United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 2013 No. 16

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

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

Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We thank You that we are a Nation fashioned out of diverse peoples and cultures, brought forth on this continent in a way not unlike the ancient people of Israel. As out of a desert, You led our American ancestors to this promised land, where they declared their independence and constituted a new Nation founded upon unalienable rights given to us by You, our Creator.

Bless our Nation with wisdom, knowledge, and understanding, and bless the Members of this people's House. Renew in us the adoption by Your spirit, that we may affirm our freedoms, not only with the conviction in the way we understand others, but in ourselves by actions proven beyond words.

Bless us this day and every day. May all that is done here 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 gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. FOXX 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.

TIME TO SUBMIT A CREDIBLE PLAN

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, families budget, small businesses budget, cities budget, churches budget, schools budget, my state of North Carolina budgets, but Washington does not.

Instead, year after year, budgetless Washington spends every single cent of the money it takes from the American people and $1 trillion more.

Not since 2009 has the Democrat Senate bothered to pass a budget, and not since 2010 has President Obama submitted his plan for a budget on time.

When you don't plan, it's easy to overcommit. And when a country overcommits year after year after year, it ends up $16.4 trillion in debt.

That debt doesn't just rob our future; it hurts Americans looking for jobs today. While government spending ballooned, 8.5 million more people have given up looking for work since 2009.

Mr. Speaker, the unchecked spending has got to stop. It's time to get this government on a budget. It's time for the President to submit a credible plan.

SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Yesterday, Defense Secretary Leon Panetta bluntly warned if sequester happens on March 1 it's going to badly damage the readiness of the United States of America. It will go right at readiness, right at maintenance, right at training.

The Navy has told us too it will cancel maintenance on 23 ships, reduce flying hours on deployed aircraft carriers by 55 percent, cancel submarine deployments, and reduce steaming days by 22 percent.

The Bipartisan Policy Center has warned us that 1 million jobs will be lost if sequester happens.

What is the response of the majority party? The Budget chair, Mr. RYAN, simply said, ''Sequester is going to happen. We can't afford to lose those cuts.''

For the sake of our economy, for the sake of our national defense, we have to do better than that. Congress must adopt the President's balanced plan and avoid the economic and military calamity, a calamity that can easily be avoided.

REPLACING PRESIDENT OBAMA'S SEQUESTER

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, President Obama missed a great opportunity today to help our economy. This was supposed to be the day that the President submitted his budget to the Congress, but it's not coming. It's going to be late. Some reports say that it could be as long as a month late. I think that's too bad. Our economy could use some Presidential leadership right now.

On Thursday, the President disbanded his jobs council after a grand total of four meetings in two years. Then, as Americans got to work on Friday, they learned that our economy still isn't creating enough jobs. The unemployment rate actually went up.

Now, if government spending does cause growth, as the President believes, we shouldn't be having these problems. And then maybe it wouldn't be so disappointing that his budget is late.

Printed on recycled paper.

Well, we are having trouble, in large part because spending is the problem. It's what's chasing jobs overseas and causing much anxiety about our future.

One example of something the President's budget could have addressed is his sequester. A sequester is Washington-speak for automatic spending cuts. The President first proposed the sequester in 2011 and insisted that it be part of the debt limit agreement.

Now, twice the House has passed legislation to replace the President's sequester with commonsense reforms that would reduce spending and preserve and strengthen our safety net for future generations. We've spelled it all out. We've done our work because we're committed to getting spending under control, and we've long said there's a better way to cut spending.

Unfortunately, our Democratic colleagues in the Senate haven't taken action. They haven't acted on our plan to replace the President's sequester or haven't offered one of their own.

What we should do is replace the President's sequester with responsible reforms that will help balance the budget in 10 years. Our goal is to grow the economy, expand opportunity and prosperity, and ensure America maintains its leading role in the world with a strong national defense.

To do that we need to budget responsibly. We need a budget that reflects those priorities. But to replace the President's sequester, we need our Democratic colleagues to get serious about spending.

I wish I could give the American people more cause for optimism, but we see the President's budget is late and the Senate hasn't passed a budget in nearly four years.

This week the House will act on a measure introduced by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) that requires the President to submit a balanced budget, because we know—and I think the American people agree—spending is the problem. And the sooner we solve our spending problem, the sooner we'll solve our jobs problem too.

□ 1410

THANK YOU, LIZARD'S THICKET

(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, in 1977, Bob and Anna Williams moved back to Columbia, South Carolina, from Alabama and opened a restaurant. Due to their hard work, Lizard's Thicket is now one of South Carolina's finest restaurant chains, celebrating 35 years of service. This real country cooking operation has grown to serve over 12,000 patrons a day at 15 different locations. Not only do people across the Palmetto State choose to dine at Lizard's Thicket for the outstanding home-style cooking, they also return time after time for the exceptional customer service.

For the past few decades, my wife, Roxanne, and I have always cherished taking our children, grandchildren, and mother-in-law to this great restaurant where we enjoy completing the meal with a warm serving of peach cobbler.

I am extremely grateful for the Williams family, their three generations of service, and the jobs they have provided across the Midlands. I wish them future success and look forward to dining with them for another 35 years.

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

IN MEMORY OF TED OGLE

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

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of one of my constituents and a dear friend, Ted Ogle.

Ted was a loving husband and father, a loyal friend, and a highly effective public leader with a great passion for his country, his State, and his community. Over the last decade, Ted's work touched the careers of Hoosier elected leaders all across our State.

On a personal note, I will be forever indebted to Ted Ogle. Ted was one of the first and most vocal supporters in my campaign for State representative 10 years ago and, as Sixth District chairman, played a central role in last year's campaign for U.S. Congress.

Ted loved his family, loved his country and State, loved his friends, and loved the Indiana Republican Party. His passing came way too soon. Ted Ogle will never be forgotten, and he will be forever missed.

I ask the entire Sixth District to keep Anne, their children Eric and Nadia, and the entire Ogle family in your thoughts and prayers in the coming weeks and months.

PASS PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, last week on the fourth anniversary of the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, I met with women leaders in my district to discuss the importance of ensuring women earn equal pay for equal work.

The women I met with told personal and powerful stories of how continued wage disparities have affected their families. In cities like Flint, Saginaw, and Bay City, women still only earn about 74 cents for every dollar that men do. That is unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, the time is long overdue for women to be paid equal pay for equal work. Women make up half of our workforce, yet they are not paid the same as men for the same work. This means women have less money for groceries, for rent, for child care, and for the everyday needs of their families.

Mr. Speaker, that's why I have cosponsored the Paycheck Fairness Act, which seeks to close disparities in pay. It's time to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act. Until women receive equal pay for equal work, we will not be the just society that we ought to be.

UNLEASHING ECONOMIC POTENTIAL OF HARDWORKING AMERICANS

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, last week we received troubling economic news. In January, unemployment went up and 169,000 people gave up looking for work. And the economy stopped growing and actually shrank.

I rise today in solidarity with those looking for work and a higher income to pay their bills, loans, and mortgages. Those seeking a better lot want to know: Where are the jobs?

Before we address any other issue grabbing headlines today, Congress and the President need to make a priority of unleashing the potential of hardworking Americans and creating the conditions for a healthy economy. We must balance our budget, reform the Tax Code, reduce excessive regulations, and expand energy production.

I call on my colleagues in this House to refocus their attention and to work to accomplish these goals so that the American people can get back to pursuing their dreams.

AMERICA HAS A SPENDING PROBLEM

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

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, America has a spending problem. The numbers don't lie. With the national debt at $16 trillion and climbing, each American's share is more than $50,000. Things only stand to get worse. In fact, Federal spending is now projected to double to 40 percent of GDP in the next three decades. This out-of-control spending is a drag on our economy and a threat to our future.

The American people agree. Polls by Gallup, the Winston Group, and Politico last month indicate that Americans overwhelmingly support cutting government spending over raising taxes to address our debt. Despite the facts, President Obama and his fellow Democrats continue to deny we have a spending problem, pointing to more revenue as the answer to our debt crisis.

