2711 and that the Committee's jurisdiction will not be adversely affected by your decision to forego consideration of H.R. 2711. As you have requested, I will support your request for an appropriate appointment of outside conferees from your Committee in the event of a House-Senate conference on this or similar legislation should such a conference be convened.

Finally, I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Committee Report and in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you again for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

DARRELL ISSA,
Chairman.

NUCLEAR IRAN PREVENTION ACT OF 2013

SPEECH OF

HON. YVETTE D. CLARKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in opposition to the Motion to Concur in the Senate Amendment to H.R. 1911—the Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act of 2013.

This bill will peg student loan interest rates to the 10-year Treasury note allowing the rate to fluctuate with financial markets.

Specifically, the bill would peg the permanent student loan interest rate to the 10-year Treasury note plus 2.05% for undergraduate subsidized and unsubsidized Stafford loans; the 10-year Treasury note plus 3.6 % for subsidized and unsubsidized Stafford loans; and the 10-year Treasury note plus 4.6% for Parent Plus and Graduate Plus loans.

One positive thing that this bill does do is that it caps student loan interest rates at 8.25% for undergraduates, 9.5% for graduate students, and 10.5% for Parents Plus and Graduate Plus loans.

I am disappointed with this bill because it fails to permanently keep student loan interest rates at their current fixed rate, and in doing so increases the cost to borrowers over the next 10 years by an estimated $715 million dollars.

Despite the public outcry over student loan debt, now totaling over $1 trillion dollars, Congress has chosen to make an estimated $715 million dollar profit off of student loans.

This is shameful! We should not be making a profit off the backs of students. Students are our future. An educated populous is what America needs to remain competitive in the 21st century. Balancing the budget on the backs of students is wrong, unfair and shameful!

NUCLEAR IRAN PREVENTION ACT OF 2013

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I regretfully rise to express my opposition to H.R. 850, the most recent legislative effort by this body to further increase sanctions on Iran. Although I believe the intentions of the authors of this legislation are good, I believe our shared goal of preventing Iran from achieving a nuclear weapon will actually be harmed by bringing this legislation forward at this critical moment.

In three days, Iran will inaugurate a new president—Hasan Rowhani—who was elected after he ran on a platform of engaging with the United States and rejecting the extremist policies of his predecessor. Despite the fact that Mr. Rowhani was not the preferred candidate of Supreme Leader Khamenei, he was elected by an overwhelming majority of the Iranian people this past June. In short, the Iranian people rejected an extremist government and voted for the candidate who represented the best opportunity to break with the human rights violations and belligerent policies of the past.

Yet, instead of taking this moment to re-engage with Iran and pursue diplomacy—which is the only way to ultimately prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon—we are instead moving forward with new, crippling sanctions before we have the opportunity to see whether President-elect Rowhani's campaign promises will lead to new, positive action. Even worse, this legislation sends a message to the Iranian people that their bravery and massive turnout this past June in the face of violent repression and intimidation from the government, was a futile and irrelevant action in the eyes of the United States.

In addition to this legislation's unfortunate timing, this bill also contains several troubling provisions which diverge significantly from previous Iran sanctions legislation. The bill contains policy language that changes the red line for war with Iran from the clear position laid out by the Obama Administration to a nebulous position that Iran should not be allowed to obtain a nuclear weapons ''capability.'' The term ''capability'' is not defined in the bill. When dealing with questions of war and peace, it is incumbent that Congress and the Administration speak with one voice and avoid putting forward policy positions are open to interpretation and could pave the way for war.

Additionally, the bill places significant restrictions on the President's ability to waive sanctions in exchange for positive action by Iran on the nuclear issue. In doing so, the bill threatens to fracture the unprecedented international coalition working to prevent Iran from achieving a nuclear weapon.

For all of these reasons, both procedural and substantive, I oppose the bill.

NUCLEAR IRAN PREVENTION ACT OF 2013

SPEECH OF

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 850, the Nuclear Iran Prevention Act.

This legislation will significantly strengthen the impact of existing sanctions on Iran in the hopes of convincing the regime's leaders to stop their nuclear weapons program.

The message to Iran must be crystal clear: stop your nuclear program or face intensifying international isolation and crippling economic pressure until your program stops.

I stand with over 350 over my colleagues who have co-sponsored this legislation in strong opposition to Iran's nuclear weapons program.

Allowing Iran to achieve nuclear weapons capability would start a very dangerous nuclear arms race in a region that is already unstable—endangering our Nation's security and the security of our friends and allies in the Middle East.

Iran continues to increase its stockpiles of twenty-percent enriched uranium, approaching a level where they can very quickly breakout whenever they want. They are also installing advanced centrifuges that would allow them to substantially increase their uranium enrichment at a rapid pace.

This legislation will eliminate sources of foreign funding, reduce oil exports by an additional million barrels per day and apply harsh penalties to human rights violators.

By passing this legislation and ensuring its enforcement, we can continue to enforce the strongest possible amount of financial pressure against Iran.

The window for a peaceful resolution is quickly closing. Through tightening sanctions, pursuing the diplomatic track, and keeping all options on the table, I believe we can persuade the Iranian regime to stop their quest for nuclear weapons before it is too late.

As co-chair of the Democratic Israel Working Group, I urge my colleagues to stand for peace and a nuclear-free Middle East and vote in support of this important legislation.

ON THE RETIREMENT OF SHERIFF WARDIE PERNELL VINCENT, SR.

HON. G. K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate my good friend, constituent, and public servant, Sheriff Wardie Pernell Vincent, Sr. upon his retirement from service as Sheriff for Northampton County, North Carolina.

Wardie Vincent was born on November 4, 1947, to Eugene and Norene Vincent in the town of Henrico, North Carolina. He attended Northampton County public schools and graduated in 1966 from historic Gumberry High School. On October 5, 1967, Wardie enlisted in the United States Army and courageously served the United States of America for two years. He was Honorably Discharged from military service and returned to his hometown where he and his wife Betty would rear three wonderful children.

Wardie Vincent's service in the United States Army introduced him to the important work of law enforcement and the value in maintaining safe communities. He applied the skills learned in the Army to excel in his desire to be a law enforcement officer and pursue training at Halifax Community College where he received a degree in Criminal Justice.

Wardie Vincent's first job out of college was as security guard with the Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers' Association in the Town of Rich Square. He later became an undercover officer working with Bertie, Hertford, Warren and Martin Counties on a variety of critical assignments targeting drug use and gang activity. It would become clear that Wardie Vincent's unmatched skills and experience would lead him to seek the office of Sheriff for Northampton County.

At age 51, Wardie Vincent was elected Sheriff of Northampton County. He would be reelected three more times to this high office, most recently in November 2010 when he ran unopposed. Sheriff Vincent has served a total of fourteen years as the High Sheriff of Northampton County and has overseen the expansion of this office though the hiring of additional Deputy Sheriffs and a strategic crackdown on illegal drugs through the county's drug taskforce. He also modernized the Sheriffs office by securing grants and improved budgeting for updated technology and law enforcement tools. There is no doubt that the Northampton County has been made safer through the visionary leadership of Sheriff Wardie Vincent.

Sheriff Vincent and his wife Betty look forward to spending more time with their three children—Kimberly, Kenisha, and Wardie, Jr. and their five grandchildren—Saige, Kai, Omani, Myles, Caleb, and Kenadi.

Mr. Speaker, the retirement of Sheriff Wardie Pernell Vincent, Sr. will leave a great void in Northampton County. But I know he will continue to play a vital role in his community as a leader, advocate, and friend to his fellow citizens. I ask my colleagues to join me in offering our sincere appreciation for Sheriff Vincent's forty years of public service and best wishes upon his retirement.

TRIBUTE TO LILLIAN KAWASAKI

HON. JUDY CHU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, this month, the Los Angeles Area lost a wonderful leader, the environmental community lost a true champion, and I lost a dear friend. Lillian Kawasaki had served the city of Los Angeles since the early 1990s, and while she wore many hats throughout her years in public service, one thing remained constant among them all—she fought to make life better for those around her.

An elected member of the WRD Board of Directors since 2006, Lillian was the first Asian-American ever appointed a department chief in Los Angeles. Lillian began heading the Los Angeles City Environmental Affairs Department in 1990 under Mayor Tom Bradley, and she worked tirelessly to improve the air quality in Los Angeles, spearheading the Los Angeles City Clean Air Plan and the City CEQA Thresholds Guidelines and Environmental Justice Program. In addition, Ms. Kawasaki served on the California State University LA Foundation Board for more than 5 years. She had recently joined the California Small Business Development Center Network Advisory Board.

Lillian was determined to clean up the city that she loved. Beginning as a researcher at UCLA, she worked on wastewater nutrient recycling programs before moving over to the Port of Los Angeles's Environmental Management Division. As a scientist, Lillian understood that the air we breathe and the water we drink affects our communities, our children, and our future, and her passion for a higher quality of life of Los Angelinos is what drove her to public service. She dedicated her life to cleaning up the Los Angeles Area, and her work will be felt for generations to come.

The daughter of Japanese-Americans who were interned during World War II, Lillian was determined to commemorate this part of American history, and served as the co-chair of the Friends of Manzanar, a National Historic Site. Lillian was determined to give back to her community, and was a member of the Women's Foundation Donor's Circle, where she championed financial literacy for women and girls in her community.

Lillian left us not long ago, but her impact lives on. The lives she touched are forever changed for the better, as are the communities she dedicated her life to improving. Her life's work provides an inspiration for all of us. So, today, I bid farewell to a friend, a community leader, and a true role model to so many.

HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF STRATFORD LANDING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Stratford Landing Elementary School in Alexandria, which is proudly celebrating 50 years of providing an excellent education to the students of Fairfax, Virginia.

Built on land once owned by George Washington, Stratford Landing Elementary School officially opened its doors with Principal Eleanor N. Hollandsworth on September 3, 1963 with an initial enrollment of 301 students in grades one through six. This student population would more than double the next year.

In response to a rapidly growing community and an influx of military families the following year, Stratford Landing underwent its first renovation in 1966, adding an additional hallway of classrooms.

As schools across the Nation began to implement kindergarten classes to comply with the Federal Head Start initiative, Stratford Landing opened its first half-day kindergarten program in 1968.

During the 1970s, Stratford Landing initiated one of the first Gifted and Talented Centers in Fairfax County Public Schools, developed to offer a unique academic program to qualifying students in grades three through six from multiple local elementary schools. Stratford Landing also expanded to include two preschool programs, which supported early intervention for young children identified with autism and developmental delays.

Over the years, the school underwent other renovations to add a gym, music room, day care facility, playground, 10-classroom modular unit, and seven learning environment trailers. It also created an English as a Second Language program to better meet the needs of students.

In 2009, Stratford Landing developed and continues to refine a Discovery Garden, supporting environmental and science studies. The school also began offering a full-day kindergarten program with the last phase-in by Fairfax County Public Schools for the 2011—2012 school year.

Stratford Landing continues to stay abreast of technological changes by adding Smart Board technology to all classrooms, increasing the number of mobile laptop carts, investing in hands-on voting systems, and using other technology tools to support the needs of 21st century learners.

Stratford Landing Elementary School, the parent-teacher association, and the school community continue to work in partnership to benefit student success and achievement both in the classroom, on the school grounds, and through diverse after-school programs. And while the school mascot and student fashions have changed over the years, Stratford Landing Elementary School has remained cotnmitted to providing an academically challenging and positive learning environment in which all students thrive.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity to commend Stratford Landing Elementary School as it marks 50 years of providing educational opportunities to the children of Fairfax County.

THE WATER FOR THE WORLD ACT OF 2013

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, as America prepares for the holiday season, it is important to pause and reflect on what we can

do for others as well as ourselves. I hope that Congress will give a gift of life, health and hope by helping people around the world with something that most Americans take for granted—safe drinking water.

Nearly 900 million of the world's poorest do not have clean drinking water, and fully 2.6 billion lack access to improved sanitation. This shortfall poses a significant challenge for development and security around the world, reinforcing a cycle of poverty and instability that represents both a humanitarian disaster and a national security threat.

Water-related diseases are particularly brutal in how they target children: 90 percent of all deaths caused by diarrheal diseases are children under 5 years of age, mostly in developing countries. In all, 1.8 million children under the age of 5 die every year, more than from AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria combined. The economic impacts are devastating—inadequate sanitation in India alone costs that country $53.8 billion, or 6.4 percent of its GDP every year.

What's more, dirty water directly affects every area of development. Children cannot attend school if they are sick from dirty water, and adults suffering from water-borne illnesses overwhelm hospitals and cannot go to work. Hours spent looking for and collecting clean water mean hours not spent adding to a family's economic well-being. In short, the best intentioned efforts at development fail if the basic necessity of clean water is not met.

In this period of good tidings, there is good news with water. The solution to this problem is cheap and relatively straightforward. We don't have to spend millions searching for a cure. Sometimes something as simple as teaching the value of hand washing, or providing access to technology we already have is all it takes to save millions of lives and increase economic development. What we lack is leadership and accountability.

It is time for Congress to act again. The Water for the World Act of 2013 builds on current U.S. efforts to provide those in need with greater access to clean water and sanitation. And in this period of tight budgets, it is important that the Water for the World Act doesn't ask for any increase in funding, but rather improves the effectiveness, transparency and accountability of international aid programs. Given the strains on Federal resources and the depth of need, it is essential that we are able to target our efforts more efficiently.

The Water for the World Act also gives the State Department and U.S. Agency for International Development the tools needed to leverage the investments they are already making by elevating the current positions within the State Department and USAID to coordinate the diplomatic policy of the U.S. on global freshwater issues and to implement country-specific water strategies.

There is nothing more fundamental to the human condition and global health than access to clean water and sanitation. More needs to be done, and it needs to be done well. Taxpayers are rightly demanding better results and greater transparency from foreign aid. This bill provides the tools and incentives to do just that.

MCT INDUSTRIES

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with the gentleman from New Mexico, Congressman BEN RAY LUJÁN, to honor a great New Mexican business, MCT Industries, for its forty-year contribution to the manufacturing infrastructure of the American economy. On this day, we also honor Ted Martinez, the founder of MCT Industries, and the entire Martinez family for their substantial contributions and service to New Mexico and to the United States of America.

To truly comprehend the success of MCT Industries, it is important to first understand the remarkable people behind the company. Born on September 18, 1947, Ted Martinez and his five brothers and sisters grew up in a home with no indoor plumbing. Just like his ancestors who homesteaded the Trujillo land on which he grew up, Ted began working on a ranch at 5 a.m. each morning.

Ted learned of the importance of hard work from his parents, Manuel and Isabel. He watched his parents each work several jobs to support the family. Together, Manuel and Isabel ran a general store, while Isabel also served as the postmaster of the only post office in the area. When Manuel was not working in the general store or on the ranch, he also drove a school bus.

From a young age, Ted had big dreams. Knowing he wanted to do more than run the ranch, he decided to leave home and get trained in welding at the Job Corps in San Antonio, Texas. Although he completed the 12-month program in just six months, Ted could not find a job because of his youth. While looking for work, he lived in his car behind a gas station and ate only one meal a day. Finally, he came upon Eidson Metal in Albuquerque and applied for a job. After a great deal of persuasion and negotiation, the foreman hired Ted. Just two months later, Ted became the foreman of the water tank crew at Eidson Metal.

In 1969, Ted married Anedina, a woman from nearby Garita, New Mexico, whom Ted had known since he was 12. Dina's father, Benerito, served as the foreman of the New Mexico State Highway Department, and kept a ranch of his own, while his wife, Mary, worked as a nurse's aide in Las Vegas, New Mexico. Although Ted and Dina did not have much, their future looked bright. Dina soon became pregnant with their first child.

Even though Ted was working 60 hours a week at Eidson Metal and Dina had a job at the Department of Agriculture, times were tough. Wanting a better life for his family, Ted quit his job when Dina was eight months pregnant with their daughter, Claudine, to start his own business. With $200 and a welding machine, Ted and Dina set out on their own.

As their workload steadily grew, they decided to formally incorporate a business. On June 8, 1973, Ted and Dina founded Martinez Custom Trailers. Having saved up $42,000 they were able to purchase five acres of land. It would be another two years before they saved up enough money to construct a building. Living at the shop in their mobile home, Ted and Dina were able to monitor business around the clock. It was during this time that they welcomed to their home their precious son Bennie. A year after Bennie was born, Dina quit her job at the Department of Agriculture to work full time at the family business.

By 1980, Martinez Custom Trailers ran full-scale production lines of various commercial trailers, and employed 25 people. Ted soon decided to expand from building commercial trailers to building trailers for the federal government. Driven by his profound respect for the military, Ted bid for and won his first federal contract for the Army M353 general-purpose trailer.

Using his Army contracting experience, he bid jobs with Sandia and Los Alamos National Laboratories and successfully landed contracts in the nuclear transportation industry. Martinez Custom Trailers proudly contributed to the nuclear disarmament effort in the USSR by collaborating with Sandia on an inspection trailer for USSR nuclear warheads.

In recognition of Martinez Custom Trailers' success, in 1984, President Ronald Reagan recognized Ted as New Mexico's Small Business Person of the Year.

Business was so successful that, in 1987, Martinez Custom Trailers evolved into a more expansive enterprise, MCT Industries, Inc. Ever eager to expand his federal client base, Ted won a major contract to produce a self-propelled diesel powered U.S. Air Force Maintenance Stand that was slated to be deployed worldwide to service the largest aircraft in the Air Force. With this contract, MCT was able to create even more New Mexican jobs, reaching a height of 240 dedicated employees.

In 1992, 28 years after he had taken a risk by leaving the ranch to enter the Job Corps training program, Ted was inducted into the Job Corps Hall of Fame to celebrate his exceptional career.

After the tragic attacks of September 11, 2001, and the ensuing overseas military involvements, MCT was quickly able to develop and build trailers to support these campaigns. To enable soldiers to rapidly extinguish a fire during convoy operations, the Army needed to field-test two different types of foam fire suppression systems to verify they could perform in combat. In less than four months, MCT designed, built, tested and deployed trailers to Iraq that accommodated both fire suppression systems. Program leaders informed MCT that in less than a week, these systems saved $1 million in Mine-Resistant Ambush Protected, MRAP, vehicles and more importantly, protected the lives of soldiers.

Ted and the Martinez family have always displayed a fierce commitment to the wellbeing of their employees. In 2003, MCT hosted President George W. Bush. Just before President Bush addressed 4,000 people and honored MCT as an exemplary small business, the family joined him in a roundtable discussion on the vital impact small businesses have on the U.S. economy. When President Bush asked Ted about the secret of his success, without missing a beat, Ted said ''my employees.''

The new millennium continued to bring blessings to the Martinez family with the birth of the third MCT generation when Diego Dylan Martinez was born on April 21, 2007. His brother Dyson Cruz Martinez quickly followed 22 months later on February 13, 2009.

Today, Bennie and Claudine carry on their parents' legacy, with Bennie leading the commercial division of MCT Industries and Claudine leading the government division.

MCT's commercial division provides the same support as the government division to its diverse client base which ranges from a local neighbor coming in for truck and trailer customization, to deploying truck fleets of state, local, and tribal governments. In an effort to reduce its carbon footprint, in 2012, MCT installed over 500 solar panels on both the Commercial and Government plants.

MCT's successes have resulted in national recognition of its contribution to America's manufacturing base. In March 2013, Claudine accepted her appointment by the Secretary of Commerce to serve as one of 25 members of the Department of Commerce Manufacturing Council. The Council advises the Secretary of Commerce on ensuring regular communication between the federal government and the manufacturing sector, providing a forum for discussing and proposing solutions to industry-related problems, and ensuring that the United States remains the world's preeminent destination for investment in manufacturing.

To ensure he can continue to provide for MCT's team for years to come, Ted founded We The People, LLC, a real estate development company co-owned by the Martinez Family and MCT team members who choose to join. Four years ago, the Martinez family announced that they would provide $250,000 in capital to the employee shareholders of We The People, and continue making yearly contributions to the company.

In honor of the 40-year anniversary of MCT Industries, we congratulate the Martinez family and the MCT employees for their numerous and longstanding contributions to the state of New Mexico and the United States of America.

TRIBUTE TO MYKE REID

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Myke Reid and commemorate his recent retirement from the American Postal Workers Union (APWU). Serving as Legislative Director of the APWU since 2004, Mr. Reid has been a tireless advocate for our Nation's postal workers and the postal service. He has worked tirelessly benefitting countless numbers of my constituents and many others across the country.

While Mr. Reid has spent many years in the halls of Congress, his life and career began much more humbly. After growing up in a blue-collar family and receiving a Bachelor of Arts degree from Norfolk State University, he began his postal career in 1976 as a clerk in Norfolk, Virginia. He became involved in the union right away, working his way up from newsletter editor, steward, local business agent, state legislative director and state president.

In 1984, Mr. Reid came to Washington to work on a legislative campaign to protect Social Security. He never left. The next year, he was appointed as a Special Assistant to then-President Moe Biller, working on legislative matters. In 1992, he was selected to fill the newly created position of Assistant Legislative Director, which he held until being promoted to Legislative Director in 2004.

Mr. Reid's career is replete with many legislative accomplishments. He played a major role in the enactment of the Family and Medical Leave Act; and reforms to the Hatch Act, the Federal Employees Retirement System Act, the Spouse Equity Act, the Postal Employees Safety Enhancement Act, and the Veterans Employment Opportunities Act. Postal workers have had no stronger advocate, and his successors have big shoes to fill.

In addition to his professional accomplishments, Mr. Reid has been active in the communities of Northern Virginia and Washington, DC. He has served on the Virginia Employment Commission Advisory Board, the Virginia Community College Board, the Alexandria Human Rights Commission, and the Alexandria Redevelopment and Housing Authority Board. He has also been active in advocacy; serving on the boards of the National Consumers League and Planned Parenthood of Metropolitan Washington. Mr. Reid's impact has been felt beyond our shores as well. He served as an international observer during the historic election of Nelson Mandela as President of the Republic of South Africa.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the House join me in congratulating Mr. Myke Reid on this well-deserved retirement. I wish him good health and Godspeed.

THE SUPREME COURT ETHICS ACT OF 2013

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, the Code of Conduct for United States Judges is a set of ethical guidelines, created in the wake of judicial scandals, to protect public confidence in the judiciary. Yet shockingly, the Code of Conduct applies to all federal judges except those on the Supreme Court, our nation's most important legal institution.

In just the last four years, Supreme Court Justices have been engaged in ethically dubious conduct at least eight times—conduct that is explicitly forbidden among all other federal justices. Yet, because the Supreme Court does not adhere to the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, they have granted themselves immunity from the standards of behavior that apply to every other justice in the land.

The guidelines contained in the Code exist to ensure that the public has faith that judicial decision-making is based on the facts and the law, not politics and outside interests. Their intent is to uphold the integrity and independence of the judiciary by demonstrating that those meting out justice are scrupulous in staying free of even the appearance of outside influence or bias. Public confidence in the judiciary suffers when our nation's highest court appears not to be governed by the same clear ethics rules that apply to all other judges.

The Supreme Court's greatest assets are its integrity and the public trust, yet the Court continues to operate without a binding code of ethics. It is troubling that the highest court in the land does not follow the same standards as the other federal courts, and it is long past time to address this shortcoming.

To that end, today I am introducing the Supreme Court Ethics Act of 2013, legislation to apply the Code of Conduct for United States Judges to justices of the Supreme Court. Formal adoption of the Code of Conduct by the Court would begin to restore the public's faith in our judicial system and help ensure the integrity of our country's highest court. Many of the Supreme Court justices were required to follow these basic rules when they were district or court of appeals judges. Accordingly, adoption of an identical Code by the members of the Supreme Court should not unduly burden members of that Court and certainly would not serve as any impediment to their complete and robust service on the Court.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation that will help protect the public's confidence in the integrity of our nation's judiciary.

RECOGNIZING CARL DOUGLAS WEEKS

HON. VERN BUCHANAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Carl Douglas Weeks, who will retire this month from his position as President of the Boys and Girls Clubs of Manatee County.

For more than 42 years, Carl has dedicated himself to the Boys and Girls Club movement, holding several positions before being named Executive Director of the Boys and Girls Clubs of Manatee County in 2000 and President in 2011.

Carl is living proof of the Boys and Girls Clubs' slogan, ''Great Futures Start Here.'' He joined the Bradenton Boys Club at the age of eight and began working there before graduating high school.

During his career, Carl has tirelessly dedicated himself to developing innovative and effective partnerships that have allowed the nonprofit organization to serve more children, more often. Under his leadership, the Boys and Girls Club of Manatee County has become the preeminent children's service organization in the community, serving over 6,000 youth in 2012.

I had the honor of meeting Carl when I visited the Boys and Girls Clubs of Manatee County in 2006. He shared with me an adage that I have often repeated: children are just 25 percent of our population but 100 percent of our future.

His passion and the mission of the Boys and Girls Clubs of Manatee County is to enable all young people, especially those who are most in need, to become productive, caring, responsible citizens.

He has also given time, energy and talents to other community service organizations, including the United Way of Manatee County, South County Community Redevelopment, the Bradenton Kiwanis Club, and the American Red Cross.

I appreciate this opportunity to recognize Carl for all he has done to help young people reach their full potential and his involvement in community service.

RECOGNIZING SIMPSON AND THE 25TH YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF THE ST. PAUL WATERWAY RESTORATION PROJECT

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 25th anniversary of the St. Paul Waterway Project and the leading role that Simpson, a Pacific Northwest forest products company in operation since 1890, played in this effort.

In 1985, the Simpson company purchased a paper mill in Tacoma, Washington along the St. Paul Waterway and developed a plan to revive and clean up the area. At the time, there were 17 acres of underwater sediment to be cleaned up and seven acres of marine habitat in need of restoration.

Located at the Commencement Bay Superfund site, Simpson's plan became the St. Paul Waterway Restoration Project. Simpson collaborated with the Audubon Society, the Puyallup Tribe, the City of Tacoma, the Sierra Club, and the Washington Environmental Council (WEC) Region 10, among others, in the successful restoration of this critical coastal habitat.

The Commencement Bay Superfund project was the first of its kind in the U.S. and has since become a model for industrial and environmental partnership.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I recognize the 25th anniversary of the St. Paul Waterway Restoration Project. Since its completion, we have seen significant improvement in the habitat and in the St. Paul Waterway and Commencement Bay.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, July 31, 2013, I missed two rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on No. 426 and No. 427.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, on July 31, 2013, I inadvertently cast a "nay" vote on agreeing to the Senate Amendment to H.R. 1911. I intended to vote "yea."

On July 31, 2013, I was not present to vote on passage of H.R. 850. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CAROLYN McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mrs. McCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent during the week of July 22, 2013. If I were present, I would have voted on the following:

Rollcall No. 375: H.R. 1542—WMD Intelligence and Information Sharing Act of 2013 (Rep. Meehan—Homeland Security), "yea."

Rollcall No. 376: H. Con. Res. 44—Authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run, "yea."

Rollcall No. 377: Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of both H.R. 2397 and H.R. 2610, "nay."

Rollcall No. 378: H. Res. 312—Rule providing for consideration of both H.R. 2397 and H.R. 2610, "no."

Rollcall No. 379: Gabbard of Hawaii Amendment No. 3, "no."

Rollcall No. 380: Blumenauer of Oregon Amendment No. 10, "aye."

Rollcall No. 381: Polis of Colorado Amendment No. 14, "aye."

Rollcall No. 382: Blumenauer of Oregon Amendment No. 15, "no."

Rollcall No. 383: Nugent of Florida Amendment No. 17, "no."

Rollcall No. 384: Nadler of New York Amendment No. 20, "aye."

Rollcall No. 385: Moran of Virginia Amendment No. 23, "no."

Rollcall No. 386: Poe of Texas Amendment No. 25, "no."

Rollcall No. 387: Walberg of Michigan Amendment No. 27, "aye."

Rollcall No. 388: Cicilline of Rhode Island Amendment No. 28, "no."

Rollcall No. 389: Cohen of Tennessee Amendment No. 29, "aye."

Rollcall No. 390: Coffman of Colorado Amendment No. 30, "aye."

Rollcall No. 391: Garamendi of California Amendment No. 33, "no."

Rollcall No. 392: Fleming of Louisiana Amendment No. 35, "no."

Rollcall No. 393: Rigell of Virginia Amendment No. 36, "no."

Rollcall No. 394: Flores of Texas Amendment No. 41, "no."

Rollcall No. 395: DeLauro of Connecticut Amendment No. 44,"aye."

Rollcall No. 396: Lee of California Amendment No. 45, "no."

Rollcall No. 397: Quigley of Illinois Amendment No. 46, "no" (check past).

Rollcall No. 398: Denham of California Amendment No. 47, "no."

Rollcall No. 399: Motion on Ordering the Previous Question of H.R. 2218 and H.R. 1582, "nay."

Rollcall No. 400: H. Res. 315, "no."

Rollcall No. 401: Jones of North Carolina Amendment No. 48, "no."

Rollcall No. 402: LaMalfa of California Amendment No. 51, "no."

Rollcall No. 403: Mulvaney of South Carolina Amendment No. 55, "aye."

Rollcall No. 404: Stockman of Texas Amendment No. 60, "no."

Rollcall No. 405: Walorski of Indiana Amendment No. 62, "no."

Rollcall No. 406: Bonamici of Oregon Amendment No. 65, "no."

Rollcall No. 407: Kilmer of Washington Amendment No. 67, "aye."

Rollcall No. 408: Nadler of New York Amendment No. 69, "aye."

Rollcall No. 409: Nadler of New York Amendment No. 70, "aye."

Rollcall No. 410: Schiff of California Amendment No. 73, "no."

Rollcall No. 411: Pompeo of Kansas Amendment No. 99, "aye."

Rollcall No. 412: Amash of Michigan Amendment No. 100, "no."

Rollcall No. 413: Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 2397, "aye."

Rollcall No. 414: Final Passage of H.R. 2397—Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2014, "yea."

Rollcall No. 415: Waxman of California Part A Amendment No. 2, "aye."

Rollcall No. 416: Tonko of New York Part A Amendment No. 3, "aye."

Rollcall No. 417: Motion to Recommit with Instructions H.R. 2218, "aye."

Rollcall No. 418: Final Passage of H.R. 2218—Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act of 2013, "no."

HONORING OTTO PORTER, JR.

HON. JASON T. SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a Morley, Missouri native—first round Washington Wizards NBA draft pick Otto Porter Jr. Mr. Porter is not only known for his outstanding athletic abilities as a versatile small forward, but also for his achievements off the court. Otto's parents, both of whom won state championships at Scott County Central High School, instilled commendable values in their son. In particular, the importance of education and holding onto his small-town roots has motivated Otto's strong work ethic and his ability to succeed on and off the court. Instead of focusing his time on the national AAU circuit in high school, Otto Porter worked a summer job, advanced his individual game with the help of his father and participated in select events with his high school team. As a Scott County Central high school senior, Mr. Porter led the Braves to a 29–2 record, averaging 30 points and 14 rebounds a game.

After graduating, Mr. Porter signed a letter of intent with the Georgetown Hoyas. Although he dazzled fans off the bench as a freshman, it wasn't until his exceptional sophomore season that his name was pushed towards the top of the NBA lottery. After averaging 16.2 points, 7.5 rebounds per game his sophomore season and shooting 42.2 percent from the three-point range, Otto was unanimously voted Big East Player of the Year by league coaches. Otto's excellent basketball IQ, high motor skills and improved shooting range make him a strong asset to the Washington Wizards for the upcoming NBA season and years to come.

RECOGNIZING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF DEAN MATHISEN

HON. LEE TERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dean Mathisen for 10 years of service to Nebraska's Second District. Dean is a tireless and devoted public servant to the Second Congressional District of Nebraska and specifically to the veterans in the metro area.

Dean Mathisen serves as a Senior Constituent Liaison in my Omaha Congressional Office and handles military and veteran's affairs. As a former US Army officer and combat veteran of the Cold and First Gulf Wars, his personal experiences aid him in understanding and helping those now serving and returning from the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan. Dean is equally committed to assisting the other ''Band of Brothers'' from our Nation's other wars. Over these past 10 years, his efforts found solutions and answers to complex requests for help with ''government bureaucracy'' by service members, veterans and family members. His counsel has been instrumental in helping me identify the need for and communicate with the Department of Veterans Affairs about bringing a National Veterans Cemetery to the Second Congressional District of Nebraska. Thanks to Dean's efforts, this project is now a reality and will soon break ground providing a final resting place for the 112,000 underserved veterans in the Omaha area that is worthy of the sacrifices they made.

Dean and I first met as members of the Omaha Young Republicans. He also served on the Douglas County Republican Central Committee as a tireless advocate for the Republican Party's message of lower taxes and a strong national defense. In his free time, he has stayed engaged within the veterans' community by being an active member of the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars. He also assists the metro area Boy Scouts with review of rank advancements and other scouting activities.

I offer Dean my sincere appreciation for his dedication and years of service to both our country and to Nebraska's Second Congressional District. I am extremely proud of his accomplishments and am thankful for his years of counsel. Omaha's veterans are better off because of Dean's service.

PHILIPPINES GENEROSITY TO JEWISH REFUGEES

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to a remarkable story, previously lost to history. Namely, how the Philippines generously opened its doors to Jewish refugees fleeing Nazi persecution, when all other nations barred their entry.

I would like to posthumously commend Manuel Quezon, President of the Commonwealth of the Philippines (1935–1944) for his resolve to lobby for immigration rights for Jewish refugees even at great political risk. He saved the lives of 1,305 Jews by allowing them entry into the Philippines and would have saved thousands more had the US State Department had allowed its commonwealth to do so.

An extraordinary tale, President Quezon collaborated with his high-profile associates, US High Commissioner Paul McNutt, Colonel (and future president) Dwight D. Eisenhower, and the Frieders, four Jewish businessmen from Ohio who had a cigar business in Manila, to overcome the huge bureaucratic and logistical challenges of saving people from the Holocaust.

I would like also to recognize the US Philippines Society for giving this story a resurgent voice and hosting a round table on June 10, 2013 titled ''Holocaust Haven in the Philippines'' which focused on an upcoming film documenting this story, An Open Door. The US Philippines Society, which recently opened its offices in Washington, D.C. on May 1, 2012, is a non-profit, non-partisan, and independent organization whose mission it is to build on the rich and longstanding historical ties between the United States of America and the Philippines.

An Open Door was produced and directed by award-winning filmmaker Noel M. Izon. This is the third film in his World War II trilogy Forgotten Stories. The film was co-produced by author and professor at St. John Fisher College, Sharon Delmendo.

The Filipino people extended a warm welcome to those who undoubtedly would have faced horrible atrocity if stranded in Europe. I hope that this story of human generosity and duty to help those in peril may find an audience among the U.S. public so we can appreciate the ingenuity and heroic risks taken by Manuel Quezon to protect victims of the Holocaust.

HONORING RICK SHIOMI'S 20 YEARS AS ARTISTIC DIRECTOR OF MU PERFORMING ARTS

HON. BETTY MCCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the inspiring career of Mr. Rick Shiomi, a leader for Asian-American actors and artists, as he retires as Artistic Director from Mu Performing Arts in Saint Paul, Minnesota.

Rick Shiomi co-founded Mu Performing Arts in 1992 and served as Artistic Director for the next 20 years. Finding that Asian-American theater did not exist in the Twin Cities at the time, Rick worked to bring community voices to the stage. He helped form Mu Daiko, a taiko drumming ensemble, which later became Mu Performing Arts to reflect the broad artistic base of theater, taiko and artistic development. Today, because of Rick's extraordinary leadership and energy, Mu is increasing the size of Asian-American audiences and the number of Asian-American performers who flourish in the Twin Cities.

Thanks to Rick's vision, Mu Performing Arts has become one of the largest pan Asian-American performing arts companies in the United States. He has been recognized numerous times for his outstanding work. His many awards include a 2012 Ivey Award for Lifetime Achievement in Twin Cities theater and a 2007 Sally Award for Vision from the Ordway Center for the Performing Arts. Mu is also a leader in the local and national development of Asian-American theater and taiko. Rick and Mu Performing Arts have helped develop and support the work of local and national playwrights, actors, directors, and musicians by premiering many new works, fostering a new generation of Asian-American artists. Through educational, community and corporate outreach programs the company has provided access to Asian-American culture and arts to communities who otherwise may not have the opportunity to experience it.

Rick's influence has brought Asian-American actors into nontraditional roles in other theaters and helped elevate the recognition of the Asian-American community. Mu Performing Arts is a Minnesota treasure and the legacy of Rick will live on in Mu Performing Arts' work bringing Asian-American voices to the stage in the Twin Cities.

Mr. Speaker, in honor of Mr. Rick Shiomi, a visionary for Asian-American performing art and artists, I am pleased to submit this statement to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in recognition of his retirement as Artistic Director from Mu Performing Arts.

COMMEMORATING THE RETIREMENT OF AMBASSADOR ALLAN KATZ

HON. DEVIN NUNES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today alongside my colleagues, Representatives DAVID VALADAO, JIM COSTA, and DAVID CICILLINE, to commemorate the retirement of U.S. Ambassador to Portugal Allan Katz.

A lawyer by training, Ambassador Katz worked on the staffs of Congressmen Bill Gunter and David Obey before serving as General Counsel of the U.S. House of Representatives Commission on Administrative Review. He then moved to Florida, where he served as Assistant Insurance Commissioner and General Counsel for the State of Florida Insurance Department. Afterward he went into private practice.

In March 2010, Allan Katz was confirmed by the U.S. Senate as U.S. Ambassador to Portugal. A capable and gifted representative of our Nation, Ambassador Katz served with distinction, upholding the United States' long friendship with the Portuguese people. We recognize and commend his fine service on the occasion of his retirement.

ATTORNEY GENERAL HOLDER'S FAILURE TO PROTECT AMERICA'S CHILDREN

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to submit a letter I sent earlier this week to Attorney

General Eric Holder once again urging that the Department of Justice prioritize the issue of human trafficking and specifically go after Web sites like Backpage.com which serve as a conduit for the buying and selling of human beings.

In multiple letters to the Department over the last year I've implored the Attorney General to tell Congress if federal law enforcement does not have the necessary tools to take legal action against such web sites—sites which time and again feature prominently in horrific stories of abuse and exploitation of the most vulnerable among us.

These requests have gone unanswered. The exploitation persists. Attorney General Holder is failing.

Hon. ERIC H. HOLDER, JR.,
Attorney General, Department of Justice, Washington DC.

DEAR ATTORNEY GENERAL HOLDER: Many Americans were undoubtedly heartened to learn yesterday that authorities rescued 105 children from 76 different cities across this nation who had been forced into prostitution, and arrested 150 pimps who were intimately involved in the exploitation of these minors—children ranging in age from 13 to 17. But I suspect that just as many Americans were shocked to learn of the scope and reach of human trafficking in our own back yard. For under the Trafficking Victims Protection Act any minor used in a commercial sex act is a victim of human trafficking.

I applaud the impressive work of the FBI; its local, state, and federal law enforcement partners, including the Fairfax County Police Department and the Loudoun County Sheriff's Office, and the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC). As you know, I have long supported efforts locally and in the annual Commerce-Justice-Science

(CJS) appropriations bill to elevate this issue as a law enforcement priority. In fact in the CJS bill which recently passed the House Appropriations Committee included language instructing U.S. Attorneys to maintain their human trafficking task forces and undertake proactive investigations of persons or entities facilitating trafficking in persons through the use of classified advertising on the Internet. The bill also directs the U.S. Attorney General to submit a comprehensive report on all DOJ anti-trafficking activities, including legislative proposals that may advance any efforts, no later than 60 days after the bill is signed into law.