This Congress, House Republicans are committed to working together to find real spending cuts, meaningful reforms of the entitlement programs that are

driving us deeper into debt, and a fairer, cleaner Tax Code. We are committed to saving our economy for future generations, and I hope the President and his fellow Democrats will join us.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STUTZMAN) laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on the Budget:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 25, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House,
The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: I am writing to inform you of my resignation, effective immediately, from the House Committee on the Budget. It is my intention that this is a leave of absence as I hope to serve on this Committee again in a future Congress. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me directly, or your staff can contact my Deputy Chief of Staff, Ian Rayder.

Sincerely,

DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1705

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS) at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL GME SUPPORT REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2013

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 297) to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize support for graduate medical education programs in children's hospitals.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 297

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 ''Children's Hospital GME Support Reauthorization Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. PROGRAM OF PAYMENTS TO CHILDREN'S HOSPITALS THAT OPERATE GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 340E of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 256e) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''through 2005 and each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011'' and inserting ''through 2005, each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011, and each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017'';

(2) in subsection (f)(1)(A)(iv), by inserting ''and each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017'' after ''2011''; and

(3) in subsection (f)(2)(D), by inserting ''and each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017'' after ''2011''.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Section 340E(b)(3)(D) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 256e(b)(3)(D)) is amended by striking ''Not later than the end of fiscal year 2011'' and inserting ''Not later than the end of fiscal year 2016''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, Pennsylvanians are fortunate to have several excellent children's hospitals in the State. One of these hospitals is the Children's Hospital of Philadelphia, the country's first hospital to exclusively care for children, and they have remained one of the best for over 150 years.

In a recent survey, the hospital was rated number one in six separate pediatric specialties and ranked no lower than fourth in another four specialty categories.

Other children around the country aren't so fortunate to have access to excellent doctors. A study in the journal Pediatrics found that more than 8 million children have no pediatrician in their area. Many other sick children have to drive hundreds of miles to see a doctor who specializes in treating their condition.

Children aren't just miniature adults, and treating them isn't just a matter of working on a smaller scale and shrinking the equipment. A doctor who is experienced in treating adults may not be able to apply that same expertise to a child. Treating children is both a medical and an emotional challenge. Often, doctors have to correctly diagnose an illness in little patients who haven't even learned to speak. It takes a special person to go into pediatrics.

For a time in the 1990s, our Nation was facing an acute shortage of pediatricians. With much of government assistance to train doctors being funneled through the Medicare program, it was becoming significantly more expensive for a doctor to choose to be trained in pediatrics.

To help correct this imbalance, Congress created the Children's Hospital Graduate Medical Education program. This is a program that was created, and has been sustained, with bipartisan support.

Unfortunately, the program is facing elimination. President Obama's budget for the 2012 fiscal year called for elimination of the program, despite the positive results.

I support getting rid of programs that are duplicative, unproven, or unnecessary, especially with the budget pressures we are facing now; however, CHGME has a proven track record. Over 40 percent of pediatricians in the United States are trained through CHGME.

□ 1710

Forty-three percent of those in subspecialities are trained through the program.

The Children's Hospital of Philadelphia runs the largest pediatric residency program in the country. Their residents will treat children in my community and then move across the country to practice in other communities. We need their expertise now more than ever.

Last Congress, I worked with my Democratic counterpart on the Energy and Commerce Health Subcommittee, Representative FRANK PALLONE, to introduce legislation to renew the program. Our legislation passed the House of Representatives twice in the 112th Congress, both times by voice vote.

Unfortunately, the bill was tied up in the Senate and was not considered. Congressman PALLONE and I wasted no time in reintroducing the bill this year, and I'm proud to say that in the very first meeting of the Energy and Commerce Committee, on January 22, the bill was reported out unanimously. The bill is a very simple, 5-year reauthorization of the CHGME program at current funding levels.

H.R. 297 is supported by the Children's Hospital Association, the American Hospital Association, the Academic Pediatric Association, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Pediatric Society, the Association of Medical School Department Chairs, the Society for Pediatric Research, the

Association of American Medical Colleges, the American Osteopathic Association, and the American College of Surgeons, among others.

Far too many children in our Nation already lack access to a pediatrician or doctor trained in a pediatric subspecialty. Without CHGME, we will once again be discouraging medical residents from choosing pediatrics.

On a personal note, nearly 2 years ago, I met Anna Lipsman, who was receiving treatment for leukemia at the Children's Hospital of Philadelphia. Today, thanks to the excellent care she received, she is happy, energetic and in school full time. She continues to remind me about what is really at stake.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 297 and reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to rise in support of H.R. 297, the Children's Hospital Graduate Medical Education Support Reauthorization Act of 2013.

As every parent knows, it's very important to have a trusted doctor to turn to when their child gets sick. Since its inception in 1999, the Children's Hospital Graduate Medical Education program, known as CHGME, has helped to make sure that the doctor is there and prepared to diagnose any symptoms that our children face.

In fact, the program has been a true success. In the 1990s, declines in pediatric training programs threatened the stability of the pediatric workforce, and CHGME helped to reverse these dangerous declines. Even then, Congress, in a bipartisan way, recognized that if we didn't create and fund programs that would train doctors to treat these children, there won't be anyone left to take care of them.

That's why the House overwhelmingly supported reauthorization of the program in the 112th Congress, passing stand-alone legislation in September 2011 and also including the reauthorization in broader legislation in December 2012.

With this Federal CHGME support, children's hospitals can play a key role in ensuring the continued growth of our Nation's pediatric workforce. In 2009, the program supported the training of 5,361 resident physicians nationally. The program will also help to enhance hospitals' research capabilities and improve hospitals' ability to provide care to vulnerable and underserved children.

Reauthorizing CHGME continues to be one of my top health priorities, and I want to thank Congressman PITTS, the chairman of our Health Subcommittee, for working with me on this bill. Together with his help and leadership, we were able to move this bill again swiftly through our committee and to the floor upon convening this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this program has proven results, and it's past time that we finally reauthorize CHGME so that we can provide certainty to hospitals, doctors, and their patients. Children in our communities are counting on this program to train a future generation of pediatricians, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the bill. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to now yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The reauthorization of the Children's Hospital Graduate Medical Education program is critically important and something we must do. But I rise today to express some frustration with the bill as presented.

Specifically, while our Nation faces an acute need for additional health professionals trained in psychiatry, this reauthorization continues a glaring mental health parity failure within the Children's Hospital Graduate Medical Education program: the failure to include children's psychiatric teaching hospitals in the program. Because Medicare classifies these hospitals as psychiatric hospitals rather than as children's hospitals, child psychiatric hospitals are ineligible to participate in CHGME.

This presents a particular burden to a spectacular pediatric hospital in my district, Bradley Hospital. And that is why, last Congress, I introduced the Children's Hospitals Education Equity Act, which was designed to fix this oversight by simply expanding the definition of a children's hospital to cover child psychiatric hospitals.

I'm disappointed, therefore, that the CHGME reauthorization is being considered under suspension of the rules today, as it prevents consideration of amendments to improve the program and to correct this omission in the bill.

Our Nation must fulfill its commitment to mental health parity, and Congress must do its part to enhance access to child and adolescent mental health care. Despite this shortcoming, I intend to support the bill, and I look forward to working with my colleagues in both parties and in both Chambers to correct this serious inequity. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PALLONE. I have no additional speakers. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support this legislation. It has tremendous bipartisan support, and, with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 297, the Children's Hospital GME Support Reauthorization Act of 2013.

H.R. 297 reauthorizes the children's hospital graduate medical education—or CHGME—program at the program's current authorization level. This program provides ongoing and consistent financial support to hospitals such as Children's Hospital of Los Angeles for the training of doctors who want to specialize in pediatrics. Over the years, the CHGME program has been enormously successful in reversing the significant decline in the number of pediatrician trainees across the country. Indeed, today, children's hospitals nationwide that are supported by the program train 40% of all pediatricians and 43% of all pediatric specialists.

Not surprisingly, the CHGME program has a decade-long history of bipartisan support. The program was first established in 1999 and has subsequently been reauthorized on two occasions. During the 112th Congress, the House passed legislation that would have reauthorized the CHGME program for another five years.

I'm sure that Members of both sides of the aisle agree we want to make certain this important program remains in place, and we want to send a strong message about the importance of fully funding it.

I want to commend the work of members of the Energy and Commerce Committee for advancing H.R. 297 to the floor today. I especially want to recognize and applaud the leadership of Ranking Member PALLONE and Chairman PITTS on this bill. I know we are all hopeful the Senate will act quickly to enact H.R. 297, so we can send legislation to the President for his signature.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 297.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the Children's Hospital Graduate Medical Education program and I am a cosponsor of H.R. 297. This successful program is the most important federal investment in the pediatric workforce and must be reauthorized. Failure to do so would be catastrophic to pediatric care in our country. Since this program began, it has allowed Children's Hospitals across the country, including Texas Children's Hospital in Houston, to increase training by 35%.

I believe we must spend more on Graduate Medical Education entirely, but today we have the opportunity to extend the successful Children's Hospital program which, like other GME funds, is money well spent. Despite the successes of the program, there are still many pediatric specialties that are experiencing shortages. This bill will help address this and will continue to strengthen our pediatric workforce. I look forward to voting in favor of this bill and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 297, the Children's Hospital GME Support Reauthorization Act of 2013. The Children's Hospital Graduate Medical Education Program not only provides a critical investment in the pediatric health workforce, but also helps improve children's access to health care.

The Children's Hospital Graduate Medical Education Program was first authorized in 1999 and has achieved incredible success. The program has enabled children's hospitals to host teaching programs while maintaining high-quality clinical care. It currently supports 56 children's hospitals and is responsible for a significant increase in the number of physicians trained in children's hospitals.

As the first registered nurse in Congress, I know firsthand that a well-trained primary care workforce is crucial to our health system. Only by ensuring the security of pediatric residency programs can we successfully work to promote the health of all Americans.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 297 the ''Children's Hospital Graduate Medical Education

(GME) Support Reauthorization Act of 2013'' This legislation would authorize the appropriation of $110 million a year for 2013 through 2017, for payment toward the direct costs of graduate medical education in children's hospitals.

As the Founder and Co-Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I understand the important of this vital program. The Children's Hospital Graduate Medical Education Program (CHGME) trains 40 percent of our Nation's pediatricians and more than half of our Nation's pediatric subspecialists. Each year, over 5,000 residents take part in this program.

We are all aware that we must continue to support the development and training of all medical professionals. Me must do more to ensure that we have enough qualified medical professional choosing to specialize in key fields in order to address the growth in both our baby boomers and child populations. I believe this legislation is a step in the right direction.

In the early 90's, we witnessed a thirteen percent decrease in the amount of qualified graduate medical students entering into pediatrics. Upon the enactment of the Children's Hospital Graduate Medical Education program we saw a significant increase in the amount of qualified medical school graduates choosing to enter into pediatrics, their numbers increased by 35 percent.

In 1999, Children's Hospital Graduate Medical Education, CHGME, was enacted as part of the Healthcare Research and Quality Act to provide freestanding children's hospitals with discretionary federal support for direct and indirect expenses associated with operating medical residency training programs. Since few children's hospitals receive Medicare funds, the program is designed to correct the exclusion of pediatric training in the Medicare Graduate Medical Education, GME, program.

Under the Children's Hospital Graduate Medical Education Program, direct medical education funding is designed to cover costs associated with stipends for residents, salaries, salaries for faculty, overhead and other costs of running a training program. The CHGME also provides indirect medical education funds that are designed to assist in expenditures such as reduced productivity of staff training residents and the processing of additional diagnostic tests those residents may order.

Graduate Medical Education, GME, begins upon graduation from medical school and passed the examination needed to obtain general board certification. GME in a specialty field (residency) and further specializations in a specific clinical field (fellowship) are generally provided in hospital settings with additional clinical experiences in non-hospital site. This can take between three and seven years to complete, depending on the medical, dental or podiatric specialty track chosen.

Freestanding children's hospitals receiving Federal GME funds have increased the number of residents and fellows that they are training since 2000:

The number of residents and fellows claimed for Federal support for the 2000 Federal fiscal year (FY) was about 4,263.

In the latest Government Performance Results Acts, GPRA, report for Federal FY 2009, the hospitals described training 5,631 pediatricians, pediatric subspecialists, and other physicians in the clinical care of children within the U.S.

Of the 5,631 resident FTEs being trained, about 48 percent were in general pediatrics, 24 percent were in pediatric subspecialties, and 28 percent were non-pediatric residents.

In FY 2009, 56 children's hospitals located in 30 states and Puerto Rico had nearly half a million inpatient discharges. Children's hospitals vary in size and service mix. The number of available beds at these hospitals varies from 30 to 456.

These freestanding children's hospitals provide services ranging from outpatient ambulatory care to inpatient critical care.

TEXAS

In Texas, excluding military and Veterans Affairs programs, there are currently 5,902 resident physicians in Texas training in 468 accredited graduate medical education (GME) programs.

It is likely that many of these resident physicians will join the ranks of the 39,872 licensed physicians currently practicing in Texas.

These practicing and resident physicians, together with 656 resident physicians training in Texas military and Veterans Affairs hospitals, provide health care to Texas 22,016,911 people.

Texas ranks 40th nationally in the number of physicians per 100,000 civilian population and faces serious challenges in attracting physicians to locate and practice in rural, remote, and urban underserved areas.

With Texas' population increasing at both age ends of the population spectrum, the ratio of 158 direct patient care physicians per 100,000 population ratio will likely not improve unless policy changes are implemented to encourage expansion of the Texas physician workforce and foster greater distribution of physicians across the state. As Texas continues to grow in general, pediatric and our aging population we will more physicians—and more specialized physicians—to care for our citizens.

With 25 percent of Texas total population uninsured and 22 percent of its children uninsured, Texas has the highest number of uninsured individuals in the country. Which is one of the many reasons I supported the Affordable Health Care Act.

The majority of under-insured Texans receive health care through the our network of locally tax-funded and privately funded teaching hospitals and clinics.

Uninsured Texans play an important role in graduate medical education; they are one of the groups of patients that residents care for and treat, while honing their medical skills and expertise.

Graduate medical education is just one piece, albeit an important piece, of the complex health-care delivery system. While ensuring the viability of the safety-net hospitals and clinics in Texas is important to the future of Texas, solving all of the problems associated with ensuring that viability is beyond the scope of this. The medical school/hospital partnerships responsible for training many of the next generation of Texas physicians are stressed financially. Especially Children's Hospitals.

The GME and The CHGME programs both train resident physicians while providing essential health-care services to those who might not otherwise receive access to care.

Currently, Five children's hospitals in Texas benefit from the CHGME program: Texas Children's Hospital (Houston), Children's Medical Center of Dallas, Driscoll Children's Hospital (Corpus Christi), Dell Children's Hospital (Austin) and Cook Children's Hospital (Fort Worth). Last year alone, more than $23 million in CHGME funds was allocated to Texas.

I can say that Texas Children's is the largest pediatric hospital in the nation, providing medical care in more than 40 pediatric subspecialties. It also has the largest pediatric cancer and hematology research and treatment center in the country

As an internationally recognized children's hospital it is the primary pediatric training site for Baylor College of Medicine, which has one of the largest pediatric residency programs in the country.

Baylor College of Medicine, operates the nation's first Children's Nutrition Research Center, a U.S. Department of Agriculture facility that conducts research on the nutritional needs of pregnant and nursing women and their children.

Since opening its doors in 1954, Texas Children's Integrated Delivery System has cared for more than one million children from every corner of the world and has more than 2 million patient encounters a year.

Together with Baylor, Texas Children's participates in approximately 400 research projects annually and received $59 million in research funding in 2003. Current projects include testing of medications to improve the quality of life for patients with HIV infection and AIDS; diagnostic methods based on DNA analysis for cystic fibrosis, muscular dystrophy, and other genetic disorders; development of treatments through human gene therapy; and other basic and applied research studies.

I must also mention the Lyndon Baine Johnson General Hospital operated by the Harris County Hospital District, it is the second primary teaching facility or the University of Texas at Houston. They have been dedicated to serving the people of Houston for over two decades. Those who are fortunate enough to receive their training under the CHGME program may very well one day be treating children who arrive at this hospital.