While the details of this campaign, Operation Cross Country, are still emerging, not unsurprising, Backpage.com featured prominently in the announcement of the crackdown. In fact, a CNN story this morning cited the assistant director of the FBI's criminal investigative division, as saying, ''This seventh iteration of Operation Cross Country also was the most successful, with a 30% to 40% increase in 'identifying both victims and pimps' compared with previous operations.'' The story continued, ''He credited the success in part to an expansion of the probe to websites such as www.backpage.com, which he called a forum 'where pimps and exploiters gather.'

An NBC news story following the raid reported, ''Search for 'Backpage.com' on the FBI's main website and up pops eight whole pages of press releases and public announcements naming the classified advertising site as a tool for sex criminals, particularly those selling children, sex and prostitution.'' Case after case shows that as long as web sites like Backpage.com operate with impunity, impervious to public shame, law enforcement will simply be playing catch up.

In that vein, just last week, an overwhelming majority of state and territorial attorneys general sent a letter to the chair and ranking members of the U.S. Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and House Committee on Energy and Commerce. The letter indicated that ''Federal enforcement alone has proven insufficient to stem the growth of internet-facilitated child sex trafficking,'' and pleaded that, ''Those on the front lines of the battle against the sexual exploitation of children—state and local law enforcement—must be granted the authority to investigate and prosecute those who facilitate these horrible crimes.''

I couldn't agree more, which is why in April 2012, well over a year ago, I wrote you a letter making clear that classified Internet advertising was the latest front in the battle against sexual exploitation and trafficking of minors. Specifically I wrote, ''...if DOJ is of the mind that there are insufficient laws on the books to prosecute this activity, I respectfully request a broader legal analysis and recommendations to Congress of legislative initiatives that may be undertaken to fully equip law enforcement to tackle this problem.'' This was the first of several letters I've written on the topic.

On June 8 2012, I wrote, ''...I continue to believe that unless there is the very real prospect of criminal liability that Backpage.com will fail to change...I recognize that these are complex legal questions but surely we can agree that this is not a complex issue. Children ought not to be bought and sold online. Those who facilitate and enable this practice should have to face consequences. I welcome the best legal analysis the Department can provide in how to ensure that this happens.''

And again, on March 27, 2013 I wrote you, this time including a series of recommendations provided by NCMEC that Backpage.com and similar Web sites used for trafficking could voluntarily adopt to reduce the sexual exploitation of children online. I urged you, as the nation's chief law enforcement officer, to press Backpage.com to immediately adopt these practices and said that if they fail to do so you should ''...take legal action against Backpage.com.''

These last two letters have gone unanswered. The legal analysis has never been provided and the exploitation of innocents continues.

Human trafficking has rightly been deemed the slavery issue of our time. It isn't simply an international tragedy, it's a national and local outrage. For years, the back of my office door featured a giant picture of William Wilberforce—the remarkable abolitionist, and man of faith, who labored tirelessly for decades to ban the slave trade in the British Empire. Wilberforce was part of a broader transatlantic abolition movement dating back to the 1700s. He served as an inspiration for the abolitionist cause on our own shores, laying the foundation for the likes of Frederick Douglas, Harriet Beecher Stowe and even Abraham Lincoln, who 150 years ago this year issued the Emancipation Proclamation.

Wilberforce, famously said, ''Having heard all this, you may choose to look the other way, but you can never again say that you do not know.'' We know that our nation's children are at risk of horrific exploitation that almost defies imagination. We know how pimps and johns use specific Web sites to profit from and prey on their vulnerability. Will you continue to look the other way?

Best wishes.

Think of all the women and children that could be helped. You could make a difference if you act.

IN RECOGNITION OF BAYAUD ENTERPRISES

HON. JARED POLIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Bayaud Enterprises, a non-profit organization dedicated to instilling hope, opportunity, and choice into Colorado's disabled community by providing unparalleled job training and placement services.

Founded in 1969, Bayaud Enterprises has been an invaluable resource to the community. This year alone, they have placed over 600 Colorado citizens into competitive positions. Bayaud uses an integrated approach to help find suitable employment for individuals with disabilities who have struggled to find work on their own. They conduct a comprehensive vocational evaluation to assess an individual's knowledge, skills, and abilities, and then, if needed, provide additional workplace training.

Bayaud continues their commitment to our citizens in need by providing job placement and coaching to our community's disabled population. I applaud Bayaud's commitment to working with Colorado's business community and our government agencies to locate suitable employment for those that previously were unable to do this on their own.

Bayaud's services lessen the impact on Colorado community's social systems and provide positive economic results. Most importantly, employment leads to a sense of accomplishment and the satisfaction that one is contributing to their community.

Mr. Speaker, I know that individuals with disabilities and the economy alike have benefited greatly from the excellent work Bayaud Enterprises has done over the last 44 years.

CONGRATULATING BERWYN SOUTH SCHOOL DISTRICT 100 FOR ITS EXCELLENCE IN PROMOTING HEALTHY SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize and personally congratulate Stan Fields, District 100 Superintendent, Jim Swicionis, School Board President, as well as the administrators, teachers and students of Berwyn South School District 100 for their amazing commitment to and success in implementing healthy school environments for their students through the promotion of nutrition and physical activity.

I applaud Berwyn South School District 100 for taking bold and robust steps to change the way students approach exercise and nutrition. A clear testament to its extraordinary work is the fact that each of its eight schools in District 100—six elementary schools and two middle schools—received awards from the Healthier U.S. School Challenge operated by the United States Department of Agriculture. The Healthier U.S. School Challenge is a voluntary certification initiative by the federal government that recognizes schools that provide

innovative healthy nutrition options and physical activity opportunities for their students. In 2010, First Lady Michelle Obama incorporated the Healthier U.S. School Challenge awards into her Let's Move campaign, awarding monetary prizes for four levels of performance: Bronze; Silver; Gold; and Gold Award of Distinction, the highest level. Berwyn South School District 100 won six Gold Awards of Distinction and two Silver Awards. Impressively, only 12 Gold Awards of Distinction were awarded in the state of Illinois, and Berwyn South School District 100 won half of them. These well-deserved honors reflect the tremendous dedication of the administrators, teachers, and staff of these schools and of the District and its School Board to improving and sustaining the health and nutrition of the students and the community.

To receive awards from the Healthier U.S. Schools Challenge, schools must demonstrate improvements to the nutrition and physical activity of their students across multiple domains, including breakfast foods, lunch foods, nutrition education, physical education, and physical activity. I wish to highlight some of the changes that schools in Berwyn South 100 adopted to improve the health of their students. Perhaps the greatest achievements are the dramatic improvements to the nutritional quality of the school breakfast and lunch menus. Beginning in November 2010, the District 100 Superintendent, School Board, administrators, principals, and food vendor—Aramark—partnered to ensure that each meal served exceeds the nutrition guidelines for sugar and fat content set by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. To complete this task, school stakeholders met with contracted meal providers to eliminate high sugar options and replace them with whole grains, fresh fruit, and vegetables. In addition, the District instituted a ''Breakfast in the Classroom'' program as a part of a district-wide policy in elementary classrooms during school hours, reducing school tardiness while increasing student focus. Schools further improved the nutrition of foods during holiday celebrations. For example, classes are encouraged to forgo candy during Halloween celebrations and focus on physical activities that celebrate the holiday and fellowship among classmates. Some schools also created various Parent Universities during the evenings that provide family-based experiences, such as Zumba and yoga, designed to educate and motivate the community to engage in physical activity. Beyond simply implementing these changes, the District 100 Initiative partners monitored the changes to evaluate the success and implementation of the initiative.

I am deeply impressed by the committed partnership among an array of school stakeholders in the Berwyn South District 100 that resulted in such positive systemic change in the nutrition and physical activity of the schools. I commend the following schools and their principals for receiving the Healthier U.S. School Challenge Gold Award of Distinction: Freedom Middle School, Principal James Calabrese; Heritage Middle School, Principal Laura LaSalle; Hiawatha Elementary School, Principal Marilyn McManus; Komensky Elementary School, Principal Jeremy Majeski; Pershing Elementary School, Principal Marilyn McManus; and Piper Elementary School, Principal John Fontanetta. I also praise the following schools for receiving the Healthier U.S. School Challenge Silver Award: Emerson Elementary School, Principal Beatriz Lopez; and Irving Elementary School, Principal Mary Havis. I laud Superintendent Fields and School Board President Swicionis for encouraging and supporting these schools in their efforts to improve the physical well-being of their students.

In closing, I recognize Berwyn South School District 100 for its excellence in promoting nutrition and physical activity, and I praise its Superintendent, School Board President, School Board, administrators, teachers, staff, and parents for their commitment to improving the health of our students and communities.

THANKING MR. ALESSANDRO ''ALEX'' CUSATI FOR HIS SERVICE TO THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the entire U.S. House of Representatives, today I pay tribute to Alessandro ''Alex'' Cusati, the Chief Engineer at the U.S. House of Representatives. Alex was born in Eboli, Italy and first came to the United States as a young man in the Italian Air Force. After his exchange program, he worked for a CBS affiliate in Alabama where he met his wife Tallulah. Alex and Tallulah have two children, Jerry and Genoveffa, and a grandson, Stephen Benny.

Alex has been a dedicated House employee for 36 years and has had an impact not only on the employees working on the Hill, but also on the public at large. Starting as an Engineer in the House Recording Studio, he rose to the position of Chief Engineer in 1995. He was instrumental in running the House's first TV broadcasts in 1979 and bore the daunting task of maintaining and upgrading the data, audio, and video capabilities of all offices within the U.S. House of Representatives. Alex has been responsible for coordinating and overseeing the transition from analog to digital data usage and the implementation of High Definition TV.

Alex was also responsible for the Recording Studio Media Center, which allows remote broadcasts from committee hearings. Additionally, he oversaw the design and opening of the House Floor Broadcasting Control Room in the Capitol Visitor Center. His personnel file, teeming with letters of gratitude for his efforts from Committee Chairmen, House Officers, and staff from foreign dignitaries, is a prime indication of his commitment to the House and his tireless worth ethic. He is commended by his colleagues for his institutional knowledge, positive attitude, and uncanny ability to resolve any unpredictable issue.

Alex Cusati will be missed throughout this institution. He is a shining example of the committed men and women who quietly and without fanfare, serve the American people in unique and invaluable ways. Their commitment and unwavering work ethic make it possible for us to conduct the vital work of this nation. Please join me in commending his outstanding service and wishing him continued success as he takes on new challenges in his retired life.

HONORING ERNEST ''JUGGIE'' HEEN, JR.

HON. TULSI GABBARD

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Ernest ''Juggie'' Heen, Jr., an iconic son of Hawai'i. ''Uncle Juggie,'' as he was known by everyone who loved him, often shared his gift for story-telling, his sense of humor, keen intellect, and love of Native Hawaiian customs and traditions. He was an accomplished musician who performed Hawaiian songs that are rarely heard today.

Born on August 31, 1930, to one of Hawai'i's most prominent political families, Uncle Juggie was the seventh of nine children. Uncle Juggie learned of Hawai'i's unique multi-cultural traditions and political dynamics at a young age. It was with his friends, many of whom were children of plantation workers, that he began the lifelong embrace of people from all heritages and his passion for service.

Uncle Juggie would often tag along with his father who became increasingly immersed in Hawai's political scene. One particular event where his father brought food to striking dock workers in the 1940s made a lasting impression on Juggie as a child. From that moment, he committed himself to organized labor in Hawai'i. In the 1960s, Uncle Juggie later went on to serve three terms in the Hawai'i State Legislature.

Uncle Juggle was a mentor to many, especially those engaged in the political process. In 2012, Uncle Juggie was honored with the prestigious Lifetime Achievement award from the Democratic Party of Hawai'i. He was also honored by the Honolulu City Council, the Hawai'i State Office of Veterans Services, and the Department of Defense during the commemoration of the 60th Anniversary of the Korean War.

His older brother, Judge Walter Heen, described Uncle Juggle as ''a true character'' and one who ''had the keen ability to perceive underlying issues that people were glossing over and was able to express the essence of those issues very clearly and succinctly.'' Always an advocate, in his final years he became a strong and visible proponent for Hawai'i's Death with Dignity movement—giving the terminally ill in Hawai'i complete autonomy over their end-of-life decisions and care.

Uncle Juggie was diagnosed with lung cancer in 1998. Although it went into remission, it returned to his liver and pancreas a few years later. After fighting courageously for more than two years with the support of the many people he mentored, Uncle Juggie passed away on June 30, 2013.

Uncle Juggie, thank you very much (mahalo nui loa) for your service to Hawai'i and our nation. Your legacy lives on in all of us. Love to you. (Aloha oe.)

RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF PROPER SUPPORT FOR PUBLIC EDUCATION

HON. RICHARD L. HANNA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I proudly rise today in support of K–12 education and our national public school system. I recently voted in favor of H.R. 5, the Student Success Act, as an imperfect but essential piece of legislation to move forward the necessary reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Had the opportunity been presented, I would have supported measures to strengthen The Student Success Act by supporting altered Title I funding allocations as well as reiterating the importance of STEM education at a young age.

The intent of Title I funding within the original ESEA was, and should continue to be, to provide federal funding to public schools with the highest concentrations of poverty. Supporting our must vulnerable populations provides impoverished communities and students with some of largest barriers to educational success an enhanced opportunity to flourish and reach their full potential.

The State of New York alone is home to thousands of public schools receiving Title I funding. We know that in order to prepare our students to succeed in a globally competitive environment, we need to equip them with the most relevant and enhanced resources available to expand their knowledge of 21st century demands. By supporting schools and students who wouldn't otherwise have the resources to improve efforts in early childhood education and emphasizing learning in in-demand subjects like science and math, we can truly support our future.

I will continue to advocate for an enhanced reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act that fully supports our public school system, teachers, and students for a better America.

WINDI AKINS PASTORINI

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to honor Windi Akins Pastorini, for being named the 2012 Texas Criminal Defense Lawyer of the Year and the 2012 Harris County Criminal Lawyer of the Year. This is the latest in a long line of awards given to this extraordinary lawyer. I have known Windi for over 20 years in my work as a judge and prosecutor in Texas, I witnessed first hand Windi's passionate dedication to the law and to her clients. Those who know her best describe her as dedicated, powerful, and relentless.

After graduating from the University of Texas at Arlington, Windi earned her law degree from the University of Texas in Austin. Windi began her legal career as a prosecutor for the Harris County District Attorney's office, and then she became a trial lawyer where she has served for over 25 years. She is an advocate in every sense of the word who works passionately to defend those who are accused of crimes.

Windi's extensive knowledge of the justice system and her incredible work ethic quickly gained her respect from her colleagues in the law profession and citizens of Harris County. Over her career, Windi has a history of victories defending those charged with drug related crimes, white collar crimes, fraud and violent offenses. Her success in defending her clients has led to her inclusion into a selective group of lawyers certified to represent indigent defendants in death penalty cases in Texas. Windi has changed many lives. The fact that she was the defense lawyer has made the difference in the outcome of numerous cases.

Windi has a long history of advocating for victims. Recently, Windi defended the rights of a young 12 year old girl who had been repeatedly sexually abused by her father since she was just 6 years old. One evening, the young girl finally stood up for herself and told her father to leave her alone. After receiving threats by her father that she would "regret her actions", the young girl shot and killed her father later that night in fear for her life. Ms. Pastorini stood by her client and successfully fought for her right of self defense. The young girl was acquitted of murder, providing an invaluable win for abused victims everywhere.

Besides being an excellent trial lawyer, Windi drives Jeep Renegades/Wranglers. Being a Jeep owner myself, I appreciate others who drive such rugged, superior vehicles!

On behalf of the Second Congressional District of Texas, I commend this remarkable Texan for her exemplary service and dedication to Harris County and to the State of Texas. Thank you, Windi, for a lifetime of remarkable achievements within the legal community and for your steadfast commitment to representing the accused citizens of Texas in the court room.

And that's just the way it is.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 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 $16,738,599,194,294.87. We've added $6,111,722,145,381.79 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.

HONORING CARL FISHER

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the outstanding public education career of Carl Fisher.

Carl has been recognized as one of five 2013 Pioneers in Education in Missouri for his commitment and contributions to public education in Missouri. Since he was just 16 years old, Carl has been serving the children in Pleasant Hope as their school bus driver. Now 83, Carl has transported three generations of students to and from school for 66 extraordinary years.

This remarkable feat makes Carl a Guinness World Record holder for the longest career as a school bus driver. However, Carl isn't the only one in his family with experience behind the wheel. Carl comes from a family of bus drivers where four out of five brothers, their father, uncle, and brothers-in-law all have served the community by safely getting students to and from school every day.

I am extremely proud of the work Carl has done for the children and families of the Pleasant Hope community over the past 66 years. His steadfast determination of truly doing what he loves is admired by all. I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating Carl Fisher, recipient of the 2013 Pioneers in Education award in Missouri.

A TRIBUTE TO THE MILWAUKEE SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING UNDERWATER ROBOTICS TEAM

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the accomplishments of the Milwaukee School of Engineering (MSOE). MSOE recently earned the top engineering evaluation score in this year's Marine Advanced Technology Education Center's International competition for Remotely Operated Vehicles (ROV). This year marks the first time MSOE has participated in this competition, and I am proud to support this great achievement.

For the past 11 years, Marine Advanced Technology Education (MATE) Center, which is funded by the National Science Foundation, has used its underwater robotics competition to help students obtain hands on science, technology, engineering and math experience, thereby preparing them for careers in the STEM fields. Through the ROV competition, students gain specialized knowledge and apply their skills in a teamwork oriented setting. Students produce technical reports as well as presentations and displays to showcase their engineering work to competition judges currently in the field. In addition, each team is required to exemplify an entrepreneurial spirit in each stage of the competition. The benefits of participating are far reaching.

A total of 53 teams participated in the 2013 international competition, and 23 teams entered MSOE's competition category. As the theme was ocean observing systems, MSOE's competition mission was to create technology that would assist in installing and maintaining instrumentation to monitor ocean activity in real time to then determine the ocean's impact on the weather. In successfully doing so, they earned the top engineering evaluation score. They demonstrated exemplary efforts and should be proud of their accomplishment.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize the Milwaukee School of Engineering Underwater Robotics team. Through their ability and diligence, they have distinguished their school

and the district. I am honored to pay tribute to MSOE.

CONGRATULATING KAZAKHSTAN ON CONSTITUTIONAL DAY

HON. ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Kazakhstan on its Constitution Day. Kazakhstan celebrates Constitution Day on August 30.

Constitution Day is one of the most important state holidays in the country. On August 30, 1995, as a result of a nationwide referendum, Kazakhstan's Constitution—the supreme national law—was adopted establishing the rules and principles of building Kazakhstan as an independent, sovereign, and economically liberal, democracy.

All internationally recognized rights and freedoms are enshrined in the Constitution, thus making it a modern and progressive basis for a sustainable movement towards a full-fledged democratic system. Democracy is a gradual process and so I commend President Nursultan Nazarbayev for his extraordinary leadership in bringing about equality and unity, and in guaranteeing the growth and well-being of every citizen of the country.

Constitutional amendments approved in May 2007 will cede the powers of the President to the Parliament in a thoughtful way that protects the country's sovereignty and the rights of its citizens. The Constitution allows for accelerated economic reform while maintaining political and social stability and the Constitution consolidates the values the people of Kazakhstan have held for many centuries. It also consolidates unity among more than 120 nationalities of Kazakhstan.

In tribute to President Nazarbayev and all that he has accomplished for and on behalf of the people of Kazakhstan, I enter this statement for the historical record. President Nazarbayev has spared no effort in securing the rights to life and liberty for all Kazakhstanis. Because of his vision, Kazakhstan is also Central Asia's leader and a global leader on issues of importance, including nuclear non-proliferation.

So, once more, I congratulate the people of Kazakhstan on Constitution Day, and I send them my very best wishes for a peaceful and prosperous future.