We must remember who these soon to be specialists will serve . . . our nation's children. Children like Audrina, who was born in October of last year. Little Audrina was born with her heart outside of her body. After six hours of surgery, baby Audrina is going home. Supporting funding for programs like the CHGME supports the training of specialists who will one day save the lives of countless children.

FAST FACTS—CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION (CHGME)

The Children's Hospital Graduate Medical Education, CHGME, Payment Program currently supports 56 children's hospitals in 30 States.

Train about a third of the Nation's pediatricians.

Trains about 50 percent of pediatric subspecialists.

The CHGME Payment Program has provided more than 2 billion dollars to eligible freestanding children's hospitals since its inception.

Fifty-Six U.S. hospitals participate in the program, which enables them to:

Provide GME to graduates of medical schools.

Enhance research capabilities.

Care for vulnerable and underserved children.

A hospital is eligible to apply for CHGME Payment Program funding if it:

Participates in an approved Graduate Medical Education (GME) program.

Has a Medicare Provider Agreement.

Is excluded from the Medicare Inpatient Prospective Payment System, IPPS, under section 1886(d)(1)(B)(iii) of the Social Security Act, and its accompanying regulations.

Operates as a "freestanding" children's teaching hospital.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 297.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. PITTS. 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.

NATIONAL PEDIATRIC RESEARCH NETWORK ACT OF 2013

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 225) 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.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 225

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 ''National Pediatric Research Network Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. NATIONAL PEDIATRIC RESEARCH NETWORK.

Section 409D of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 284h; relating to the Pediatric Research Initiative) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (f); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

''(d) NATIONAL PEDIATRIC RESEARCH NETWORK.—

''(1) NETWORK.—In carrying out the Initiative, the Director of NIH, acting through the Director of the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development and in collaboration with other appropriate national research institutes and national centers that carry out activities involving pediatric research, may provide for the establishment of a National Pediatric Research Network consisting of the pediatric research consortia receiving awards under paragraph (2).

''(2) PEDIATRIC RESEARCH CONSORTIA.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Institute may award funding, including through grants, contracts, or other mechanisms, to public or private nonprofit entities—

''(i) for planning, establishing, or strengthening pediatric research consortia; and

''(ii) for providing basic operating support for such consortia, including with respect to—

''(I) basic, clinical, behavioral, or translational research to meet unmet needs for pediatric research; and

''(II) training researchers in pediatric research techniques in order to address unmet pediatric research needs.

''(B) RESEARCH.—The Director of NIH shall ensure that—

''(i) each consortium receiving an award under subparagraph (A) conducts or supports at least one category of research described in subparagraph (A)(ii)(I) and collectively such consortia conduct or support all such categories of research; and

''(ii) one or more such consortia provide training described in subparagraph (A)(ii)(II).

''(C) NUMBER OF CONSORTIA.—The Director of NIH may make awards under this paragraph for not more than 20 pediatric research consortia.

''(D) ORGANIZATION OF CONSORTIUM.—Each consortium receiving an award under subparagraph (A) shall—

''(i) be formed from a collaboration of cooperating institutions;

''(ii) be coordinated by a lead institution;

''(iii) agree to disseminate scientific findings, including from clinical trials, rapidly and efficiently; and

''(iv) meet such requirements as may be prescribed by the Director of NIH.

''(E) SUPPLEMENT, NOT SUPPLANT.—Any support received by a consortium under subparagraph (A) shall be used to supplement, and not supplant, other public or private support for activities authorized to be supported under this paragraph.

''(F) DURATION OF SUPPORT.—Support of a consortium under subparagraph (A) may be for a period of not to exceed 5 years. Such period may be extended at the discretion of the Director of NIH.

''(3) COORDINATION OF CONSORTIA ACTIVITIES.—The Director of NIH shall—

''(A) as appropriate, provide for the coordination of activities (including the exchange of information and regular communication) among the consortia established pursuant to paragraph (2); and

''(B) require the periodic preparation and submission to the Director of reports on the activities of each such consortium.

''(4) ASSISTANCE WITH REGISTRIES.—Each consortium receiving an award under paragraph (2)(A) shall provide assistance to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention in the establishment or expansion of patient registries and other surveillance systems as appropriate and upon request by the Director of the Centers.

''(e) RESEARCH ON PEDIATRIC RARE DISEASES OR CONDITIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In making awards under subsection (d)(2) for pediatric research consortia, the Director of NIH shall ensure that an appropriate number of such awards are awarded to such consortia that agree to—

''(A) focus primarily on pediatric rare diseases or conditions (including any such diseases or conditions that are genetic disorders (such as spinal muscular atrophy and Duchenne muscular dystrophy) or are related to birth defects (such as Down syndrome and fragile X)); and

''(B) conduct or coordinate one or more multisite clinical trials of therapies for, or approaches to, the prevention, diagnosis, or treatment of one or more pediatric rare diseases or conditions.

''(2) DATA COORDINATING CENTER.—

''(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—In connection with support of consortia described in paragraph (1), the Director of NIH shall establish a data coordinating center for the following purposes:

''(i) To distribute the scientific findings referred to in paragraph (1)(C).

''(ii) To provide assistance in the design and conduct of collaborative research projects and the management, analysis, and storage of data associated with such projects.

''(iii) To organize and conduct multisite monitoring activities.

''(B) REPORTING.—The Director of NIH shall—

''(i) require the data coordinating center established under subparagraph (A) to provide regular reports to the Director of NIH and the Commissioner of Food and Drugs on research conducted by consortia described in paragraph (1), including information on enrollment in clinical trials and the allocation of resources with respect to such research; and

''(ii) as appropriate, incorporate information reported under clause (i) into the Director's biennial reports under section 403.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support and urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 225, the National Pediatric Research Network Act of 2013.

Simply put, this legislation will foster important research on diseases that affect children. The bill will allow the National Institutes of Health to establish a national research network compromised of pediatric research consortia. According to NIH, there are between 6,000 and 7,000 diseases considered rare that affect 25 to 30 million people. Most of the approximately 7,000 rare diseases are pediatric diseases and often genetic.

Sadly, there are insufficient therapies for doctors to treat such diseases. The use of pediatric research consortia is a proven way to support pediatric applied research and to promote coordinated research activities that focus on translating research to practice. This will help improve care for children.

As an example, it is important to note that this bill will address some devastating diseases such as spinal muscular atrophy. This is a rare pediatric disease that kills more babies than any other genetic disease. Right now, it is incurable, untreatable, and fatal.

H.R. 225, introduced by Representatives LOIS CAPPS and CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS, amends the Public Health Service Act so that the director of the NIH, acting through the director of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, could provide for the establishment of a national pediatric research network compromised of pediatric research consortia.

□ 1720

The director could award cooperative agreements to those that strengthen and provide basic support to pediatric research consortia and train researchers. Consortia that receive an award would be comprised of cooperating institutions and coordinated by a lead institution. No more than 20 pediatric research consortia could receive awards.

In addition, the Director of NIH would be able to establish a data-coordinating center to support research and distribute scientific findings and provide reports to the Director of the NIH and the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration.

The bill would result in no new or increased budget authority, entitlement authority, tax expenditure, or revenues. Nor does the bill contain any earmarks.

So I am pleased to support this legislation. It is my hope that the National Pediatric Research Network will improve our understanding of pediatric diseases, improve treatment and therapies, and provide better health care outcomes for our Nation's children.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 225, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 225, the National Pediatric Research Network Act, and commend our colleagues, Congresswoman CAPPS and Congresswoman MCMORRIS RODGERS, for their bipartisan efforts to move this legislation forward.

There are many rare pediatric diseases, and in some of these diseases the children are incredibly fragile. If we can allow for research to occur across the country—not just one single location—research can be done at a larger level because children could then participate without having to travel.

This bill would allow the National Institutes of Health to establish a national pediatric network comprised of up to 20 pediatric research consortia, groups of collaborating institutions. The consortia will conduct basic clinical, behavioral, and translational research on pediatric diseases and conditions.

Among the 20 consortia, the NIH Director is directed to ensure that an appropriate number of awards go to consortia that focus primarily on pediatric rare diseases such as spinal muscular atrophy or birth defects such as Down syndrome.

In addition, we all know too well that traditionally pediatric research has been underfunded. That can make it hard to train and develop the research talent needed to address these devastating illnesses. The consortia can therefore be the training grounds for future researchers helping to fill the pediatric pipeline.