NATIONAL HEALTH CENTER WEEK

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge August 11 through 17, 2013, as National Health Center Week. America's community health centers are at the core of our health care system; the nation's safety net, delivering accessible, high quality, cost effective primary and preventative care to all individuals regardless of their ability to pay.

Health centers, located in medically underserved areas and locally-controlled by patient-majority boards, make each health center responsive to the needs of the individual community it serves. Currently, there are more than 1,200 health centers serving as health homes for more than 22 million individuals at more than 9,000 locations across the country.

Health centers offer patient-focused, coordinated health care—preventive and primary care that families and individuals need, where and when they need it.

Health centers employ more than 9,500 physicians and more than 6,300 nurse practitioners, physician assistants, certified nurse midwives, social workers, case managers, and community health workers. These employees are part of a multi-disciplinary clinical team designed to treat the whole patient; coordinating care and managing chronic disease, at the same time reducing unnecessary, avoidable and wasteful use of health resources.

The health home model that health centers use is at the forefront of pioneering and goes beyond primary medical care. They provide behavioral health and dental services, case management and enabling services to ensure care is provided in an efficient and timely manner.

The health center model has proven to be an effective means of overcoming access barriers for the medically underserved. In doing so, health care outcomes are improved and health care costs are reduced. This unique model allows health centers to save the healthcare system approximately $24 billion annually by keeping patients out of costlier health care settings, such as emergency rooms.

As locally owned and operated small businesses, health centers serve as critical economic engines helping to power local economies, particularly in times of recession. In these difficult economic times, health centers are economic drivers in their communities. In 2009 alone, health centers generated $20 billion in combined economic impact and were responsible for creating nearly 200,000 jobs in areas hit hardest by the recession.

This year, over 400 communities nationwide submitted applications seeking a health center with only 25 new centers anticipated, demonstrating an overwhelming demand for access to comprehensive primary care across the nation. Health centers are expected to become the health care home for many new patients, but the demand for health centers continues to outpace growth, considering many existing health centers are already at capacity. Health centers are committed to expanding and meeting the needs of the communities they serve in order to grow their reach to more individuals who lack regular access to a health care home.

National Health Center Week offers the opportunity to recognize America's health centers, their staff, board members, and all those responsible for the continued success and growth of the program since its creation almost 50 years ago. During this National Health Center Week, we recognize the multitude of ways in which America's Health Centers transform care in local communities by delivering comprehensive, high quality, cost effective, and accessible health care.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in celebrating the community health centers in recognizing August 11 through 17, 2013 at National Health Center Week. I encourage everyone to visit their local health center and celebrate the important partnership between America's Health Centers and the communities they serve.

RECOGNIZING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COUNCIL FOR RESPONSIBLE NUTRITION

HON. JARED POLIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Council for Responsible Nutrition (CRN) on its 40th Anniversary.

CRN is the leading trade association representing dietary supplement manufacturers, ingredient suppliers, and companies that supply services for the supplement industry—all of which are committed to responsible industry.

CRN was formed in 1973 by three companies, with the primary objective to establish an association of dietary supplement companies with a strong commitment to science, research and a collaborative approach to working with Congress and government agencies on issues that affect dietary supplements and nutrition.

As the respected voice of the dietary supplement industry, CRN has been at the forefront of supporting landmark legislation and regulation that benefit consumers; playing a key role in the passage of the Nutrition Labeling Education Act of 1990 and the Dietary Supplement Health and Education Act of 1994 (DSHEA).

CRN worked collaboratively with the Food and Drug Administration and the Federal Trade Commission on the implementation of DSHEA, urging the creation and promulgation of Good Manufacturing Practices specific to dietary supplements, and created a voluntary, self-regulatory advertising review program to monitor false, deceptive and misleading dietary supplement advertising.

For consumers, the ''Life . . . Supplemented'' campaign exemplifies CRN's commitment to helping individuals create a healthier lifestyle by offering actionable suggestions and educational information about the three pillars of a smart wellness regimen: healthy diet, exercise and dietary supplements.

M. Speaker, CRN has created an environment that allows companies to responsibly develop, manufacture and market dietary supplements and nutritional ingredients that enable consumers to live healthier lives. It continues to serve as a credible and respected scientific resource for Congress, regulators, scientists, journalists and consumers on all matters related to dietary supplements, including demonstrating the health-related and economic benefits that dietary supplements can provide.

As a co-chair of the Dietary Supplement Caucus, it is my pleasure to congratulate the Council for Responsible Nutrition on its anniversary, as well as the influence it has had on the dietary supplements over its 40-year history, and the promise it gives for industry and consumers alike in the years to come.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE DECREASE UNSAFE TOXINS ACT

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Decrease Unsafe Toxins (D.U.S.T.) Act, which would ban children's cushioned products that contain an unacceptable level of toxic flame retardant chemicals. In doing so, this bill would reduce infant and children exposure to these harmful chemicals.

This bill would set a maximum level of 1,000 parts per million for the toxic chemicals in the filling materials used in products, such as high chairs, strollers, bouncers, infant walkers, changing pads, and baby carriers.

Studies clearly show that exposure to these toxic chemicals may be associated with cancer, birth defects, immune disruption, reproductive disorders, hormonal imbalances, and neurologic and mental development disorders. Toddlers who crawl in the dust and put their hands in their mouths have three to four times the levels of toxic flame retardants in their bodies compared to their parents. This is at an age when their neurological and reproductive organs are still developing and they are the most vulnerable to the toxic effects of the chemicals.

In addition to the potential health hazards, flame retardants have not been found to significantly improve fire safety or prevent ignitions from small flame sources. According to data from fire protection groups, such as the National Fire Protection Association, no fire safety benefit exists from including flame retardant chemicals in these products.

Our current regulatory system does not protect our children from such toxic chemicals. We must act now to help reduce our exposure and protect our most vulnerable, our children.

The legislation has been endorsed by the Green Science Policy Institute, Women's Voices for the Earth, Clean Production Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility, First Focus, Environmental Working Group, Zero to Three, IKEA North America Services, and the U.S. Public Interest Research Group (PIRG), Children's Defense Fund, and Alaska Community Action on Toxins. I hereby submit for the RECORD letters of support from these organizations and urge the House of Representatives to consider this bill to improve the health of infants and kids in communities across America.

GREEN SCIENCE POLICY INSTITUTE,
Berkeley, CA, July 17, 2013.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN DELAURO: The Green Science Policy Institute is writing in support of the Decrease Unsafe Toxins (DUST) Act that will be introduced in the 113th Congress. The DUST Act seeks to amend the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 to ban flame retardant chemicals from use in resilient filling materials in children's products.

At Green Science Policy Institute independent research and scientific integrity guide our mission to promote responsible use of chemicals, ensuring a healthy planet for current and future generations. We provide unbiased scientific data to facilitate informed decision-making about the use of chemicals in consumer products. We encourage scientists to use their research in the public interest. We are currently focusing on reducing the use of unnecessary flame retardants due to their adverse impacts on human and environmental health.

Flame retardant chemicals are currently added to the foam of baby products and furniture to meet California Furniture Flammability Standard Technical Bulletin 117 (TB117). Flame retardant use in California furniture and juvenile products to meet 1B117 has not led to a measurable improvement in fire safety. The use of some halogenated flame retardants may actually decrease fire safety since they can increase the amount of soot, smoke, carbon monoxide and other toxic gases produced when a product does burn. The soot and smoke can impede escape and toxic gases, rather than flames, are the largest cause of fire deaths. Importantly, baby products do not pose a fire hazard.

TB117 is scheduled to be updated on January 1, 2014 so flame retardants will no longer be needed in children's product foam in California. DUST Act legislation will align with this important change.

Working in collaboration with researchers at Duke University and the San Francisco Estuary Institute, Green Science Policy Institute collected foam samples from baby products and found that 80% of products tested contained chemical flame retardants which are either known to be associated with adverse health effects or lack adequate health information.

Children and infants are most sensitive to the adverse health effects of these chemicals, some of which have been linked with reduced IQ, learning disorders, reduced fertility, thyroid disruption and cancer. Babies are born with these chemicals in their bodies and get a further dose from their mother's milk and exposure to baby products.

The average American home can contain pound levels of these chemicals. Flame retardant chemicals leak from products into dust. Dust gets on hands and food. Babies and children crawl, sit and play on the floor where dust settles. They explore the world by putting things in their mouths.

We urge Congress to adopt the DUST Act to protect infants and children from these unnecessary harmful toxins.

Sincerely,

DR. ARLENE BLUM,
Executive Director.
DR. VEENA SINGLA,
Associate.

PHYSICIANS FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY—LOS ANGELES,
Los Angeles, CA, July 30, 2013.

Re Support the Decrease Unsafe Toxins (DUST) Act

Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN DELAURO: On behalf of Physicians for Social Responsibility—Los Angeles, we write to express our strong support for the Decrease Unsafe Toxins (DUST) Act that will be introduced in the 113th Congress. The DUST Act amends the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 to ban flame retardants chemicals from use in the resilient filling materials in infant and children's products.

PSR–LA is a 5,000 member strong organization representing physicians and other health professionals dedicated to promoting healthy communities and advocating for social and environmental justice. We have a long history of educating the medical community about the gravest environmental threats to human health, and working to eliminate health inequalities caused by environmental exposures.

Flame retardants chemicals have been added to the filling materials of children products and furniture to meet the California Standard Technical Bulletin (TB) 117, which has become the de facto national standard for furniture manufacturers. Flame retardant chemicals continuously migrate out of household products and settle into dust, which is inhaled and ingested by people and pets.

Research shows that exposure to toxic flame retardant chemicals can be associated with increased cancer, neurological deficits, developmental problems and reduced fertility. Although some flame retardants were removed from children's sleepwear in the 1970s, similar flame retardants continue to be used in children products such as nursing pillows, car seats, sleeping wedges, portable crib mattresses, baby carriers, strollers and changing table pads, despite the fact that these products do not pose a fire hazard. Toddlers who crawl in the dust and put their hands in their mouths have the some of the highest levels of toxic flame retardant chemicals in their bodies. This is at an age when their neurological and reproductive organs are still developing and they are highly vulnerable to the toxic effects of the chemicals.

California is revising its TB 117 because of the strong evidence that flame retardants used to meet the standard have not provided greater protection from fires, and can in fact make fires more dangerous. While this standard revision is a positive change, companies will not be required to abandon the use of flame retardant chemicals. For that reason, the DUST Act is necessary to protect children from toxic chemicals, and we urge its immediate passage.

Sincerely,

ANA MASCAREÑAS,
Policy & Communications Director.
MARTHA DINA ARGÜELLO,
Executive Director.

PUBLIC INTEREST RESEARCH GROUP (PIRG), FEDERATION OF STATE PIRGS,
Washington, DC, July 26, 2013.

Hon. ROSA DELAURO,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN DELAURO: We write in support of the Decrease Unsafe Toxins (DUST) Act that will be introduced in the 113th Congress. The DUST Act amends the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 to ban toxic flame retardant chemicals from use in the resilient filling materials in infant and children's products. Accumulation of flame retardant chemicals in humans and animals and adverse health effects in animals have been well documented in a large body of peer reviewed literature. Studies have found associations between high levels and reduced IQ in children, endocrine and thyroid disruption, changes in male hormone levels and reduced fertility, increased time to become pregnant in women, adverse birth outcomes, impaired development, and cancer. Children are especially at risk for exposure to flame retardants in household dust because they crawl on floors and have the tendency to puts hands, toys, and other objects in their mouths. In addition to the potential for adverse health effects from exposure to toxic flame retardants, infants and children to have critical periods of development during which exposure to toxic substances can cause increased susceptibility to disease, which might not become apparent until later in life.[1] Finally, adding flame retardant chemicals to baby products has not been shown to be effective in saving life or property.

Manufacturers put flame retardant chemicals into baby products to meet Technical

Bulletin 117 (TB 117), a unique California flammability standard for foam in juvenile products and upholstered furniture implemented by the California Bureau of Electronic and Appliance Repair, Home Furnishings and Thermal Insulation (the Bureau) that has recently been revised to address concerns about flame retardants in children's products.

Recent research has detected flame retardants in the majority of baby products tested. A 2011 study identified flame retardants in 80 of 101 baby products from across the U.S. and from Canada.[2] Another study released in January 2012 found flame retardants in 17 of 20 tested baby products.[3] These tests indicated that chlorinated Tris is the most prevalent flame retardant in children's products in concentrations ranging up to five percent. The most prevalent chemical found is TDCPP, or Tris (1,3-dichloro–2–propyl) phosphate, which was removed from children's pajamas in the 1970s when it was discovered to be mutagenic. TDCPP was designated as a carcinogen by the State of California under Proposition 65 in October 2011 based on laboratory studies finding increases in kidney, liver, and testicular tumors as well as evidence of mutagenicity. Previously, a Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) assessment designated the chemical as a probable carcinogen. A 2011 study tested the chemical's effects on the development of brain cells and compared its effects to those of chlorpyrifos, a pesticide known to be toxic to the nervous system. By some measures, TDCPP was even more toxic to the cells than chlorpyrifos, with effects on cell development, number, and DNA synthesis.[4]

Adding flame retardant chemicals to baby products has not been shown to be effective in saving life or property. An analysis of fire data from 1980 to 2005 by the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA)—years when TB 117–compliant furniture containing these chemicals was sold much more in California than in other states—does not show a greater reduction in the rate of fire deaths in California compared to that of other states where the chemicals were used less frequently.

Fire prevention is the first step in avoiding the unnecessary and excessive use of harmful flame retardant chemicals. Fire-safe cigarettes, sprinklers, and smoke detectors, along with the enforcement of improved building codes, are all proven to be effective in reducing fire-related deaths. Good product design can also reduce and eliminate the need for chemical flame retardants by using less flammable materials or by placing a physical barrier between the flammable component and outside materials. Finally, safer alternatives to chlorinated and brominated flame retardants that still meet applicable flammability standards have been identified. The EPA recently acknowledged that there is no evidence to substantiate claims that the use of certain flame retardants has resulted in a reduced incidence of fires.

Thank you for your leadership in protecting America's consumers and children from toxic flame retardants. We urge the Congress to adopt the DUST Act to protect infants and children from these dangerous chemicals.

Sincerely,

JENNY LEVIN,
U.S. PIRG Public Health Advocate.

[1] Growing Up Toxic: Chemical Exposures and Increases in Developmental Disease. Frontier Group, U.S. PIRG Education. 2011

[2] Hidden Hazards in the Nursery. Washington Toxics Coalition/Safer States. 2012.

[3] Identification of Flame Retardants in Polyurethane foam Collected from Baby Products. Heather M. Stapelton, Susan Klosterhaus, Alex Keller, P. Lee Ferguson, Saskia van Bergen, Ellen Cooper, Thomas F. Webster, and Arlene Blum. Environmental Science & Technology.

[4] Hidden Hazards in the Nursery. Washington Toxics Coalition/Safer States. 2012.

WOMEN'S VOICES FOR THE EARTH,
Missoula, MT, July 24, 2013.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN DELAURO: We write in support of the Decrease Unsafe Toxins (DUST) Act that will be introduced in the 113th Congress. The DUST Act amends the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 to ban flame retardants chemicals from use in the resilient filling materials in infant and children's products.

Flame retardants chemicals have been added to the filling materials of children products and furniture to meet the California Standard Technical Bulletin (TB) 117, which has become the de facto national standard for furniture manufacturers. Flame retardant chemicals continuously migrate out of household products and settle into dust.

Research shows that exposure to toxic flame retardant chemicals can be associated with increased cancer, neurological deficits, developmental problems and reduced fertility. Although some flame retardants were removed from use in children sleepwear in the 1970s, similar flame retardants continue to be used in children products such as nursing pillows, car seats, sleeping wedges, portable crib mattresses, baby carriers, strollers and changing table pads. Toddlers who crawl in the dust and put their hands in their mouths have the highest levels of toxic flame retardant chemicals in their bodies. This is at an age when their neurological and reproductive organs are still developing and they are the most vulnerable to the toxic effects of the chemicals.

Based on recent studies and laboratory research, the California standard TB 117 has not been found to significantly improve fire safety or prevent ignitions from small flame sources. Furthermore, such baby products do not pose a fire hazard. According to fire protection groups, flame retardants have not led to improvements in fire safety and pose an unnecessary health hazard.

We urge the Congress to adopt the DUST Act to protect innocent infants and children from these harmful toxins.

Sincerely,

JAMIE MCCONNELL,
Director of Programs and Policy.

IKEA NORTH AMERICA SERVICES, LLC,
Conshohocken, PA.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN DELAURO, We are contacting you as a follow-up on the letter addressed to you that I gave to Ms. Treefa Aziz when I met her in your office on April 26th, 2013. Please find the letter enclosed. We are wondering if your office is following the CPSC NPR for the 16 CFR 1634 Rulemaking? Please let us know if you have any questions in this regard. IKEA has extensive experience with flammability testing of upholstered furniture, both here in the US and in Europe.

We also write in support of the Decrease Unsafe Toxins (DUST) Act that will be introduced in the 113th Congress. The DUST Act amends the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 to ban flame retardants chemicals from use in the resilient filling materials in infant and children's products. IKEA actively work to eliminate, replace and reduce environmentally hazardous substances in our products and manufacturing processes. Our focus is to minimize the impact IKEA products have on humans and the environment.

Sincerely,

MALIN NÄSMAN,
Product Requirements & Compliance Specialist.

FIRST FOCUS CAMPAIGN FOR CHILDREN,
Washington, DC, July 22, 2013.

Hon. ROSA DELAURO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN DELAURO: I am writing on behalf of the First Focus Campaign for Children, a bipartisan advocacy organization committed to making children and their families a priority in federal policy and budget decisions, to express our support for the Decrease Unsafe Toxins (DUST) Act to be introduced in the 113th Congress.

The First Focus Campaign for Children is a strong advocate for banning flame retardant chemicals from being used in filling materials in children's products. Flame retardant chemicals have been found in over 80 percent of children's cushioned products, such as strollers, changing pads, and high chairs, according to a 2011 study published in Environmental Science and Technology. These chemicals, such as organohalogen and organophosphorous, are toxic and lead to problems like reduced IQ hyperactivity, and birth defects. Other flame retardant chemicals found in children's products have been linked to cancer, immune and endocrine disruption, developmental impairment, and reproductive dysfunction.

Flame retardant chemicals are known to settle in the dust on the ground, making toddlers at greatest risk of being exposed. Toddlers play on the floor and put their hands in their mouth, ingesting the contaminated dust. Studies have shown that flame retardant chemicals are not necessary and do not significantly improve fire safety, nor do they reduce the risk of ignition from small flame sources.

The Decrease Unsafe Toxins (DUST) Act helps to ensure the safety of children and infants by banning the use of flame retardant chemicals in the resilient filling materials in children's products. This Act would deem any children's product with flame retardant chemicals as a ''banned hazardous substance'' under the Federal Hazardous Substances Act if it is manufactured a year after the passage of the Act.

First Focus Campaign for Children applauds the introduction of the Decrease Unsafe Toxins (DUST) Act and we look forward to working with your office to help ensure that products are safe for children.

Sincerely,

BRUCE LESLEY,
First Focus Campaign for Children.

ENVIRONMENTAL WORKING GROUP,
Washington, DC, July 29, 2013.

Hon. ROSA DELAURO,
Rayburn House Office Building,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN DELAURO, Environmental Working Group is pleased to support your Decrease Unsafe Toxic Chemicals (DUST) Act. The DUST Act is an important piece of legislation that would amend the Consumer Safety Improvement Act of 2008 to ban the use of certain flame-retardants in the padding and foam parts of children's products. The use of these chemicals is unsafe and exposes children to unnecessary health risks.

Many chemical fire retardants used in children's items can be toxic to human health. Maternal exposure to a type of chemical fire retardant known as polybrominated diphenyl ethers (PBDEs) alters thyroid hormone levels and affect children's neurodevelopment.

PBDEs were withdrawn from commerce in the mid–2000s due to toxicity concerns, but replacement chemicals show worrisome signs of toxicity to human health.

Fire retardant chemicals have been added to products because of a nationally recognized safety standard set by California known as the Furniture Flammability Standard Technical Bulletin (TB117). But as evidence has mounted on the toxicity of PBDEs and replacement chemicals, experts have concluded that children's products do not pose a significant fire hazard, and TB117 is being revised.

Infants and children are especially vulnerable to chemical exposure, and coupled with the significant amount of time spent crawling and playing on the ground where dust accumulates only increases their direct exposure through inhalation and hand to mouth contact. A 2008 study of PBDE concentrations in American families found that young children had much higher concentrations of these chemicals than their mothers, presumably due to greater contact with fire retarded furniture and contaminated house dust.

The DUST Act would work to reduce the number of unnecessary health risks posed to young children by banning the use of certain flame-retardants in children's products. It would also treat any product manufactured on or after one year after the enactment of the DUST Act with more than 1,000 parts per million of a flame-retardant as a banned hazardous substance.

The commonsense proposals in the DUST Act will protect public health and our most vulnerable populations. EWG strongly supports the bill and looks forward to working with you to ensure its enactment.

Sincerely,

KENNETH A. COOK.
President.

CHILDREN'S DEFENSE FUND,
July 30, 2013.

Hon. ROSA L. DELAURO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN DELAURO: The Children's Defense Fund applauds your effort to protect infants and young children from harmful chemicals during their critical developmental years. We offer our support of your ''Decrease Unsafe Toxins (DUST) Act'', which will ensure companies do not use toxic flame retardants in the production of cushioned children's products. By classifying products created with such chemicals as ''banned hazardous substances,'' the DUST Act will prevent children from harmful toxins via car seats, nursing pillows, strollers and other items.

For forty years, the Children's Defense Fund has worked to ensure all children in America get the healthy start they need to survive and thrive. This includes paying attention to environmental health hazards that threaten their health and development. Preventing the exposure of infants and young children to harmful chemicals during their early years is critical to their development. A recent study conducted by the Pediatric Academic Societies demonstrated that prenatal exposure to flame retardant chemicals is associated with hyperactivity and lower intelligence in early childhood. Yet toddlers have been proven to have the highest levels of flame retardant chemicals in their systems—higher even than adults. The developmental consequences of this continue after exposure; the largest cognitive deficits were observed in children over age five.

By reducing the amount of toxins young children are exposed to during their critical early years and preventing developmental delays, your bill strengthens the foundation necessary for children to succeed later in life. We commend you for encouraging congressional action to allow all infants and young children a healthy start in life and so appreciate your ongoing leadership on behalf of children and families.

Sincerely yours,

MARIAN WRIGHT EDELMAN.

CLEAN PRODUCTION ACTION,
July 26, 2013.

Re Support the Decrease Unsafe Toxins (DUST) Act

Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN DELAURO: We write in support of the Decrease Unsafe Toxins (DUST) Act that will be introduced in the 113th Congress. The DUST Act amends the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 to ban flame retardants chemicals from use in the resilient filling materials in infant and children's products.

Flame retardants chemicals have been added to the filling materials of children products and furniture to meet the California Standard Technical Bulletin (TB) 117, which has become the de facto national standard for furniture manufacturers. Flame retardant chemicals continuously migrate out of household products and settle into dust, which is inhaled and ingested by people and pets.

Research shows that exposure to toxic flame retardant chemicals can be associated with increased cancer, neurological deficits, developmental problems and reduced fertility. Although some flame retardants were removed from children's sleepwear in the 1970s, similar flame retardants continue to be used in children products such as nursing pillows, car seats, sleeping wedges, portable crib mattresses, baby carriers, strollers and changing table pads, despite the fact that these products do not pose a fire hazard. Toddlers who crawl in the dust and put their hands in their mouths have the some of the highest levels of toxic flame retardant chemicals in their bodies. This is at an age when their neurological and reproductive organs are still developing and they are highly vulnerable to the toxic effects of the chemicals.

California is revising its TB 117 because of the strong evidence that flame retardants used to meet the standard have not provided greater protection from fires, and can in fact make fires more dangerous. While this standard revision is a positive change, companies will not be required to abandon the use of flame retardant chemicals. For that reason, the DUST Act is necessary to protect children from toxic chemicals, and we urge its immediate passage.

Sincerely,

BEVERLEY THORPE.

ALASKA COMMUNITY ACTION ON TOXICS,
Anchorage, AK, July 29, 2013.

Re Support the Decrease Unsafe Toxins (DUST) Act

Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN DELAURO: We write today on behalf of the members of Alaska Community Action on Toxics (''ACAT'') in support of the Decrease Unsafe Toxins (DUST) Act that will be introduced in the 113th Congress. The DUST Act amends the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 to ban flame retardants chemicals from use in the resilient filling materials in infant and children's products. ACAT is a statewide non-profit public interest environmental health research and advocacy organization dedicated to protecting environmental health and achieving environmental justice. Our mission is to assure justice by advocating for environmental and community health. We believe that everyone has a right to clean air, clean water and toxic-free food. We work to stop the production, proliferation, and release of toxic chemicals that may harm human health or the environment.

Flame retardants chemicals have been added to the filling materials of children products and furniture to meet the California Standard Technical Bulletin (TB) 117, which has become the de facto national standard for furniture manufacturers. Flame retardant chemicals continuously migrate out of household products and settle into dust, which is inhaled and ingested by people and pets.

Research shows that exposure to toxic flame retardant chemicals can be associated with increased cancer, neurological deficits, developmental problems and reduced fertility. Although some flame retardants were removed from children's sleepwear in the 1970s, similar flame retardants continue to be used in children products such as nursing pillows, car seats, sleeping wedges, portable crib mattresses, baby carriers, strollers and changing table pads, despite the fact that these products do not pose a fire hazard. Many times, the chemicals used to treat the foam in children products are not identified on the product labels or elsewhere. Toddlers who crawl in the dust and put their hands in their mouths have some of the highest levels of toxic flame retardant chemicals in their bodies. This is at an age when their neurological and reproductive organs are still developing and they are highly vulnerable to the toxic effects of these chemicals.

California is revising its TB 117 because of the strong evidence that flame retardants used to meet the standard have not provided greater protection from fires, and can in fact make fires more dangerous. While this standard revision is a positive change, companies will not be required to abandon the use of flame retardant chemicals.

Alaska Community Action on Toxics has been a leader in the campaign for effective fire safety without harmful flame retardant chemicals, through education, advocacy, supporting legislative measures in Alaska and working to reform national and international chemicals policy. For these reasons, we believe the DUST Act is necessary to protect children from toxic chemicals, and we urge its immediate passage.

Sincerely,

PAMELA MILLER,
Executive Director.
MARICARMEN CRUZ-GUILLOTY,
Environmental Health and Justice Coordinator.

ZERO TO THREE: NATIONAL CENTER FOR INFANTS, TODDLERS, AND FAMILIES,
Washington, DC.

Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO,
Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC.

DEAR ROSA: On behalf of ZERO TO THREE (ZTT): National Center on Infants, Toddlers, and Families, I am writing to express our support of the Decrease Unsafe Toxins (DUST) Act that will be introduced in the 113th Congress. The DUST Act amends the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 to ban flame retardants chemicals from use in the resilient filling materials in infant

and children's products (e.g. high chairs, car seats, changing pads and others).

ZERO TO THREE's mission is to ensure that all babies and toddlers have a strong start in life. For over thirty years, we have focused on translating the science of early brain development for parents, practitioners, and policymakers. We take an interdisciplinary approach and seek to underscore the fact that domains of development in very young children are inextricably related. We believe that ''good health,'' as defined and included in our policy framework and priorities, is crucial for children to be able to develop, learn, and be ready for school. A baby's good health begins with her caregiver's ability to make sound choices about child rearing practices and use of baby products that can positively or negatively impact their child's development. In order to make these choices, caregivers need guidance resulting from evidence-based information about exposure to environmental and synthetic toxins.

This farsighted legislation will help prevent developmental delays in children that may be stemming from or linked to flame retardants. Research is showing that flame retardants chemicals are toxic to all human beings. However, the removal of such toxins is especially critical for pregnant mothers as well as infants and toddlers because they are more vulnerable to the effects of toxin exposure because of their rapid rate of growth. These stages are marked by rapid cell division and differentiation, organ formation, and brain development. This growth rate renders the systems particularly vulnerable to disruption. In fact, studies show that flame retardants have been correlated with negative effects to motor performance (coordination, fine motor skills), cognition (intelligence, visual perception, visual-motor integration, inhibitory control, verbal memory, and attention), and behavior (e.g. hyperactivity). Moreover, prenatal exposure to such toxins can result in miscarriage, birth defects, low birth weight, and preterm birth. In the longer-term, such exposure poses increased risk for development of childhood cancer, widespread disorders like asthma and obesity, infertility, and other child- and adult-onset diseases.

Flame retardants chemicals are added to the filling materials of children products and furniture to meet the California Standard Technical Bulletin (TB) 117. While California is the only state following TB 117, it has become the de facto national standard. Many national furniture manufacturers use this standard for all their furniture across the U.S. to avoid double inventory. Flame retardant chemicals continuously migrate out of household products and settle into dust.

Research shows that exposure to toxic flame retardant chemicals can me associated with increased cancer, neurological deficits, developmental problems and reduced fertility. Although some flame retardants were removed from use in children sleepwear in the 1970s, similar flame retardants continue to be used in children products such as nursing pillows, car seats, sleeping wedges, portable crib mattresses, baby carriers, strollers and changing table pads. Toddlers who crawl in the dust and put their hands in their mouths have the highest levels of toxic flame retardant chemicals in their bodies. This is at an age when their neurological and reproductive organs are still developing and they are the most vulnerable to the toxic effects of the chemicals.

Based on recent studies and laboratory research, the California standard TB 117 has not been found to significantly improve fire safety or prevent ignitions from small flame sources. Furthermore, such baby products do not pose a fire hazard. According to fire protection groups, flame retardants have not led to improvements in fire safety and pose an unnecessary health hazard.

We urge the Congress to adopt the DUST Act to protect innocent infants and children from these harmful toxins. The DUST Act translates the compelling research into preventive policy and legislation that helps promote positive, healthy development that will resonate throughout a child's school career and life, increasing their individual well-being and future contributions to society.

Sincerely,

MATTHEW MELMED,
Executive Director.

RECOGNIZING THE 90TH ANNIVERSARY OF BOY SCOUT TROOP 401 OF AUBURN, WASHINGTON

HON. DAVID G. REICHERT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 90th anniversary of Boy Scout Troop 401 of Auburn, Washington on August 10, 2013. Troop 401 is one of the longest running Boy Scout Troops in its council and in the state. Beginning as Troop 1, under Scoutmaster Harlan R. Stone 90 years ago, they remain a strong and visible presence in the Auburn community.

On this momentous occasion, I'd like to personally thank Boy Scout Troop 401 for its outreach to the community and its service to the Auburn area. Each time I return to my District, Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of the incredible work of the Boy Scout Troops in our communities. For almost a century, Troop 401 has helped make future leaders of this country by combining educational activities with lifelong values of service and ensuring they have fun in the process. Investing in our youth is the key to building a more conscientious, responsible, and productive society.

Mr. Speaker, Boy Scout Troop 401 is a unique and dedicated group of young men. Their true impact is immeasurable and their outreach and accomplishments are legendary. Here's to the next 90 years, Mr. Speaker.

Special recognition belongs to the current Scouts and Scout Leaders of Troop 401. They are listed below.

Scouts: Andrew Armatas, Andrew Fischer, Brandon Griffin, Brandon Clark, Conner Whitlock, Connor Perius, Dalton Blair, D'Angelo Washington, David Barnett, Dennis Nugent, Dominic Nelson, Gavin Skaar, George Gibson, Gunter Rice, Guy Adamo, Hunter Danz, Hunter Whitlock, Isaac Park, Jacob Wheeler, Jarrett Floyd, Joey Cushing, Joshua Blair, Judah Stelzer, Justin Higginson, Kaelub Graevell, Kolby McCue, Kyle Wilkins, Lee Vandeberg, Marshall Barnhart, Matthew Higdon, Mikko Holcomb, Nicholas Mayer, Noah Koester, Spencer Jones, Steven Ernst, Steven Frank, Thomas Snyder, Tyler Cushing, Tyler Hayes, Tyler Schef, Wyatt Bishop, and Zane Barnhart.

Scout Leaders: Chris Cushing, Craig Koester, Daniel Whitlock, Dave Bishop, Gordon Blair, Holly Jones, James Nannery, John Wilson, Julie Fischer, Kevin Fischer, Kim Cushing, Laura Higdon, Laura Whitlock, Margrett Everitt, Michael Jones, Mitchell Gering, Nick Perius, Rex Frank, Sharon D'Adams, Stacey Bishop, Terri Danz, Tiffany Hopkins, and Will Cadra.

MONTESSORI ACADEMY OF PEMBROKE PINES

HON. DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the newly expanded Montessori Academy in Pembroke Pines, FL.

As the 2013–2014 academic term commences, the Montessori Academy will educate students from infancy through middle school, with the goal of preparing them to be lifelong learners and responsible citizens of the world community.

A quality education equips our youth with the skills they need to succeed in life, including critical thinking skills for inside and outside the classroom. Students attending the Montessori Academy will be able to take advantage of the new elementary and middle school classrooms, labs, arts and media centers, computer labs, and gymnasium.

As a parent of three students in Broward County schools, I am grateful for every fantastic teacher, school leader, and professional working to make a difference in the lives of our children. Education is not only the right of every child; it is the cornerstone of America's future.

I wish the Montessori Academy the best as faculty, staff, students, and parents prepare for a successful school year. Go Eagles!

HONORING MEDICARE'S 48TH BIRTHDAY

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of the 48 years of Medicare's existence.

The benefits Medicare has brought to older Americans are almost boundless. Millions of Americans have lived longer, more productive, healthier lives because of the medical care they received under this program. Many would have incurred financial ruin, suffered needlessly and died prematurely otherwise.

I voted for Medicare during my first summer as a congressman, back in 1965, during a time that was very different from the America of today.

For several years, President Lyndon Johnson had been calling for Congressional action to address the overwhelming need to extend medical care to all seniors, as only half of older adults had any health insurance during that era.

Responding to President Johnson's call for a Medicare bill, and following my own convictions, I joined with Rep. Cecil King of California and introduced in January of 1965, as my very first piece of legislation, a bill that would have provided hospital care under Social Security and an increase of benefits.

I said, at the time, ''Our senior citizens have far too long been neglected in this the most prosperous of societies on earth. Many of them, after leading productive lives prior to their twilight years, have been so overburdened with medical costs that they have been denied the rewards that should come with retirement.''

We have five decades of evidence that indicates the solution to our nation's healthcare crisis isn't cutting Medicare. It's strengthening Medicare and expanding it to cover everyone.

However the Affordable Care Act ultimately plays out, we know two things for certain: Millions of Americans will remain uncovered and the for-profit insurance industry will remain in charge of prices and life-and-death treatment decisions. The only way to ensure everyone is covered is with Medicare-for-All, single payer system.

The richest country in the history of humanity has a moral obligation to cover all of its inhabitants with health care coverage. We believe health care is a right, and should not be treated as a benefit reserved for the privileged.

Mr. Speaker, today, as we celebrate Medicare's birthday, I urge Congress to fulfill Medicare's promise and enact H.R. 676, single-payer legislation and enshrine health care as a fundamental right recognized by our great nation.

HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CITY OF CORAL SPRING, FLORIDA

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the 50th Anniversary of the great City of Coral Spring, Florida. Incorporated on July 10th, 1963, the City of Coral Springs has grown from little more than a patch of marshland in southern Florida into the 13th largest city in the state and the first state-level recipient of the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award. Today I recognize Coral Springs for its remarkable transformation from town with a single covered bridge to a city of more than 120,000 residents.

Whether it be its top-rated public schools and city government, large and robust park and recreation system, myriad of shops, delicious restaurants and entertaining nightlife, Coral Springs truly has something for everyone. If you are looking to raise a family or are a young professional looking to enjoy one of the top 100 cities in the Nation for young people, the city's vibrant economy and high quality of living make Coral Springs a wonderful place to call home.

I join today with my family in wishing Coral Springs many more years of prosperity. On the 50th Anniversary of its inception, I urge all cities across of this great country to follow Coral Spring's footsteps.

IN RECOGNITION OF GREATER SHADY GROVE MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH'S 150TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and pleasure to extend my sincere congratulations to the congregation of Greater Shady Grove Missionary Baptist Church in Columbus, Georgia as the church's membership and leadership celebrates a remarkable 150 years. The congregation of Greater Shady Grove Missionary Baptist Church will celebrate this very significant anniversary with a Sesquicentennial Celebration on Sunday, August 4, 2013 at the Columbus Convention and Trade Center in Columbus, Georgia.

Tracing its roots back to the Civil War era, the church was founded in 1863 on the eastern bank of the Chattahoochee River, under a grape arbor in an oak grove. During a meeting at the house of Brother Boston Miles and Sister Mary Moore, the first members of the church, the church was named ''Shady Grove Baptist Church.''

From its inception through 1932, the church was served by its first sixteen ministers, each leaving their lasting mark on the church in some form or fashion. Perhaps the most notable, Reverend L.F. O'Bryant, served eleven years as the seventh pastor of the church and instituted a large renovation program to expand the size and reach of the church.

In 1932, Reverend W.A. Reid began his service as the church's seventeenth minister, and would go on to serve until his death in 1942. Under Rev. Reid's careful eye, the church expanded again, adding an annex and instituting the Vacation Bible School.

In 1949, under the Reverend J.J. Ivey, the eighteenth pastor, more renovations were made, which included the purchase of new pews and pulpit furniture, the installation of hardwood floors, and the purchase of an organ to enhance church service. Rev. Ivey would serve the church for seventeen years before retiring from the pastorate.

One of the most significant moments in the church's history occurred under Reverend Rudolph Carter Allen in August 1967, when the First Baptist Church of Columbus, Georgia awarded the full Title and Deeds of the building in which Shady Grove worshipped to the congregation of the church. The church was then renamed to Greater Shady Grove Baptist Church to distinguish the congregation from other similarly named churches in Georgia. Less than a year later, the Superior Court of Muscogee County incorporated the Greater Shady Grove Baptist Church.

Throughout the years, the church would be remodeled and renovated several times. With these aesthetic changes came changes to the church mission. After creating several new committees, programs, and outreach ministries and increasing focus on the community, the Church was renamed for a second time to Greater Shady Grove Missionary Baptist Church, as it is called today. In addition to the new name, the church became a tithe-and-offering church, eliminating the need for assessments and fundraising. Today, under the leadership of Reverend Marcus J'uan Gibson, the church continues to grow and change with the vision of holistic transformation and continual improvement in Christ.

The story of Greater Shady Grove Missionary Shady Baptist Church, which began as a small group of people worshipping in the shade of a grape arbor 150 years ago and has grown into an expansive and successful church, is truly an inspiring one of the dedication and perseverance of a faithful congregation of people who put all their love and trust in the Lord.

Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Greater Shady Grove Missionary Baptist Church in Columbus, Georgia for their long history of coming together through the good and difficult times to praise and worship our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

APPLAUDING THE SUPREME COURT DECISION REAFFIRMING THE IMPORTANCE OF DIVERSITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to recognize that the Supreme Court's recent decision in Fisher v University of Texas at Austin represents an important milestone for our nation as we build a more inclusive, diverse America. The Court's decision reaffirms that universities may consider racial and ethnic diversity as one factor among many in a carefully-crafted admissions policy. This ruling represents a victory for equal opportunity in education and helps prepare our citizens to compete in the diverse, global economy of the 21st century.