Mr. Speaker, no funds are specifically allocated to this effort under the bill, but it's our hope and expectation that NIH will choose to create the network and build on the important work in pediatric research that it already supports.

In the last Congress, this same bill was considered and approved by the Energy and Commerce Committee and the full House by voice vote. It was also included in a broader children's health bill at the end of the session, but it failed to be considered in the Senate.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan effort to address pediatric research; and with that strong support, it's my hope that we can encourage its passage in the Senate this time.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, this legislation, H.R. 225, the National Pediatric Research Network Act of 2013, indeed brings us a step closer to helping kids with unmet health needs, especially those with rare pediatric and genetic diseases. According to the NIH, there are more than 6,800 rare diseases, and most of them have no treatment or cure; and, yes, they primarily affect children.

I've met a number of times with one family in my district, the Kennedys, who have two precious little girls, Brielle and Brooke. I actually call them Sleeping Beauty and Cinderella. They have the rare disease called spinal muscular atrophy. They're great kids, and Brielle and Brooke have been little warriors in our effort to make the National Pediatric Research Network a reality.

It is so difficult to conduct research into these diseases due to the very small number of people with that disease, but tonight we're working to provide families like the Kennedys and so many others with greater hope for a cure or advances in treatment.

This bill is going to support and coordinate research on rare pediatric and genetic diseases and help improve the health and well-being of these kids afflicted with these diseases.

This bill establishes a national pediatric research network comprised of pediatric research consortia. These consortia are a proven way to overcome the gaps in research. They include leading institutions that act as partners to consolidate and coordinate research efforts. They're going to promote efficiency and collaboration, which is especially important when a disease impacts just a small number of kids.

This bill is in essence the same bill as H.R. 6163 of the last Congress, which passed in September and was part of S. 1440 in December of 2012. Last month, in January, our committee, the Energy and Commerce Committee, passed this legislation on a very broad bipartisan voice vote.

I want to particularly commend the author of the legislation, LOIS CAPPS. I want to thank CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS on our side, the Republican side, for her leadership, as well as JOE PITTS, Mr. WAXMAN, and others. This is a bill that all of us should support, and I would urge my colleagues to do the same thing.

It was unfortunate that last year it took the House a little while to pass this; and in the last waning days of the session, we couldn't get the Senate to move. This year, there's a reason why this is now one of the first bills to pass in the House: to give the Senate the time to get this thing done and get it to the President's desk to have him sign it into law so that he can help not only the Kennedys in my district, but the Kennedys literally in every district around the country and so many kids that deserve our help. We can make a difference tonight, and we will when we pass this on a bipartisan vote.

I thank all those Members and staff, particularly, for getting this to the floor in such a timely fashion.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 4 minutes to the sponsor of the legislation, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 225, the National Pediatric Research Network Act.

I want to associate myself with the remarks of our committee chairman, Mr. UPTON. He has a family dear to his heart, as I have one too; and they reflect families across this country for whom this bill will provide a stronger glimmer of hope for the future.

This is a bipartisan bill. It will improve research in clinical trials on pediatric diseases, train future pediatric researchers, and disseminate research findings quickly so that all children may benefit.

It does not replace our current pediatric research investments, but instead builds upon the work already being done at the National Institutes of Health and at so many research centers across the country by creating research consortia to form a nationwide network of pediatric researchers. This is important to make sure that we are always working with the most current science and that this information is quickly shared and verified.

This bill will also expand the geographic scope of research, giving sick kids easier access to research programs and clinical trials. Moreover, this bill will help a wider variety of institutions participate in this critical research while providing training grounds for our next generation of pediatric researchers.

Another key feature of this bill is that it will place an added emphasis on researching children's rare diseases and develop new treatments to fight them.

My colleagues have heard me talk before about diseases like spinal muscular atrophy just referenced by our committee chair. This does not just affect a sick child, but it also fundamentally changes the daily lives of their

family, their school, their community. The low prevalence of such diseases makes them particularly hard to research. But for those affected, a new cure or treatment could mean a world of difference.

The National Pediatric Research Network Act will be an important step forward to helping these families and those who may develop these diseases long into the future.

□ 1730

I am a nurse, a mother, and a grandmother as well, and I am very pleased to have authored this bill that will help bring more treatments and cures to many children.

Children have unique health care experiences, treatment needs, research challenges; and while public and private research has come a very long way on pediatric diseases over the years, we know that we are still far behind on important diagnostics, cures, and treatments for far too many of our ailing children, which is why this bill is so important.

I especially thank Representative CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS for co-leading this bill through two Congresses with me and for all her hard work on children's health issues. I want to thank the leadership of the Energy and Commerce Committee. Chairman UPTON I have referenced, but I also thank Ranking Member WAXMAN, Chairman PITTS, Ranking Member PALLONE, and their staffs for their dedication to this bill. I especially thank Ruth Katz for helping us move this bill through the committee quickly. I thank my colleague Congresswoman DEGETTE, who has worked on this bill with me for many years.

Finally, I would like to thank my constituents Bill and Victoria Strong for their tireless work on behalf of their daughter, Gwendolyn, and all the children with spinal muscular atrophy and other rare diseases. For them, I wear a particular bracelet, which reads: ''Never give up.'' Gwendolyn, who it was once thought would never live past age 2, is now in kindergarten. The work her parents, Bill and Victoria, do day in and day out to make their daughter's world a little better is so inspiring. The dedication of her parents and their medical team truly allows Gwendolyn to live life to the fullest. They have shown how entire communities can come together and fight diseases like SMA.

I urge my colleagues to follow their example. Come together, and support this bill today so we can do all we can to make it law.

Mr. Speaker, the National Pediatric Research Network Act is an important bill, not just for current and future researchers, but for sick children and for their families. It is a bipartisan measure that received overwhelming support in the 112th Congress, and it's the right thing to do, so I urge its full support.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. HARPER).

Mr. HARPER. I rise today to speak about the importance of the National Pediatric Research Network Act of 2013. This bill rightfully develops pediatric research consortia to identify and promote therapies for rare childhood diseases.

One of the disorders that this proposal targets is spinal muscular atrophy, or SMA, which is the number one genetic killer of children under the age of 2. This often unforgiving neurological disease leaves children weak and unable to move, breathe, swallow or talk; but research is promising and a cure is close.

Recently, a friend of mine, Jeff Horton from my home county in Mississippi, shared with my office that his daughter, Evie, who has SMA, had an encouraging visit with an SMA specialist in Dallas. You see, Evie has toured the country and has met with experts devoted to advancing new and innovative SMA therapies. As a result, Evie's quality of life continues to improve as she gains mobility and a sense of independence.

I urge you today to please support this legislation for Evie and others, such as her cousin, Reese, and the many other families that are affected by rare childhood diseases. This is something that we can do and that we should do.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. At this point, I would urge the passage of the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD CBO's cost estimate for H.R. 225. The cost estimate was not available when the committee filed its report on the bill.

I urge all Members to support this important legislation. With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, February 4, 2013.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 225, the National Pediatric Research Network Act of 2013.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Jamease Miles, who can be reached at 226–9010.

Sincerely,
DOUGLAS W. ELMENDORF.

Enclosure.

H.R. 225—National Pediatric Research Network Act of 2013

H.R. 225 would authorize the Director of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) to establish a National Pediatric Research Network that could provide support for research and training at up to 20 pediatric research consortia for up to five years. The bill would require the Director of NIH to establish a data coordinating center for the consortia. Upon request by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), consortia participating in the program would be required to provide assistance to the CDC to establish or expand surveillance systems, such as patient registries.

NIH currently supports many research networks that support research and training focused on pediatric health care needs and operates data coordinating centers for those networks. Those networks perform essentially the same activities as the consortia described in the bill. Existing networks do not routinely provide assistance to the CDC to establish surveillance systems. Based on information provided by NIH, CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 225 would have no effect on the number of research consortia or data coordinating centers that NIH would support. CBO expects that CDC would request assistance from a few networks to establish surveillance systems. Based on past coordination involving patient registries, CBO expects that the cost of providing such support would total about $1 million over five years. Thus, CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 225 would cost $1 million over the 2014–2018 period, assuming the availability of appropriated funds.