The historical structure of the House of Representatives exists to represent our nation's vast geographic diversity as well as to value the diverse opinions of each constituency to set the national agenda of progress. Serving in the House for nine terms, I am happy to say that I continue to learn from the diverse pool of people and ideas that comprise the House of Representatives. For the first time in our nation's history, women and minorities constitute the majority of the House Democratic Caucus. This diverse environment plays a critical role in the health and responsiveness of our Caucus. Indeed, diversity is considered by many as one of the most valuable assets to assuring success in business, the arts, science, and sports.

Similarly, a diverse environment on college and university campuses strengthens our nation by providing equal educational opportunity and promoting the creative thinking needed for innovation. I am a strong supporter of the holistic admission process. By promoting inclusivity and diversity on the campuses of our nation's higher education institutions via the admissions process, we recognize that students' successes are characterized by much more than their grade point averages alone. A carefully-crafted admissions policy that considers a wide-array of characteristics—such as leadership experiences, socio-economic status, racial or ethnic background, athletic skills, and artistic abilities helps our educational institutions provide a diverse

learning environment that reflects the diversity of our nation, enhances the ability of students to engage with persons from different backgrounds and cultures to better prepare them for our global economy, and improves access to higher education. As the global marketplace grows more interconnected, it is crucial that the United States remains an active leader in the new global economy by training a workforce prepared to engage with those from different cultures.

I am pleased that the Supreme Court recognized the ability of our nation's colleges and universities to consider racial and ethnic diversity as one factor among many in a carefully-crafted admissions policy. This decision will help promote access to higher education and enrich our country.

HONORING ELVIN HAYES ON BEING INDUCTED INTO THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE BASKETBALL HALL OF FAME

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mr. Elvin Hayes, ''The Big E'', on his induction into the National Collegiate Basketball Hall of Fame and numerous accomplishments as a professional athlete. Mr. Hayes, a fellow University of Houston Cougar, is today considered one of the 50 Greatest Players in NBA History.

In 1966, Elvin Hayes, along with Don Chaney, became the first African American basketball players for the University of Houston. During his sophomore year, Hayes led the Cougars to victory in the ''Game of the Century''; an upset win, played in the Houston Astrodome, against the UCLA Bruins. While at U of H, Hayes was a 2-time NCAA First Team All-American, leading the Cougars to back-to-back NCAA Final Four appearances. In 1968, Hayes was the UPI, Sporting News, and the Associated Press' College Player of the Year. To this day, Elvin Hayes holds the University of Houston's single-game, single-season, and career records in scoring and rebounding.

With his early departure from college, Mr. Hayes was the first overall pick in the 1968 NBA Draft by the San Diego Rockets, who later became the Houston Rockets. During his illustrious NBA career Mr. Hayes played 1,303 games over 16 seasons accruing a number of accomplishments: 12 × NBA All Star (1969–1980), NBA Scoring Champion (1969), and finally NBA Champion (1978). He is 8th all time in NBA scoring and 4th all time in NBA rebounding.

After his retirement from the NBA, Mr. Hayes returned to the University of Houston to finish up his Bachelors degree, an example for all athletes who are called into professional sports before graduating. In 2010, Mr. Hayes again returned to the University of Houston where he now serves as an analyst for radio broadcasts of the Cougars' games.

It is with great pleasure that I recognize Mr. Elvin Hayes, for his service to the city of Houston, and I congratulate him on his induction into the National Collegiate Basketball Hall of Fame.

INTRODUCTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S FREEDOM ACT OF 2013

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today, I am proud to reintroduce the International Women's Freedom Act with my colleagues, Representatives BARBARA LEE and ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON. This bill is a comprehensive piece of legislation which will increase awareness of human rights violations against women, as well as provide a set of mechanisms for the U.S. to address the violations of women's human rights abroad.

The bill is modeled after the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (IRFA). IRFA created the U.S. Commission on Religious Freedom which has been successful in identifying violations of religious freedom abroad and recommending actions to Congress, the Secretary of State, and the President.

It has been clear for many years that expanding opportunities for women not only improves their position in society, but also has a positive impact on economic growth and burgeoning democracies. And yet around the world, many countries relegate women to second-class status, denying them the right to vote, restricting their travel, and limiting their access to education and health care.

The International Women's Freedom Act would ensure we have the tools to empower women on a global level. The bill would establish a Commission on International Women's Rights and would expand the duties of the existing Office of International Women's issues in the State Department and rename it, the Office on International Women's Rights. Both the Commission and the Office on International Women's Rights would be granted the responsibilities of issuing a report on the status of women's rights abroad and advising the President and Secretary of State regarding matters affecting these issues.

We need to work harder to ensure women's full participation in society. This legislation would move us closer to achieving this foreign policy imperative.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 426, had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

RE-INTRODUCING THE STRENGTHENING MEDICARE ANTI-FRAUD MEASURES ACT

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise with my colleague Ways and Means Health Subcommittee Ranking Member JIM MCDERMOTT (D–WA) to re-introduce the Strengthening Medicare Anti-Fraud Measures Act.

This bipartisan legislation is part of our commitment to efforts to reduce fraud, waste and abuse in Medicare.

This legislation was previously introduced by our former colleagues Wally Herger (R–CA) and Pete Stark (D–CA). This bill provides Medicare with important fraud-fighting tools and so we are continuing their mission to strengthen anti-fraud efforts in the Medicare program.

Currently, the Department of Health and Human Services, HHS, Office of the Inspector General, OIG, lacks authority to exclude an individual or entity that is affiliated with an entity that has been sanctioned for fraud. This enables individuals and entities to continue to receive Medicare payments even if they contributed to the sanctioned behavior.

It is important that we change the law to provide the Inspector General with these additional, requested tools to better protect Medicare.

The legislation would provide OIG with two important authorities:

First, the OIG would have the authority to prevent individuals involved with fraudulent entities from receiving Medicare payments. This would essentially ban executives whose companies have been convicted of Medicare fraud from the program. These executives currently defraud Medicare, then circumvent exclusion by moving to another company. I believe we can all agree these individuals should not be allowed to use this loophole to steal from the program that serves seniors' medical needs.

The OIG would also have the authority to prevent entities involved with other fraudulent entities from receiving Medicare payments. This would ban the use of shell companies by corporations engaging in fraudulent activities. It is irrational to think that while these shell corporations are engaged in illegal activities their parent companies hold zero liability. Where individuals and entities are involved with fraudulent entities, they should not be permitted to continue to defraud the Medicare program.

This legislation passed the House of Representatives in 2010 by voice vote. Unfortunately, the Senate failed to act on it.

We encourage our colleagues to cosponsor this common sense legislation so we can add simple, anti-fraud tools to better protect Medicare beneficiaries and American taxpayers.

RECOGNIZING MAJOR ROBERT S. SWENSON, USAFR, RETIRED

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Major Robert S. Swenson, USAFR, Retired, for being honored with the Bronze Star Medal in recognition of his actions during World War II. Following the recovery of lost records recommending this honor, the Bronze Star was presented to Major Swenson in July 2013 at Joint Base Lewis-McChord.

In 1945, as a glider pilot in the 435th Troop Carrier Group, 75th Squadron, Major Swenson

and his fellow airmen distinguished themselves when enemy infantry mounted a counter attack. The 435th Troop Carrier Group fought and repelled the attack of approximately 200 enemy soldiers, a tank, a self-propelled artillery, and two 20mm flak guns.

After the battle, a request was made by Major Charles O. Gordon that all members of the 435th Troop Carrier Group be given due recognition. However, at the end of the war, the order was lost and went unfulfilled. It was not until July 2013, at the Trigger Time Forum at Joint Base Lewis—McChord, that Major Swenson, now living in Washington State, was awarded the Bronze Star.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I recognize Major Robert S. Swenson, USAFR, Retired, for his inspiring bravery and dedication to serving his country.

INTRODUCTION OF THE CIDER INDUSTRY DESERVES EQUAL REGULATION OR ''CIDER'' ACT

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing bipartisan legislation—the ''Cider Industry Deserves Equal Regulation,'' or ''CIDER,'' Act—to update the provisions of the tax code that relate to the cider industry.

Across the country, cidermakers large and small are developing their craft, establishing businesses and brands, and providing new markets for our nation's apple and pear orchards. As they pursue this work; they do so in an uncertain tax and regulatory environment, one where slight variations in the fermenting process can cause them to run afoul of narrow tax and alcohol regulatory rules. Congress, by enacting this legislation, would support this growing industry and ensure that it is treated fairly by regulatory agencies.

During the fermentation process a variety of factors can lead to small changes in the composition of a cider's alcohol content and carbonation. Because of the narrow way that hard cider is currently defined in the tax code, these small variations can lead to cider being taxed at a rate fifteen times higher than what the statute clearly intended. This legislation would broaden this definition to include pear as well as apple cider and would greatly reduce the chance that improper taxation would occur. The legislation also aligns the US cider definitions more closely with global definitions for these products, and helps ensure that American-made cider is competitive on international markets.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to support the American cider industry.

CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF WLNG

HON. TIMOTHY H. BISHOP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate WLNG 92.1 FM as the station celebrates its 50th anniversary on the air. Broadcasting from its studio in Sag Harbor New York, WLNG is known and loved throughout eastern Long Island for its oldies format, local news and sports, and personality disc jockeys like Gary Sapiane, Rusty Potz and the late Paul Sydney. WLNG may well be a one-of-a-kind radio station. Since 1963 the station has stuck to its popular oldies format playing hits from the 1950's, 60's, 70's and 80's, mixed with lots of old-style jingles, birthday announcements and live remote broadcasts from local events.

Perhaps more importantly, WLNG has served as the pulse of the community connecting friends and neighbors in good times and in bad. The station can be found doing a remote broadcast from a local fundraiser for cancer or providing life-saving information during an emergency. The station served as a reliable resource for the latest on Hurricane Irene in 2011, and during Hurricane Sandy in 2012 WLNG continued broadcasting and streaming online using generator power and flashlights as the storm surge rose to ''ankle deep'' in the studio. One of its mainstay programs is the ever-popular ''Swap and Shop,'' a kind of on-air ebay in which residents can sell used or unwanted items to their neighbors. Listeners also rely on WLNG for the latest in school closings during a snow storm or the scores of local high schools sports events—even for finding a lost dog.

Radio junkies love WLNG for the retro jingles and reverb—the sound of radio the way it used to be. Its DJs are happy to dedicate songs in honor of listeners. Independently-owned, WLNG has remained steadfastly the same in times of huge and sometimes overwhelming changes in communication technology and format, and maybe that is the key to its success. It can be relied upon like a good neighbor. Perhaps Paul Sydney summed it up best when he was quoted in an interview with the Sag Harbor Express saying, ''WLNG is like a person. You're with it. It's your friend. We're talking to one person at a time. I know there is no other station in the world like it. Even if you want to avoid it, you always come back. Whether it's Sag Harbor or Norman, Oklahoma, Main Street is Main Street.''

It gives me great pleasure to congratulate WLNG radio on its 50th anniversary and wish the station many more years of successful broadcasting.

A TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE OF KIP TOKUDA

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I along with Representatives SMITH of Washington, rise today to honor the life of Kip Tolcuda, and pay tribute to his leadership, service, and dedication to the citizens of the State of Washington.

Kip was a Seattle native and a graduate of the University of Washington. Following completion of his graduate studies in social work in 1969, Kip entered public service as a social worker with the Washington State Department of Social and Health Services and gained a reputation for being a strong advocate for children and individuals with disabilities. He was later named to the Washington Council for Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect.

The second son of parents who were incarcerated at the Minidoka Relocation Center, Kip possessed an unwavering sense of justice and equality. A prominent figure within the Asian American community, he served as the president of Seattle's chapter of Japanese American Citizens League (JACL)—an organization which is the oldest and largest Asian American civil rights organization. In 1998, Kip went on to found the Asian Pacific Islander Community Leadership Foundation, a non-profit organization that focuses on social justice, community empowerment, and public service.

Beginning in 1994, Kip served as a Representative for Washington's State 37th Legislative District. During his four terms in the Washington State Legislature, he enjoyed many legislative successes. He introduced his first Day of Remembrance resolution in 1997, which has since become an annual tradition in the Legislature. He served as the co-prime sponsor, along with Representative Mike Wensmen of House Bill 1572, which created the Washington Civil Liberties Public Education fund in 2000. Kip also secured passage of the Special Needs Adoption bill, which helped adoption of special-needs children. He was a strong advocate who helped to pass the Homeless Children's Lawsuit legislation, which provided services for over 60,000 homeless families with children.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that we recognize the life of Kip Tokuda—a true trailblazer. We ask our colleagues to join us in honoring a long career of selfless and inspired service to his community, the State of Washington, and our nation.

HONORING MR. TOM MILLER

HON. KRISTI L. NOEM

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a truly outstanding individual and his lifelong commitment to public service, Mr. Tom Miller. Tom has two passions: first and foremost, his two daughters; and second, advocacy on behalf of individuals with disabilities. His lifelong service on behalf of this population has not only earned him recognition within the disability community throughout South Dakota, but also high honors within our great state as the recipient of the 2011 Governor's Award for an Outstanding Citizen with a Disability.

Tom has also had great impact on a national level, working within the AbilityOne® Program through his service on the SourceAmerica™ Board for the past 15 years. His dedication and commitment to the employment of people who have disabilities has opened the doors of opportunity to tens of thousands of deserving Americans, making their own dreams of becoming productive citizens become a reality. Tom has personally educated hundreds of his peers on self-advocacy, helping these individuals visit Capitol Hill and ensure we know what is important to them. Words like fearless, straight talking, devoted, mentor, father and advocate begin to capture the essence of Tom. He is a true leader.

As an AbilityOne Congressional Champion, I am honored to recognize Tom for his lifetime

commitment to service. South Dakota is a better state, and America a better nation thanks to people like Tom Miller.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVEN A. HORSFORD

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, on consideration H.R. 1911, I am not recorded because I was absent due to medically mandated recovery. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on final passage of the bill (rollcall No. 426).

On rollcall No. 353 on final passage of H.R. 850, I would have voted ''aye'' on final passage of the bill.

CONGRATULATING LYNN FORNEY YOUNG ON HER ELECTION AS PRESIDENT GENERAL OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

HON. JOHN ABNEY CULBERSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Lynn Forney Young on her election as President General of the Daughters of the American Revolution. Lynn, a fourth generation DAR member, joined the Tejas Chapter in Texas in 1977 as a Junior member and throughout her thirty-six years of continuous membership has distinguished herself at every level of service in the National Society.

She served her chapter in seven offices including Chapter Regent and in thirteen committee chairmanships. In addition to holding nine state chairmanships in the Texas State Society, she served as State Parliamentarian, State Recording Secretary, State Chaplain, State Vice Regent, and State Regent. She was appointed to six National Vice Chairmanships, has held three National Chairmanships including Americanism, Printing and Publications, and State Regents' Dinners, and has served on the national Investment and Personnel Committees. She attended the Volunteer Field Genealogy Course, served as a DAR Museum Correspondent Docent, and currently serves as a VAVS Deputy Representative.

Lynn has attended every Continental Congress since 1980, serving as a Congressional page for eight years and on three Congressional Committees. Honored by the Texas Daughters as their State Outstanding Junior Member, State Outstanding Chapter Regent, and State Outstanding Conference Page, she is the only member in the state to be so recognized. She holds membership in the Executive Club, National Officers' Club, State Regents' and State Vice Regents' Clubs, National Chairmen's and National Vice Chairmen's Associations, Outstanding Junior Club, Heritage Club, 1890 Giving Circle, and Founders' Club. She has served on the Advisory Boards of Crossnore School and Kate Duncan Smith DAR School as well as on the Tamassee DAR School Regents' Council.

Each year during Lynn's term as State Regent, Texas recorded a net gain in membership. Additionally, she encouraged, and Texas Daughters enthusiastically embraced and supported, four major projects: an exhibition of DAR Museum quilts at the International Festival in Houston, the erection of a monument at the Texas State Cemetery to the patriots of the American Revolution buried in Texas, and major financial support for the restoration of the historic Texas Governor's Mansion. Her State Regent's Project brought together the State and National Societies in a cooperative effort to produce a new membership recruitment video, ''Today's DAR,'' which celebrates the work of the chapters on the local level and highlights the variety of programs and opportunities for service that make the DAR relevant in today's society.

Through the years, Lynn has been an avid supporter of the National Society Children of the American Revolution, having served as Senior Society Treasurer and President, Senior State Registrar, First Vice President, and President and Senior National Vice President of the South Central Division.

Lynn received a B.S. degree from the University of Houston, worked as a Legal Secretary and Paralegal for seventeen years, was a law firm administrator and bookkeeper for three years, and currently serves as the bookkeeper for the family cattle ranch.

A pillar of her church and community, Lynn served the Presbyterian Church as an Elder, Lay Minister and Clerk of the Session. She has served on the Steering Committees of both the DAR Houston Fisher House and Homes for Our Troops. She was named one of the Outstanding Young Women of Montgomery County, Texas and in 2007 received the Inspire Women Outstanding Community Leader Award. Married to Steve Young, she is the mother of one DAR daughter and one son and the loving grandmother of two grandsons.

Lynn's devotion to DAR and unwavering commitment to its ideals and mission are evidenced by her many years of service. Her experience, keen sense of business, proven leadership abilities and vision, together with her beautiful style and grace, will certainly help to strengthen the organization and ensure that it will continue to grow and prosper.

Please join me and the Texas Daughters of the American Revolution as we congratulate Lynn Forney Young on her recent election as the first DAR President General from the great state of Texas.

SUPPORTING H.R. 2009, ''KEEP THE IRS OFF YOUR HEALTH CARE ACT''

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting the ''Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act.'' This bill authored by my friend, Dr. PRICE, will prohibit the IRS from implementing any provisions of the President's health care law.

The IRS is an agency plagued by a multitude of scandals and significant misuses of taxpayer funds. The IRS is probably the worst government agency that we would want to have involved with Americans health care.

The IRS cannot fulfill its current core missions. With this in mind, we should not allow them to hire thousands of new employees to oversee our health care. The IRS cannot even properly supervise many of its current employees. We cannot trust the IRS with our health care. I urge my colleagues to pass this bill.

CONGRATULATING THE NATIONAL BLACK DATA PROCESSING ASSOCIATES

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in congratulating the National Black Data Processing Associates (BDPA) on its 35th anniversary of service to the residents of the District of Columbia and, the national capital region and its 45 active chapters across the United States.

Founded in May 1975 by Earl Pace and the late David Wimberly, BDPA was formed out of a concern shared by both men that minorities were not adequately represented in the information technology industry. The first BDPA chapter was organized in Philadelphia, PA in 1977. A year later, the second chapter was organized in Washington, D.C., and shortly thereafter, the third chapter was organized in Cleveland, OH. In 1979, BDPA was restructured as a national organization.

As the oldest and largest African American information technology (IT) organization, comprised of over 2,000 African-American IT professionals as well as, science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) college students, BDPA's vision is to be a powerful advocate for their stakeholders' interests within the global, technology industry. Its mission is to be a global member-focused technology organization that delivers programs and services for the professional well-being of its stakeholders.

BPDA continues to promote professional growth and technical development for the young people and those entering into information and communication technology (ICT) in academia and corporate America. We also appreciate BDPA and its 45 chapters for continuing to provide ICT opportunities for STEM students and professionals.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in celebrating the 35th anniversary of the National Black Data Processing Associates, in congratulating them on their outstanding accomplishments and commitment to the residents of the District of Columbia and around the country, and in welcoming those attending the BDPA Annual National Technology Conference and Career Fair titled ''Diverse Opportunities In The Age of Convergence by Bringing Jobs Back to D.C.,'' on August 14–17, 2013, at the Washington Hilton Hotel.

INTRODUCTION OF THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it has been forty-one years since

Congress passed the Equal Rights Amendment (also known as the Women's Equality Amendment). This historic amendment was intended to affirm in our United States Constitution fundamental equality based on sex in all areas of society.

In 1972, Congress passed the ERA with a measure that it had to be ratified by the necessary number of states (38) within 7 years. Though this deadline was extended, it was only for 10 short years. With this narrow time limit, the ERA was unfortunately just three states shy of full ratification when the deadline passed in 1982. Other constitutional amendments were given much wider deadlines for ratification. One example is the 27th amendment, concerning Congressional pay raises, which was accepted after a 203 year ratification period.

This Congress I intend to finally add the word "women" to the constitution. It is time for our nation to understand the necessity of equality for women based on the way it has been deprived of them. While we have made cracks in the glass ceiling many times before, we have yet to shatter it. I believe that this amendment provides that recognition to women without taking equality rights away from others.

Over the past several decades, legislative efforts have increased women's rights—but these strides toward achieving equality are not irreversible. Without the ERA, women have often been denied the ability to seek justice when they have experienced discrimination. Though certain court decisions, such as the Supreme Court decision in the Virginia Military Institute case (Virginia v. United States), helped to clarify that gender cannot be used to keep women from achieving social, legal and economic gains, important decisions like this can also be overturned. In addition, laws can still perpetuate gender classifications that keep women from achieving their full potential. Passage of the ERA would provide a Constitutional affirmation of the Supreme Court decision.

Our democracy rests on the principle of "liberty and justice for all." We need the ERA to ensure that this concept applies equally to all.

I am pleased to introduce this bill with ninety-three of my bipartisan colleagues, Representatives CYNTHIA LUMMIS, RODNEY FRELINGHUYSEN, JERROLD NADLER, KAREN BASS, JOYCE BEATTY, XAVIER BECERRA, SANFORD BISHOP, TIMOTHY BISHOP, EARL BLUMENAUER, CORRINE BROWN, G.K. BUTTERFIELD, LOIS CAPPS, MICHAEL CAPUANO, TONY CÁRDENAS, KATHY CASTOR, DAVID CICILLINE, YVETTE CLARKE, WM. LACY CLAY, JAMES CLYBURN, STEVE COHEN, JAMES COOPER, JAMES COSTA, JOSEPH COURTNEY, JOSEPH CROWLEY, ELIJAH CUMMINGS, DANIEL DAVIS, SUSAN DAVIS, PETER DEFAZIO, DIANA DEGETTE, CHARLIE DENT, JOHN DINGELL, TAMMY DUCKWORTH, KEITH ELLISON, SAM FARR, CHAKA FATTAH, WILLIAM FOSTER, MARCIA FUDGE, TUSLI GABBARD, JOHN GARAMENDI, ALAN GRAYSON, AL GREEN, RAUL GRIJALVA, MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM, LOUIS GUTIÉRREZ, BRIAN HIGGINS, JAMES HIMES, RUBÉN HINOJOSA, STEVE ISRAEL, SHEILA JACKSON LEE, HAKEEM JEFFRIES, EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, HENRY "HANK" JOHNSON, MARCY KAPTUR, WILLIAM KEATING, JOSEPH KENNEDY, DANIEL KILDEE, BARBARA LEE, SANDER LEVIN, JOHN LEWIS, DAVID LOESBACK, ZOE LOFGREN, STEPHEN LYNCH, BETTY MCCOLLUM, JAMES MCDERMOTT, JAMES MCGOVERN, GRACE MENG, GWEN MOORE, GRACE NAPOLITANO, WILLIAM PASCRELL, EDWARD PERLMUTTER, CHELLIE PINGREE, MICHAEL QUIGLEY, CHARLES RANGEL, RAUL RUIZ, TIMOTHY RYAN, LINDA SÁNCHEZ, SCOTT DAVIS, TERRI SEWELL, CAROL SHEA-POTTER, BRAD SHERMAN, LOUISE SLAUGHTER, BENNIE THOMPSON, DINA TITUS, PAUL TONKO, NIKI TSONGAS, CHRISTOPHER VAN HOLLEN, NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ, MAXINE WATERS, MELVIN WATT, HENRY WAXMAN, PETER WELCH, and FREDERICA WILSON. I urge my fellow Members of Congress to join in support.

REUNIFICATION ON THE ISLAND OF CYPRUS

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage renewed efforts to bring about reunification on the island of Cyprus.

In 2004, the inhabitants of the island participated in a referendum put forward by the United Nations under Secretary-General Kofi Annan. The proposal known as the Annan Plan foresaw a bi-communal, bi-zonal federation based on political equality. Unfortunately, it was overwhelmingly rejected by Greek Cypriots in 2004 despite vast support by Turkish Cypriots. Had it been accepted, it would have brought about a resolution to this longstanding separation of the island and contributed to political stability in this region of the world.

In 2008, the Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot leaders reaffirmed their commitment to a bi-zonal, bi-communal federation with political equality as defined by relevant Security Council resolutions. These talks proceeded through May 2012, often being guided by former United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon. The framework included a federal government with a single international personality as well as a Turkish Cypriot constituent state and a Greek Cypriot constituent state, both of equal status. Unfortunately, this process has been put on hold for more than a year, as Cyprus has dealt with serious economic crises and political reforms.

The time has come for both sides to resume this process and seek long-term solutions that will bring peace and prosperity to the island. On July 28, Turkish Cypriots successfully completed elections, advancing the cause of democracy on the island. I congratulate the Turkish Cypriots for holding free and fair elections, and wish them well as they endeavor to form a new government. But a broader solution, involving the participation of both sides of the island, is essential to Cyprus's long-term success. It is my strong hope that economic conditions have stabilized sufficiently on the island to allow this process to move forward. The United States should do all it can to support this process.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOYCE BEATTY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, July 24, 2013, due to unforeseen illness, I missed rollcall votes No. 411, on the Pompeo amendment, and No. 412, on the Amash amendment. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on the Pompeo amendment, and "nay" on the Amash amendment.

ENERGY CONSUMERS RELIEF ACT OF 2013

SPEECH OF

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1582) to protect consumers by prohibiting the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating as final certain energy-related rules that are estimated to cost more than $1 billion and will cause significant adverse effects to the economy, with Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN in the chair.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this so-called Energy Consumers Relief Act, which would be more accurately titled the Blocking Public Health Protections Act. The best I can say about this bill is that it is going precisely nowhere—and for good reason.

Under this legislation, the Department of Energy would be required to waste increasingly limited resources undertaking costly and time-consuming review of certain "energy-related" EPA rules. The term "energy-related" is not defined, and no time limit is given for completion of DoE's duplicative analysis.

As a result, H.R. 1582 would have the practical—and intended— effect of blocking or indefinitely delaying important public health protections, even if the Secretary of Energy never exercises his authority to overturn the EPA—protections like the Mercury and Air Toxic Standards, which will reduce mercury and other harmful toxins from power plants; or the vehicle tailpipe standards, which, ironically, are already saving consumers money at the pump.

Madam Chair, Americans expect their government to ensure that their air is healthy and their water is clean. H.R. 1582 is poorly drafted, ill-conceived legislation that would take us in precisely the opposite direction.

I urge a "no" vote.

ENCOURAGING PEACE AND REUNIFICATION ON THE KOREAN PENINSULA

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of H. Con. Res. 41, a bill encouraging peace and reunification on the Korean Peninsula, I rise to encourage my colleagues to join me in support of the bill.

This month, hundreds of Korean War veterans will gather in the nation's capital to commemorate the 60th anniversary of the Korean War Armistice. In recognition of their service and for those who continue to serve on the peninsula to this day, we pause to express our appreciation and support.

The Korean War began when North Korea invaded the South on June 25, 1950. A peace treaty was never signed, only an armistice marking the end of hostilities. Today, Korea remains a divided nation, separating more than 10 million South Koreans, including 100,000 Korean-Americans, from their families in the North. As we pause to recognize the sacrifice of those who fought and died in the conflict, we must also remember all the others who were affected as well. This resolution reaffirms the commitment of the US to our alliance with South Korea and our commitment to working with South Korea to encourage the North to cease its nuclear proliferation activities so that talks to reunify the peninsula can commence.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

See Résumé of Congressional Activity.

Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 22, Adjournment Resolution.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S6141–S6263

Measures Introduced: Seventy bills and eight resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1417–1486, S. Res. 212–217, and S. Con. Res. 22–23.

Pages S6206–09

Measures Reported:

S. 1429, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014. (S. Rept. No. 113–85)

S. 933, to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the authorization of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program through fiscal year 2018. **Page S6204**

Measures Passed:

Commending David J. Schiappa: Senate agreed to S. Res. 212, commending David J. Schiappa.

Pages S6142–43

Adjournment Resolution: Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 22, providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and an adjournment of the House of Representatives. **Page S6162**

Hydropower Regulatory Efficiency Act: Senate passed H.R. 267, to improve hydropower. **Page S6257**

Bureau of Reclamation Small Conduit Hydropower Development and Rural Jobs Act: Senate passed H.R. 678, to authorize all Bureau of Reclamation conduit facilities for hydropower development under Federal Reclamation law. **Page S6257**

FOR VETS Act: Senate passed H.R. 1171, to amend title 40, United States Code, to improve veterans service organizations access to Federal surplus personal property. **Page S6257**

Helping Heroes Fly Act: Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1344, to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to provide expedited air passenger screening to severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans, and the bill was then passed, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Page S6257**

Reid (for Pryor) Amendment No. 1848, in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S6257–58**

Pipeline Safety Regulatory Documents: Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2576, to amend title 49, United States Code, to modify requirements relating to the availability of pipeline safety regulatory documents, and the bill was then passed. **Page S6258**

Korean Peninsula Peace and Reunification: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 41, encouraging peace and reunification on the Korean Peninsula.

Page S6258

Northern Mariana Islands: Senate passed S. 256, to amend Public Law 93–435 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands, providing parity with Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, after agreeing to the committee amendment.

Page S6258

Specialist Christopher Scott Post Office Building: Senate passed 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''.

Pages S6258–59

Staff Sergeant Nicholas J. Reid Post Office Building: Senate passed 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". Page S6259

James R. Burgess Jr. Post Office Building: Senate passed 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". Page S6259

Thaddeus Stevens Post Office: Senate passed 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". Page S6259

First Lieutenant Alvin Chester Cockrell, Jr. Post Office Building: Senate passed 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". Page S6259

200th August Quarterly Festival: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 199, celebrating the 200th August Quarterly Festival taking place from August 18, 2013, through August 25, 2013, in Wilmington, Delaware, and the resolution was then agreed to. Page S6259

Secretary for the Minority of the Senate: Senate agreed to S. Res. 216, electing Laura C. Dove, of Virginia, as Secretary for the Minority of the Senate. Page S6259

American College of Surgeons Days: Senate agreed to S. Res. 217, expressing support for designation of October 6, 2013, through October 10, 2013, as "American College of Surgeons Days" and recognizing the 100th anniversary of the founding of the organization. Page S6259

Measures Considered:

Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act: By 54 yeas to 43 nays (Vote No. 199), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on 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. Pages S6154–55

Energy Efficiency Bill—Agreement: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry. Pages S6162, S6162–81

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at 11 a.m., on Tuesday, September 10, 2013, the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill be agreed to and Senate proceed to consideration of the legislation. Page S6181

Appointments:

Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance: The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, pursuant to Public Law 99–498, as amended by Public Law 110–315, appointed the following individuals to the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance: Michael Poliakoff of Virginia, vice David Gruen and Andrew Gillen of Washington DC, vice William Luckey. Page S6260

Farm Bill Conferees: Chair appointed the following conferees to H.R. 2642, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018: Senators Stabenow, Leahy, Harkin, Baucus, Brown, Klobuchar, Bennet, Cochran, Chambliss, Roberts, Boozman, and Hoeven. Pages S6259–60

Authorizing Leadership To Make Appointments—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that, notwithstanding the upcoming recess or adjournment of the Senate, the President of the Senate, the President Pro Tempore, and the Majority and Minority Leaders be authorized to make appointments to commissions, committees, boards, conferences, or interparliamentary conferences authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses, or by order of the Senate. Page S6260

Authority For Committees—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that, notwithstanding the Senate's recess, committees be authorized to report legislative and executive matters on Wednesday, September 4, 2013 from 11 a.m. to 1 p.m. Page S6260

Signing Authority—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that during the adjournment or recess of the Senate from Thursday, August 1, 2013 through Monday, September 9, 2013, Senators Cardin and Levin be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions. Page S6260

Pro Forma—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the Senate adjourn, and convene for pro forma sessions only with no business conducted on the following dates and times, and that following each pro forma session, Senate adjourn until the next pro forma session: Friday, August 2, 2013, at 11:45 a.m.; Tuesday, August 6, 2013, at 10:30 a.m.; Friday, August 9, 2013, at 12 p.m.; Tuesday, August 13, 2013, at 12 p.m.; Friday, August 16, 2013, at 12 p.m.; Tuesday, August 20, 2013, at 11 a.m.; Friday, August 23, 2013, at 12 p.m.; Tuesday, August 27, at 9 a.m.;

Friday, August 30, 2013, at 2 p.m.; Tuesday, September 3, 2013, at 9:15 a.m.; and Friday, September 6, 2013, at 5 p.m.; and that Senate adjourn on Friday, September 6, 2013, until 2 p.m., on Monday, September 9, 2013, unless the Senate receives a message from the House that it has adopted S. Con. Res. 22, providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and an adjournment of the House of Representatives; and that if the Senate receives such a message, Senate adjourn until 12 p.m., on Monday, August 12, 2013, for a pro forma session only, with no business conducted, pursuant to S. Con. Res. 22, and that following the pro forma session, Senate adjourn until 2 p.m., on Monday, September 9, 2013. **Page S6260**

Caproni and Broderick Nominations—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at 5 p.m., on Monday, September 9, 2013, Senate begin consideration of the nominations of Valerie E. Caproni, of the District of Columbia, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, and Vernon S. Broderick, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York; that there be 30 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, Senate vote, without intervening action or debate, on confirmation of the nominations in the order listed; that no further motions be in order; and Senate then resume legislative session. **Page S6260**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By a unanimous vote of 97 yeas (Vote No. EX. 198), Raymond T. Chen, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit.

Pages S6147–54, S6261

By 87 yeas to 10 nays (Vote No. EX. 200), Samantha Power, of Massachusetts, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, with the rank and status of Ambassador, and the Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations. **Pages S6156–61, S6261**

Jeffrey Shell, of California, to be Chairman of the Broadcasting Board of Governors.

Jeffrey Shell, of California, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2015.

Robert F. Cohen, Jr., of West Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission for a term of six years expiring August 30, 2018.

Gerald Lyn Early, of Missouri, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2018.

Daniel Iwao Okimoto, of California, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2018.

Katherine H. Tachau, of Iowa, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2018.

F. Scott Kieff, of Illinois, to be a Member of the United States International Trade Commission for the term expiring June 16, 2020.

Janet Lorraine LaBreck, of Massachusetts, to be Commissioner of the Rehabilitation Services Administration, Department of Education.

Mary Jo White, of New York, to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for a term expiring June 5, 2019.

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.

Stephen J. Hadley, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace for a term of four years.

Timothy Hyungrock Haahs, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the National Institute of Building Sciences for a term expiring September 7, 2014.

John Unsworth, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2016.

James J. Jones, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Administrator for Toxic Substances of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Catherine M. Russell, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador at Large for Global Women's Issues.

Stuart F. Delery, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Cynthia L. Attwood, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission for a term expiring April 27, 2019.

Matthew C. Armstrong, of Illinois, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2015.

Harry R. Hoglander, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the National Mediation Board for a term expiring July 1, 2014.

Linda A. Puchala, of Maryland, to be a Member of the National Mediation Board for a term expiring July 1, 2015.

Dorothy Kosinski, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2016.

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.

Joseph W. Nega, of Illinois, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years.

Michael B. Thornton, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years.

Davita Vance-Cooks, of Virginia, to be Public Printer.

Ryan Clark Crocker, of Washington, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2013.

Ryan Clark Crocker, of Washington, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2016.

Richard T. Metsger, of Oregon, to be a Member of the National Credit Union Administration Board for a term expiring August 2, 2017.

Kara Marlene Stein, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for a term expiring June 5, 2017.

Michael Sean Piwowar, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for a term expiring June 5, 2018.

Mark E. Schaefer, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere.

James F. Entwistle, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Nigeria.

Douglas Edward Lute, of Indiana, to be United States Permanent Representative on the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, with the rank and status of Ambassador.

Daniel A. Sepulveda, of Florida, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State 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.

William Ira Althen, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission for a term of six years expiring August 30, 2018.

John H. Thompson, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of the Census for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 2016.

Thomas C. Carper, of Illinois, to be a Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors for a term of five years.

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.

Avi Garbow, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Jason Furman, of New York, to be a Member and Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers.

Daniel Brooks Baer, of Colorado, to be U.S. Representative to the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, with the rank of Ambassador.

Catherine Elizabeth Lhamon, of California, to be Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, Department of Education.

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.

Liliana Ayalde, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Federative Republic of Brazil.

James Costos, of California, to be Ambassador to Spain.

John B. Emerson, of California, to be Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Germany.

John Rufus Gifford, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to Denmark.

Kenneth Francis Hackett, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Holy See.

Patricia Marie Haslach, of Oregon, to be Ambassador to the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia.

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.

Denise Campbell Bauer, of California, to be Ambassador to Belgium.

Morrell John Berry, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to Australia.

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.

Daniel A. Clune, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Lao People's Democratic Republic.

David Hale, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Lebanon.

Terence Patrick McCulley, of Washington, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Cote d'Ivoire.

David D. Pearce, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to Greece.

Linda Thomas-Greenfield, of Louisiana, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (African Affairs).

Robert Bonnie, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture for Natural Resources and Environment.

Krysta L. Harden, of Georgia, to be Deputy Secretary of Agriculture.

Susan J. Rabern, of Kansas, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

James Costos, of California, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to Andorra.

Patrick Hubert Gaspard, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Republic of South Africa.

James C. Swan, of California, to be Ambassador to the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Kirk W.B. Wagar, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Singapore.

Alexa Lange Wesner, of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Austria.

Dennis V. McGinn, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

Matthew Winthrop Barzun, of Kentucky, to be Ambassador to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

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.

Nicholas Christopher Geale, of Virginia, to be a Member of the National Mediation Board for a term expiring July 1, 2016.

4 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

47 Army nominations in the rank of general.

7 Coast Guard nominations in the rank of admiral.

1 Marine Corps nomination in the rank of general.

33 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, and Navy.

Pages S6253–57, S6261–63

Ellen C. Herbst, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

Ellen C. Herbst, of Virginia, to be Chief Financial Officer, Department of Commerce.

Margaret Louise Cummisky, of Hawaii, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce. **Pages S6257, S6263**

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. **Pages S6257, S6261**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Michelle T. Friedland, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Nancy L. Moritz, of Kansas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit.

John B. Owens, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Christopher Reid Cooper, of the District of Columbia, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia.

Daniel D. Crabtree, of Kansas, to be United States District Judge for the District of Kansas.

Sheryl H. Lipman, of Tennessee, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Tennessee.

Gerald Austin McHugh, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

M. Douglas Harpool, of Missouri, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Missouri.

Edward G. Smith, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Gary Blankinship, of Texas, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of Texas for the term of four years.

Robert L. Hobbs, of Texas, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Texas for the term of four years.

Amos Rojas, Jr., of Florida, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of Florida for the term of four years.

Peter C. Tobin, of Ohio, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of Ohio for a term of four years.

J. Christopher Giancarlo, of New Jersey, to be a Commissioner of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission for the remainder of the term expiring April 13, 2014.

Deborah Lee James, of Virginia, to be Secretary of the Air Force.

Frank G. Klotz, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Nuclear Security.

Christopher A. Hart, of Colorado, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board for a term expiring December 31, 2017.

Deborah A.P. Hersman, of Virginia, to be Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board for a term of two years.

Deborah A.P. Hersman, of Virginia, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board for a term expiring December 31, 2018.

Michael P. O'Rielly, of New York, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 2014.

Kathryn D. Sullivan, of Ohio, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere.