Enacting the bill would not affect direct spending or revenues; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures do not apply.

H.R. 225 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would not affect the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Jamease Miles. The estimate was approved by Holly Harvey, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 225, the National Pediatric Research Network Act of 2013. The House passed legislation similar to H.R. 225 twice last year. I am hopeful that this time around we will get this bill over the finish line.

H.R. 225 represents a bi-partisan effort to allow the National Institutes of Health (NIH) to establish a national pediatric research network dedicated to finding treatments and cures for pediatric diseases and conditions—especially those that are rare. The network would be comprised of up to 20 research consortia or groups of collaborating research institutions such as universities and hospitals. These consortia would be investigator-initiated and would conduct basic, clinical, behavioral, and translational research on pediatric diseases and conditions. NIH funding would be used to create the infrastructure necessary to carry out this research.

Within the network, the NIH Director is instructed to ensure that an appropriate number of awards go to those consortia that focus primarily on pediatric rare diseases such as spinal muscular atrophy—or SMA—or birth defects such as Down syndrome. Because these kinds of diseases and conditions are rare and some of the children who suffer from them are very fragile, it makes it difficult for them to travel great distances to participate in clinical trials or other research. This is often the case when—not infrequently—only one institution is conducting such research. The availability of consortia—by definition, multiple cooperating institutions—should make clinical research opportunities far more accessible to these kids and their families. In turn, we would hope they would help speed up the time and effort in finding treatments and cures for these devastating diseases and conditions.

In addition to the research itself, the consortia are expected to serve as training grounds for future pediatric researchers. Traditionally, pediatric research has been underfunded. This has sometimes resulted in real challenges in recruiting the talent necessary to

tackle diseases and conditions that affect kids—again, especially those that are rare. Thus, H.R. 225 places a special emphasis on pediatric research techniques with the goal of helping to "prime the pump" for a greater number of leading edge pediatric researchers.

Taken together, the components of H.R. 225 make for a package that would allow NIH to build on the strong body of pediatric research that it currently conducts and supports. I would encourage NIH to take full advantage of this opportunity.

I want to commend all those members of the Energy and Commerce Committee who have come together to make H.R. 225 happen. I especially want to the note the efforts of Congresswoman CAPPS and Congresswoman MCMORRIS RODGERS—the sponsors of this bill—for their tireless efforts to bring it before us today.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 225.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I support the National Pediatric Research Network Act, H.R. 225. Thank you to Representatives CAPPS and MCMORRIS-RODGERS for their continued leadership on this issue.

This important bill will allow the National Institutes of Health to focus funding on researching rare and genetic pediatric diseases such as spinal muscular atrophy, muscular dystrophy, Down syndrome, and Fragile X. Because there are such a small number of incidences of these terrible diseases, they are extremely difficult to study. This bill takes steps toward giving our research community the tools necessary to increase research of an array of diseases that cause so much pain and suffering to children and their families.

Increasing our nation's commitment to researching rare pediatric diseases is an area that enjoys bipartisan support. I look forward to voting for this bill and urge my colleagues to do the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 225.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. PITTS. 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 motion will be postponed.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE SITUATION IN OR IN RELATION TO CÔTE D'IVOIRE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113–8)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency, unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13396 of February 7, 2006, with respect to the situation in or in relation to Côte d'Ivoire is to continue in effect beyond February 7, 2013.

The situation in or in relation to Côte d'Ivoire, which has been addressed by the United Nations Security Council in Resolution 1572 of November 15, 2004, and subsequent resolutions, has resulted in the massacre of large numbers of civilians, widespread human rights abuses, significant political violence and unrest, and fatal attacks against international peacekeeping forces. Since the inauguration of President Alassane Ouattara in May 2011, the Government of Côte d'Ivoire has made progress in advancing democratic freedoms and economic development. While the Government of Côte d'Ivoire and its people continue to make progress towards peace and prosperity, the situation in or in relation to Côte d'Ivoire continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency and related measures blocking the property of certain persons contributing to the conflict in Côte d'Ivoire.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 4, 2013.*

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

PROVIDING FOR A JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS TO RECEIVE A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 11

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

That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, February 12, 2013, at 9 p.m., for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 225, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 297, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

NATIONAL PEDIATRIC RESEARCH NETWORK ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 225) 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, 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 Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 375, nays 27, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 31]

YEAS—375

Alexander	Cantor	Culberson
Amodei	Capito	Cummings
Andrews	Capps	Daines
Bachmann	Cárdenas	Davis (CA)
Bachus	Carney	Davis, Danny
Barletta	Carson (IN)	Davis, Rodney
Barr	Carter	DeFazio
Barrow (GA)	Cartwright	DeGette
Barton	Cassidy	Delaney
Bass	Castor (FL)	DeLauro
Beatty	Castro (TX)	DelBene
Becerra	Chabot	Denham
Benishek	Chaffetz	Dent
Bentivolio	Chu	DeSantis
Bera (CA)	Cicilline	DesJarlais
Bilirakis	Clarke	Deutch
Bishop (NY)	Clay	Diaz-Balart
Bishop (UT)	Clyburn	Dingell
Black	Coble	Doggett
Bonamici	Coffman	Doyle
Bonner	Cohen	Duckworth
Boustany	Cole	Duffy
Brady (PA)	Collins (GA)	Duncan (TN)
Brady (TX)	Collins (NY)	Edwards
Braley (IA)	Connolly	Ellison
Brooks (IN)	Cook	Ellmers
Brownley (CA)	Cooper	Engel
Buchanan	Costa	Enyart
Bucshon	Courtney	Eshoo
Burgess	Cramer	Esty
Bustos	Crawford	Farenthold
Calvert	Crenshaw	Fattah
Camp	Crowley	Fincher
Campbell	Cuellar	Fitzpatrick

Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (IN)

NAYS—27

Amash
Bridenstine
Broun (GA)
Conaway
Cotton
Duncan (SC)
Foxx
Gohmert
Graves (GA)
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Labrador
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
McClintock
Mullin
Neugebauer
Poe (TX)
Radel
Ribble
Rohrabacher
Stockman
Stutzman
Weber (TX)
Woodall
Yoho

NOT VOTING—29

Aderholt
Barber
Bishop (GA)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capuano
Cleaver
Conyers
Farr
Fortenberry
Gabbard
Herrera Beutler
Kingston
Larsen (WA)
McNerney
Meeks
Moran
Richmond
Rush
Scott, David
Simpson
Smith (WA)
Stivers
Walberg
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1853

Messrs. STOCKMAN, CONAWAY, Mrs. LUMMIS, Messrs. ROHRABACHER, STUTZMAN, NEUGEBAUER, POE of Texas, and HUDSON changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. CARTWRIGHT changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL GME SUPPORT REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 297) to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize support for graduate medical education programs in children's hospitals, 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 Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 352, nays 50, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 32]

YEAS—352

Alexander
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Forbes
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lance
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (IN)

NAYS—50

Amash	Garrett	Mulvaney
Bentivolio	Gohmert	Neugebauer
Bridenstine	Gowdy	Pearce
Broun (GA)	Graves (GA)	Pittenger
Collins (GA)	Hensarling	Poe (TX)
Conaway	Huelskamp	Radel
Cotton	Jenkins	Rice (SC)
Cramer	Jordan	Rokita
Culberson	King (IA)	Salmon
Davis, Rodney	Labrador	Schweikert
DesJarlais	Lamborn	Stockman
Duncan (SC)	Lankford	Stutzman
Duncan (TN)	Loebsack	Weber (TX)
Fleming	Lummis	Westmoreland
Flores	Marchant	Wilson (SC)
Foxx	Massie	Yoho
Franks (AZ)	McClintock	

NOT VOTING—29

Aderholt	Conyers	Richmond
Barber	Farr	Rush
Bishop (GA)	Fortenberry	Scott, David
Blackburn	Gabbard	Simpson
Blumenauer	Herrera Beutler	Smith (WA)
Brooks (AL)	Kingston	Stivers
Brown (FL)	Larsen (WA)	Walberg
Butterfield	McNerney	Young (AK)
Capuano	Meeks	Young (FL)
Cleaver	Moran	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1902

Mr. BENTIVOLIO changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 31, H.R. 225—National Pediatric Research Network Act of 2013, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 31, H.R. 297—Children's Hospital GME Support Reauthorization Act of 2013, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 444, REQUIRE PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP AND NO DEFICIT ACT

Mr. WOODALL, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–8) on the resolution (H. Res. 48) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 444) to require that, if the President's fiscal year 2014 budget does not achieve balance in a fiscal year covered by such budget, the President shall submit a supplemental unified budget by April 1, 2013, which identifies a fiscal year in which balance is achieved, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LET'S START BUDGETING RESPONSIBLY

(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, the only way for Washington to control its spending problem is to start budgeting, and budgeting responsibly.