Steven Croley, of Michigan, to be General Counsel of the Department of Energy.

Karen Dynan, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

R. Gil Kerlikowske, of the District of Columbia, to be Commissioner of Customs, Department of Homeland Security.

John Andrew Koskinen, of the District of Columbia, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue for the term expiring November 12, 2017.

Matthew T. Harrington, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Lesotho.

Anne W. Patterson, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of State (Near Eastern Affairs).

Pamela K. Hamamoto, of Hawaii, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Office of the United Nations and Other International Organizations in Geneva, with the rank of Ambassador.

Sarah Sewall, of Massachusetts, to be an Under Secretary of State (Civilian Security, Democracy, and Human Rights).

Richard F. Griffin, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of four years.

Stevan Eaton Bunnell, of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security.

Patrick Pizzella, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Labor Relations Authority for a term of five years expiring July 1, 2015.

Suzanne Eleanor Spaulding, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary, Department of Homeland Security.

Peter Joseph Kadzik, of New York, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Linda A. Schwartz, of Connecticut, to be Assistant Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

Dwight L. Bush, Sr., of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Morocco.

Page S6257–60

Nomination Withdrawn: Senate received notification of withdrawal of the following nomination:

Lafe E. Solomon, of Maryland, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of four years, which was sent to the Senate on May 23, 2013. **Page S6263**

Messages from the House: **Page S6198**

Measures Referred: **Page S6198**

Executive Communications: **Pages S6198–S6203**

Petitions and Memorials: **Pages S6203–04**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Pages S6204–06**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S6209–11**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S6211–38**

Additional Statements: **Pages S6192–97**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S6238–45**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S6245–46**

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total—200) **Page S6154, S6155, S6161**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 8:45 p.m., until 11:45 a.m. on Friday, August 2, 2013. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S6260.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Appropriations: Committee ordered favorably reported an original bill (S. 1429) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014.

POLITICAL STATUS OF PUERTO RICO

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the November 6, 2012 referendum on the political status of Puerto Rico and the Administration's response, after receiving testimony from Representative Pierluisi; Commonwealth of Puerto Rico Governor Alejandro Garcia-Padilla, Popular Democratic Party, and Ruben Berrios Martinez, Puerto Rican Independence Party, both of San Juan, Puerto Rico.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 1386, to provide for enhanced embassy security, with amendments; and

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, 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, and Ryan

Clark Crocker, of Washington, Matthew C. Armstrong, of Illinois, and Jeffrey Shell, of California, to be Chairman, all to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors.

POW/MIA ACCOUNTING

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Financial and Contracting Oversight concluded a hearing to examine Prisoner of War (POW) and Missing in Action (MIA) accounting, after receiving testimony from Major General Kelly McKeague, Commander, Joint POW/MIA Accounting Command, Major General W. Montague Winfield, USA (Ret.), Deputy Assistant Secretary for Prisoner of War/Missing Personnel Affairs, and John A. Goines, III, Chief, Life Sciences Equipment Laboratory, Wright-Patterson AFB, all of the Department of Defense.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 933, to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the authorization of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program through fiscal year 2018; and

The nominations of Patricia Ann Millett, of Virginia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit, Gregory Howard Woods, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, Elizabeth A. Wolford, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of New York, and Debra M. Brown, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Mississippi.

Also, committee began markup of S. 987, to maintain the free flow of information to the public by providing conditions for the federally compelled disclosure of information by certain persons connected with the news media but did not complete action thereon, and will meet again on Thursday, September 12, 2013.

HUMAN COST OF REGULATORY PARALYSIS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Oversight, Federal Rights and Agency Action concluded a hearing to examine the human cost of regulatory paralysis, after receiving testimony from Rena Steinzor, University of Maryland Carey School of Law, Baltimore; Sam Batkins, American Action Forum, and Peg Seminario, AFL–CIO, both of Washington, D.C.; Patrick K. McLaughlin, George Mason University Mercatus Center, Arlington, Virginia; and Janette E. Fennell, KidsAndCars.org, Bala Cynwyd, Pennsylvania.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 78 public bills, 2900–2977; and 9 resolutions, H.J. Res. 55–57; H. Con. Res. 48–50; and H. Res.323–325 were introduced. **Pages H5341–45**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H5347–49**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Huizenga to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H5265**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:55 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H5271**

Energy Consumers Relief Act of 2013: The House passed H.R. 1582, to protect consumers by prohibiting the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating as final certain energy-related rules that are estimated to cost more than $1 billion and will cause significant adverse effects to the economy, by a recorded vote of 232 ayes to 181 noes, Roll No. 432. Consideration of the measure began yesterday, July 31st. **Pages H5285–93**

Rejected the Capps motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 188 ayes to 221 noes, Roll No. 431. **Pages H5291–92**

Agreed to:

Woodall amendment (No. 4 printed in part B of H. Rept. 113–174) that requires EPA to make publicly available all data and documents relied upon by the Agency to develop estimates under the bill and **Pages H5285–86**

Murphy (PA) amendment (No. 6 printed in part B of H. Rept. 113–174) that prohibits the EPA from using the "social cost of carbon" valuation affected by this bill (by a recorded vote of 234 ayes to 178 noes, Roll No. 430). **Pages H5286–88, H5290–91**

Rejected:

Waxman amendment (No. 1 printed in part B of H. Rept. 113–174) that was debated on July 31st

that sought to strike section 2 of the bill, which allows DOE to effectively veto EPA rules (by a recorded vote of 183 ayes to 230 noes, Roll No. 428) and **Pages H5288–89**

Connolly amendment (No. 3 printed in part B of H. Rept. 113–174) that was debated on July 31st that sought to prevent section 2 of the bill from applying to rules related to protecting air and water quality (by a recorded vote of 182 ayes to 224 noes, Roll No. 429). **Pages H5289–90**

H. Res. 315, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 2218) and (H.R. 1582) was agreed to on Wednesday, July 24th.

Recess: The House recessed at 2:21 p.m. and reconvened at 2:35 p.m. **Page H5288**

Suspension—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure which was debated yesterday, July 31st:

Vietnam Human Rights Act of 2013: H.R. 1897, amended, to promote freedom and democracy in Vietnam, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 405 yeas to 3 nays, Roll No. 435. **Pages H5295–96**

Stop Government Abuse Act: The House passed H.R. 2879, to provide limitations on bonuses for Federal employees during sequestration, to provide for investigative leave requirements for members of the Senior Executive Service, and to establish certain procedures for conducting in-person or telephonic interactions by Executive branch employees with individuals, by a yea-and-nay vote of 239 yeas to 176 nays, Roll No. 436. **Pages H5276–85, H5296–H5306**

H. Res. 322, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 367), (H.R. 2009) and (H.R. 2879), was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 223 yeas to 189 nays, Roll No. 434, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 222 yeas to 191 nays, Roll No. 433.

Pages H5276–85, H5293–94

Pursuant to section 9 of the rule, the following bills are laid on the table: H.R. 1541, H.R. 2579, and H.R. 2711. **Page H5306**

Regulations From the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2013: The House began consideration of H.R. 367, to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law. Consideration of the measure is expected to continue tomorrow, August 2nd. **Pages H5306–32**

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of H. Rept. 113–187, shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule. **Page H5315**

Agreed to:

Rodney Davis (IL) amendment (No. 2 printed in part B of H. Rept. 113–187) that adds to the definition of what constitutes a ''major rule'' to include any interim final rule issued by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) that would have a significant impact on a substantial amount of agricultural entities (as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture); **Pages H5319–20**

Sessions amendment (No. 5 printed in part B of H. Rept. 113–187) that requires the agency submitting the report on a proposed Federal rule to include an assessment, as part of the cost-benefit analysis submitted to the Comptroller General and each House of Congress, of anticipated jobs gained or lost as a result of implementation, and to specify whether those jobs will come from the public or private sector; **Pages H5322–24**

McKinley amendment (No. 9 printed in part B of H. Rept. 113–187) that reduces the annual effect on the economy of the term ''major rule'' from $100 million or more to $50 million or more; and **Pages H5328–29**

Webster amendment (No. 11 printed in part B of H. Rept. 113–187) that prevents Federal agencies from implementing significant policy changes without appropriate congressional review. Brings administrative rules having an economic impact of $100 million or more as scored by the Office of Management and Budget before Congress for a vote. **Pages H5329–30**

Proceedings Postponed:

Scalise amendment (No. 1 printed in part B of H. Rept. 113–187) that seeks to require the Administration to receive approval from Congress before implementing a carbon tax; **Pages H5317–19**

Smith (MO) amendment (No. 3 printed in part B of H. Rept. 113–187) that seeks to require congressional approval for all rules under the authority of the Affordable Care Act; **Pages H5320–21**

Latham amendment (No. 4 printed in part B of H. Rept. 113–187) that seeks to clarify that the report required to be submitted to Congress by Federal agencies promulgating a rule under the Act must include a list of any other related regulatory actions taken by or that will be taken by any other Federal agency with authority to implement the same statutory provision or regulatory objective; **Pages H5321–22**

Nadler amendment (No. 6 printed in part B of H. Rept. 113–187) that seeks to exempt from the bill's congressional approval requirement any rule pertaining to nuclear reactor safety standards in order to prevent nuclear meltdowns like the one in

Fukushima. The amendment would ensure enhanced nuclear safety protection requirements can go into effect; **Pages H5324–25**

Johnson (GA) amendment (No. 7 printed in part B of H. Rept. 113–187) that seeks to exempt from the provisions of the bill any rule that the Office of Management and Budget determines would result in net job creation; **Pages H5325–26**

Jackson Lee amendment (No. 8 printed in part B of H. Rept. 113–187) that seeks to exempt from the bill's congressional approval requirement any rule promulgated by the Department of Homeland Security; and **Pages H5326–28**

Moore amendment (No. 12 printed in part B of H. Rept. 113–187) that seeks to exempt rules pertaining to veterans from the additional requirements of this Act. **Pages H5330–32**

H. Res. 322, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 367), (H.R. 2009) and (H.R. 2879), was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 223 yeas to 189 nays, Roll No. 434, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 222 yeas to 191 nays, Roll No. 433.

Pages H5276–85, H5293–94

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H5309.

Senate Referral: S. Con. Res. 22 is held at the desk. **Page H5309**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four yea-and-nay votes and five recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H5289, H5289–90, H5290, H5292, H5292–93, H5293, H5294, H5295–96, H5306. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 9:55 p.m.

Committee Meetings

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Military Personnel held a hearing entitled "Department of Defense's Challenges in Accounting for Missing Persons from Past Conflicts". Testimony was heard from Paul M. Cole, ORISE Fellow, Joint POW/MIA Accounting Command, Central Identification Laboratory; Brenda S. Farrell, Director, Defense Capabilities and Management, Government Accountability Office.

INITIAL CONCLUSIONS FORMED BY THE DEFENSE STRATEGIC CHOICES AND MANAGEMENT REVIEW

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Initial Conclusions Formed by the Defense Strategic Choices and Management Review". Testimony was heard from Ashton B. Carter, Deputy Secretary of Defense; and Admiral James A. Winnefeld, Jr., Vice Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, Department of Defense.

ENSURING NAVY SURFACE FORCE EFFECTIVENESS WITH LIMITED MAINTENANCE RESOURCES

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness; and Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces held a joint subcommittee hearing entitled "Ensuring Navy Surface Force Effectiveness With Limited maintenance resources". Testimony was heard from Rear Admiral Timothy S. Matthews, USN, Director, Fleet Readiness, Chief of Naval Operations, Department of Defense; and Rear Admiral Thomas S. Rowden, USN, Chief of Naval Operations, Department of Defense.

PPACA PULSE CHECK

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "PPACA Pulse Check". Testimony was heard from Marilyn Tavenner, Administrator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 2848, the "Department of State Operations and Embassy Security Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2014"; and H.R. 419, to strengthen and clarify the commercial, cultural, and other relations between the people of the United States and the people of Taiwan, as codified in the Taiwan Relations Act, and for other purposes. The following bills were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 419; and H.R. 2848.

TRAN-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP: OUTLOOK AND OPPORTUNITIES

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade held a hearing entitled "The Trans-Pacific Partnership: Outlook and Opportunities". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

IRANIAN PRESENCE IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE 19 YEARS AFTER AMIA ATTACK

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa; and Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere held a joint hearing entitled "Examining the State Department's Report on Iranian Presence in the Western Hemisphere 19 Years After AMIA Attack". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

IMPACT OF U.S. WATER PROGRAMS ON GLOBAL HEALTH

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations held a hearing entitled ''The Impact of U.S. Water Programs on Global Health''. Testimony was heard from Christian Holmes, Global Water Coordination, U.S. Agency for International Development; Aaron A. Salzberg, Special Coordinator for Water Resources, Department of State; and public witnesses.

WEST FERTILIZER, OFF THE GRID: THE PROBLEM OF UNIDENTIFIED CHEMICAL FACILITIES

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technology held a hearing entitled ''West Fertilizer, Off the Grid: The Problem of Unidentified Chemical Facilities''. Testimony was heard from Stephen L. Caldwell, Director, Homeland Security and Justice, Government Accountability Office; David Wulf, ISCD Director, National Protection and Programs Directorate, Department of Homeland Security; and public witnesses.

INNOVATION IN AMERICA: THE ROLE OF TECHNOLOGY

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property and the Internet held a hearing entitled ''Innovation in America: The Role of Technology''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

IMPACTS OF THE OBAMA ADMINISTRATION'S CLOSED–DOOR SETTLEMENTS ON ENDANGERED SPECIES AND PEOPLE

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Transparency and Sound Science Gone Extinct?: The Impacts of the Obama Administration's Closed-Door Settlements on Endangered Species and People''. Testimony was heard from Dan Ashe, Director, Fish and Wildlife Service; Kent McMullen Chairman, Franklin County Natural Resources Advisory Committee, Pasco, WA; and public witnesses.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY'S BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION: DISCRIMINATING AGAINST VETERANS AND RETALIATING AGAINST WHISTLEBLOWERS

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Department of Energy's Bonneville Power Administration: Discriminating Against Veterans and Retaliating Against Whistleblowers''. Testimony was heard from Daniel B. Poneman, Deputy Secretary, Department of Energy; Gregory H. Friedman, Inspector General, Department of Energy; and Anita J. Decker, Chief Operating Officer, Bonneville Power Administration.

''EPA HYDRAULIC FRACTURING STUDY IMPROVEMENT ACT''; AND ISSUANCE OF SUBPOENAS

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 2850, the ''EPA Hydraulic Fracturing Study Improvement Act''; and to authorize the issuance of a subpoena. The bill H.R. 2850 was ordered reported, as amended. The Committee voted to approve a resolution authorizing the Chairman to issue a subpoena.

EPA'S BRISTOL BAY WATERSHED ASSESSMENT—A FACTUAL REVIEW OF A HYPOTHETICAL SCENARIO

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Oversight held a hearing entitled ''EPA's Bristol Bay Watershed Assessment—A Factual Review of a Hypothetical Scenario''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Full Committee held a markup on the following legislation: H.R. 813, the ''Putting Veterans Funding First Act of 2013''; H.R. 1804, the ''Foreign Travel Accountability Act''; H.R. 2072, the ''Demanding Accountability for Veterans Act of 2013''; H.R. 2189, to establish a commission or task force to evaluate the backlog of disability claims of the Department of Veterans Affairs; H.R. 2481, the ''Veterans G.I. Bill Enrollment Clarification Act of 2013''; H.R. 1443, the ''Tinnitus Research and Treatment Act of 2013''; and H.R. 2011, the ''Veterans' Advisory Committee on Education Improvement Act of 2013''. The following bills were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 813; H.R. 1804; H.R. 2072; H.R. 2189; H.R. 2481; and H.R. 1443. The following bill was ordered reported, without amendment: H.R. 2011.

STATUS OF THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT IMPLEMENTATION

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Status of the Affordable Care Act Implementation''. Testimony was heard from Gary Cohen, Deputy Administrator and Director, Center for Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services; and Daniel Werfel, Principal Deputy Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner for Services and Enforcement Internal Revenue Service.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, AUGUST 2, 2013

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, hearing on H.R. 2824, the ''Preventing Government Waste and Protecting Coal Mining Jobs in America Act'', 9 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, Oceans and Insular Affairs, hearing on H.R. 2208, the ''North American Wetlands Conservation Extension Act of 2013''; H.R. 2798, to amend Public Law 106–206 to direct the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to require annual permits and assess annual fees for commercial filming activities on Federal land for film crews of 5 persons or fewer; and H.R. 2799, the ''Sportsmen's Heritage and Recreational Enhancement Act'', 9:30 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on National Security; and Committee on Natural Resources' Subcommittee on Public Lands and Environmental Regulation, joint hearing entitled ''Missing Weapons at the National Park Service: Mismanagement and Lack of Accountability'', 9 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Government Operations hearing entitled ''Examining the Skyrocketing Problem of Identity Theft Related Tax Fraud at the IRS'', 9 a.m., 2247 Rayburn.

Résumé of Congressional Activity

FIRST SESSION OF THE ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS

The first table gives a comprehensive résumé of all legislative business transacted by the Senate and House. The second table accounts for all nominations submitted to the Senate by the President for Senate confirmation.

DATA ON LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY

January 3 through July 31, 2013

	Senate	*House*	*Total*
Days in session	94	100	..
Time in session	669 hrs., 22′	486 hrs., 34′	..
Congressional Record:			
Pages of proceedings	6,140	5,263	..
Extensions of Remarks	..	1,179	..
Public bills enacted into law	4	18	22
Private bills enacted into law	..	..	..
Bills in conference	..	..	..
Measures passed, total	212	210	422
Senate bills	31	4	..
House bills	23	121	..
Senate joint resolutions	..	..	..
House joint resolutions	..	..	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	11	9	..
House concurrent resolutions	9	12	..
Simple resolutions	138	64	..
Measures reported, total	122	182	304
Senate bills	83	..	..
House bills	7	140	..
Senate joint resolutions	1	..	..
House joint resolutions	..	..	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	1	..	..
House concurrent resolutions	..	4	..
Simple resolutions	30	38	..
Special reports	12	5	..
Conference reports	..	..	..
Measures pending on calendar	114	48	..
Measures introduced, total	1,668	3,322	4,990
Bills	1,416	2,899	..
Joint resolutions	20	54	..
Concurrent resolutions	21	47	..
Simple resolutions	211	322	..
Quorum calls	2	1	..
Yea-and-nay votes	197	177	..
Recorded votes	..	249	..
Bills vetoed	..	..	..
Vetoes overridden	..	..	..

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

January 3 through July 31, 2013

Civilian nominations, totaling 314, disposed of as follows:

Confirmed	78
Unconfirmed	231
Withdrawn	5

Other Civilian nominations, totaling 1,000, disposed of as follows:

Confirmed	9
Unconfirmed	991

Air Force nominations, totaling 5,222, disposed of as follows:

Confirmed	816
Unconfirmed	4,406

Army nominations, totaling 5,329, disposed of as follows:

Confirmed	3,698
Unconfirmed	1,631

Navy nominations, totaling 3,171, disposed of as follows:

Confirmed	1,572
Unconfirmed	1,598
Withdrawn	1

Marine Corps nominations, totaling 762, disposed of as follows:

Confirmed	760
Unconfirmed	2

Summary

Total nominations carried over from the First Session	0
Total nominations received this Session	15,798
Total confirmed	6,933
Total unconfirmed	8,859
Total withdrawn	6
Total returned to the White House	0

Next Meeting of the **SENATE**

11:45 a.m., Friday, August 2

Senate Chamber

Program for Friday: Senate will meet in a pro forma session, unless the Senate receives a message that the House of Representatives has agreed to S. Con. Res. 22, Adjournment Resolution.

Next Meeting of the **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

9 a.m., Friday, August 2

House Chamber

Program for Friday: Complete consideration of H.R. 367—Regulations From the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2013. Consideration of H.R. 2009—Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act of 2013 (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Congressional Record The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are 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.