House Republicans have passed responsible budgets for 2 consecutive years that restore economic growth and reduce our deficits. Unfortunately, the Senate has not passed a budget in 4 years, and today the President missed the deadline for submitting his own budget to Congress for the fourth time in the last 5 years.

You don't have to look much further than these facts to learn why Washington has such a hard time living within its means. For this reason, the House is advancing a series of initiatives to force Washington's hand.

On January 23, 2013, the Chamber passed the No Budget, No Pay Act, which forces the Senate to pass a budget or Members of Congress will lose their pay. This week the House will consider legislation forcing the President to produce a balanced budget or submit a plan that indicates the earliest year he believes fiscal balance can be achieved.

Hardworking Americans run their households by setting a budget and then living within those means. It's time for Washington to do the same.

□ 1910

PULSE OF TEXAS—RONALD FROM KINGWOOD, TEXAS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Ronald from Kingwood, Texas, writes me this:

> My family and I paid taxes, raised a family, contributed to the community and our church. But we are very disappointed in Washington. Our government is spending money it doesn't have. And our President says, in other words, Tax those Americans who have worked hard, balanced their household budgets, saved, and have been successful.
>
> My wife and I always thought that was the American Dream. In 2013, our taxes have gone up. Why? Why? Why? Because Congress doesn't cut its spending. There should be no tax increases on any Americans until there are significant spending cuts. Normal Americans can't simply borrow money. So why should government? I've worked hard for what I've achieved. Now why should we pay more taxes just because Washington has a spending addiction?

Mr. Speaker, we can't tax our way and spend our way into prosperity.

And that's just the way it is.

REMEMBERING THEODORE ''TED'' W. OGLE

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

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and salute a remarkable Hoosier, Theodore ''Ted'' W. Ogle. He was a true leader in his home of Columbus, Indiana. He left us way too soon.

Mr. Ogle served his community in many ways, including as a youth sports official and coach, as a board member of the Big Brothers and Big Sisters, and for 16 years on the Columbus City Council. Most recently, he served local Republicans as county and district chair. He was my dear friend.

I got to know Ted best when I first ran for office and needed his support. Ted said he was happy to see me but that his boys had a swim meet, and if I needed to see him, it was going to have to be there. So off I went to see him that day. To be honest, I probably learned more about swimming than politics.

As this Chamber knows, politics can be a tough business. There's always another meeting, another event, another obligation. It is all too easy to push our family life to the back burner. In his own quiet but direct way, Ted showed me where he set his priorities, and when it came time for me to have a wife and children, where I should set mine. I try to do that.

That was Ted Ogle—a man truly committed to God, his family, his country, and his party. I will miss his friendship, counsel, and most of all, his good example.

A REMEMBRANCE OF THE HEROES OF THE SPACE SHUTTLE ''COLUMBIA—STS'' 109

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, on April 12, 1981, the space shuttle *Columbia* blasted off into space to launch America's space shuttle program. She would complete 28 missions, with over 300 days in space. As every American knows, we lost Columbia as she came home on February 1, 2003. We all mourn the seven brave astronauts who lost their lives that day. We'll never forget Commander Rick Husband, Pilot Willie McCool, and the five mission specialists: Michael Anderson, David Brown, Kalpana Chawla, Ilan Ramon from Israel, and Laurel Clark.

As a Member of Congress who grew up with astronauts, I have been blessed to meet some of the families of *Columbia's* last crew. One of them said words I'll never forget:

> In their final moments, *Columbia* and her crew came home to Texas.

May the *Columbia* crew rest in peace with our eternal thoughts and blessings.

REMEMBERING FORMER NEW YORK MAYOR ED KOCH

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

Mr. ENGEL. This morning, I attended the funeral of former Congressman and former mayor Ed Koch in New

York City. Ed was larger than life. He was a great mayor of the city of New York, a fantastic Congressman before that, and a personal friend of mine and so many others. It's generally thought that Ed was the one who brought New York City back from the bad days—starting the good days. He was the quintessential mayor of New York, walking up and down the streets when he was mayor, asking people, ''How am I doing?''

I just want to say this body had the good fortune to have had Ed Koch as one of its Members, and New York City had the good fortune to have him as mayor for three terms, and I had the good fortune to have him as my friend. In later years, he and I would meet periodically and go out for lunch at one of the restaurants downtown in mid-Manhattan. Ed would always pick the restaurant and be as feisty as ever. He was a very proud, proud New Yorker, and we are very proud of Congressman and Mayor Ed Koch. I will miss him dearly, as will all of New York and America. May he rest in peace.

CONGRESSIONAL PRAYER CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUDSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to come to the floor tonight to discuss our Nation's rich spiritual heritage and the foundation it laid for the religious freedoms we still enjoy today. I'm hosting this Special Order hour as founder and co-chairman of the Congressional Prayer Caucus, a bipartisan group with more than 90 Members of the House of Representatives dedicated to protecting religious freedom in America and preserving our Nation's rich spiritual heritage. I co-chair this caucus with my good friend, Mr. MIKE MCINTYRE, a Democrat Member from North Carolina. We founded the caucus in 2005 to formally acknowledge the important role that faith plays in American life and to recognize our Nation's religious heritage. We're working to guard these legacies for future generations.

Members of the Congressional Prayer Caucus gather each week in the United States Capitol, just a few feet from here, to pray for our Nation. We leave political labels at the door and we join in prayer for one another and our country. We all know how unusual it is in the current political climate for Members to unite across the aisle and work together. Yet throughout the more than 200-year history of our Nation, prayer has played a vital role in strengthening the fabric of our society.

Mr. Speaker, our prayers build upon the legacy that was established by early legislators. In fact, the first act of America's first Congress in 1774 was to ask a minister to open with prayer and lead Congress in the reading of four chapters of the Bible. As our fledgling Nation grew and encountered overwhelming challenges, time and time again we saw our Nation's leaders turn to God in prayer.

We live in a challenging time. Wherever I go, I encounter people who want to know if the future of America is optimistic or pessimistic. When I review the insurmountable challenges our Nation overcame to get to this point—the Civil War, World War II, the Great Depression, and so many more—I believe our future is optimistic. As long as there are men and women in our government and throughout our Nation who continue to turn to God for help, we'll always have hope.

In addition to joining in prayer each week, members of the Prayer Caucus also work together to preserve the presence of religion, faith, and morality in the marketplace of ideas. We're seeing increased efforts to remove references to God and faith from the public square. Activists seek to remove ''God'' from our national motto and Pledge of Allegiance. They seek to prevent city and county councils from praying and recognizing our Nation's spiritual heritage. And they seek to silence people who wish to live out their faith.

□ 1920

Members of the Prayer Caucus have countered these efforts, successfully ensuring that our history remains intact for future generations.

In the 112th Congress, I introduced a resolution reaffirming our national motto ''In God We Trust'' and encouraging its public display in public buildings. The measure passed overwhelmingly by a vote of 396–9. Some ask why we needed to reaffirm our national motto; yet if left unstated, the motto could be changed in a de facto manner.

On November 2010, before a worldwide audience in a much publicized speech focusing on the United States' relationship with the Muslim world, President Obama incorrectly proclaimed that our national motto was ''E Pluribus Unum.'' Despite a bipartisan letter from 42 Members of Congress, the President didn't correct his inaccurate statement. Now, thanks to the House passage of the In God We Trust resolution, children across America know that if God can be displayed on the walls of their classroom, they cannot be prevented from talking about him at school.

Members of the Prayer Caucus also worked to correct inaccuracies and omissions in the Capitol Visitor Center. In 2008, the over-half-billion-dollar Capitol Visitor Center opened for the purpose of educating over 15,000 Capitol visitors daily on the legislative process, as well as the history and development of the architecture and art of the U.S. Capitol.

When Members toured the facility, however, CVC historians had censored the building of any references to our Judeo-Christian history. They had replaced the inscription of ''In God We Trust'' inscribed right behind you on the Speaker's rostrum with stars and a replica of the House Chamber and had cropped an actual picture of the Chamber so you could not see the words ''In God We Trust.''

Additionally, a plaque was placed in the CVC falsely educating visitors that the national motto was E Pluribus Unum. They had not included the Pledge of Allegiance in the CVC because it referenced God. Only after Members of Congress intervened publicly and legislatively were these omissions and inaccuracies corrected.

I am proud to partner with my good friend, Mr. MIKE MCINTYRE, in leading this extraordinary group of Members in the Congressional Prayer Caucus, and I'm so pleased to be joined this evening by my colleagues who are working to protect religious freedom in America and around the world.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield to my colleague and my good friend from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his work on the Prayer Caucus. I would also acknowledge my good friend, MIKE MCINTYRE, for his work. This idea of religious freedom and liberty is indeed a bipartisan issue.

Our Founding Fathers came here from countries that had monarchs—kings—kings that could tell a person who they were to marry, what job they could have, what level of education they might attain. They could tell you what church you must be a member of. It was those state-ordained religions that many came to this country to get away from. They came here with an idea of a government that could only declare what your freedoms were, not limit those freedoms. It was that freedom of religion that caused many of the colonies to be organized differently, by different faiths—and some by no faith at all. It was in that backdrop that the Constitution was written which caused our Founding Fathers great pause.

The initial Constitution was written and could not be ratified. It could not be ratified by enough States until more freedoms were added, more freedoms that began with the First Amendment to the Constitution, the amendment that declared that we would have religious freedoms, that the government could make no laws concerning those freedoms.

Our Founding Fathers well understood the value of free and open expression of religious faith, one that was

free from the tentacles of government, one that was free for each person to choose, to exercise or to not exercise. Our Founding Fathers were not hesitant to declare their reliance on divine guidance.

Shortly after our Revolution—that revolution of ideas that started this grand experiment of self-governance—it was amazing that France decided they would try the same thing. But they were oh so uncertain about this divine guidance, this relationship with a higher power; and so they wanted something more tangible.

Their revolution became about reason. The problem with reason was that it was a human-ordained institution. We ourselves, we as people would not acknowledge that we were to comply with a higher power. That reliance on reason among men resulted in the chaos that became the French Revolution. It never found the success that the American Revolution had. I believe that much of that failure—and much of our success—was the difference in reliance, that difference of internal commitment to values and rules outside oneself.

Our Founding Fathers well understood that we, in order to have a Republic, must be a moral Nation. They declared that a Republic or democracy—whichever you would call it—can't impose through tremendous tyrannical restraints. It depends on us having a voluntary compliance with laws.

They feared a Federal Government that was too strong. The Constitution repeatedly limits the power of the Federal Government because they knew what strong centralized governments would do. They had to escape from Europe to get away from those exact things.

Today, we find a central government that is willing to compromise our freedom of religion and the freedom of expression of religion. Whether a person has a religious belief or not, it should cause you concern that this government is willing to take away the conscience protections. To make people buy products that offend their basic core beliefs should be alarming to any single member of this country, any single citizen. To find a government that will declare doctors have to perform acts that offend their very conscience is something that should give us all pause. But, instead, we see a Federal Government charging more heartily into the fray, even to diminishing and dismissing the belief in a higher power.

I think that that's the reason that the Congressional Prayer Caucus is so necessary and so needed at this time, because a Nation that forgets the real values is at risk of much greater catastrophe than what we've seen thus far, much greater catastrophe than an economy sagging brings, the loss of jobs brings. Because right now, we in America are struggling to find out what's in our heart.

We see many who are declaring that people are essentially good. The problem is not the person; the problem is in the guns, for example. I would say that the greater problem in America is not guns. The problem in America is the heart of America. Until we acknowledge and begin to reflect on that, until we begin to teach the new generations the importance of our heart in aligning with the heart of God, I think this Nation is going to go through more turmoil, more questions.

Our recommendation is that this Congress would stay away from limiting religious freedoms. I would request that every single citizen of this country contemplate those limitations that are currently being considered, those attempts to silence those in the faith community. A secular government is far different from a secular society, and yet that appears to be the discussion that we're having.

So, again, I would like to thank the gentleman from Virginia for his leadership in this issue. I would like to thank all of the members of the Congressional Prayer Caucus. But I would especially like to thank the members and the citizens of this country for the unflagging belief that there is something more important than the human ideas. There's something more powerful, more stable, and more permanent than our current viewpoints on policies. Those are the laws of God that are inherent and knowledgeable to each one of us.

Again, I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue.

□ 1930

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for his great work on religious freedom and religious liberty issues, and thank you for sharing that tonight.

Mr. Speaker, as individuals watch Congress across the country, one of the big criticisms they always talk about is all of the partisanship that hits here, and they just don't get to see the Congressional Prayer Caucus. If they did, they would see what they are going to see on this floor tonight, and that is my co-chairman, who is also one of my dearest friends in here tonight, and that is MIKE MCINTYRE. He is a Democrat from North Carolina; I'm a Republican from Virginia. But I can tell you that I have just the utmost respect for him, and I think he does for me.

It is my honor to now yield the floor to him.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you Congressman FORBES, Randy, for your friendship and your leadership, undying, uncompromising leadership to help the Congressional Prayer Caucus be the great spiritual force and practical legislative force that it is in its witness and its work.

And I'm thrilled to join my colleague, Congressman FORBES, and my other colleagues from both sides of the aisle who meet regularly for the Congressional Prayer Caucus, and particularly this week, as we get ready for the National Prayer Breakfast coming up this Thursday.

Many Americans don't realize that this is a tradition that has gone on now for many years. In fact, this will be the 61st National Prayer Breakfast coming up this Thursday morning. I hope folks back home will tune in.

This has happened every single year since President Eisenhower, by every single President; and we are excited that the President and First Lady will be with us again, as they have been the last four years, and that this will be a time to see about 3,000 people from around the world gather together from about 140 nations to come and ask God's blessings and wisdom as we begin this new Congress in this new year.

But let me say in even a broader context, as Congressmen Forbes and Pearce have indicated, the Congressional Prayer Caucus is to carry on that, that in addition to supporting the National Prayer Breakfast this Thursday is to carry it on throughout the year and to affirm our commitment to maintaining and strengthening our great country's religious freedom.

Through the more than 200-year history of our Nation, we know that faith, prayer, and trust in God have played a vital role in strengthening the fabric of our society. We are incredibly blessed to live in a country that was founded on the bedrock of faith and allowing our citizens to worship freely and without fear of persecution, which is guaranteed by our Constitution.

Our Founding Fathers knew the importance of faith to the success of our infant democracy and affirmed it in the Declaration of Independence, declaring that our unalienable rights that we love to talk about as Americans, our rights of life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness, are endowed to us by our Creator.

Indeed, faith was so integral to our new government that on Tuesday, September 6, 1774, the very first act of the first Continental Congress was to pause and join together in prayer. So this tradition doesn't just go back 61 years as we celebrate with the National Prayer Breakfast this week; it goes back to the very beginning of the first Continental Congress.

It's from these historic underpinnings that our Nation has grown and thrived, and we stand here today on the shoulders of those Americans who stood up and boldly fought for our rights to practice our faith freely. And we must never grow complacent, as Congressman FORBES pointed out, in some of the specific areas that we've had some issues recently. It's our duty to defend and protect the rights of all Americans, especially in a place like the U.S. Capitol, where we ought to be able to gladly recognize what our Nation's religious heritage has been.

Today we face many serious challenges as a Nation, and it's never been more important that we join together to ask God for guidance in making the right decisions. And that's why, during

the first vote each week, we gather right across the hall here during that first vote, if it's on Monday night or Tuesday night or sometimes even the middle of the week on Wednesday, but when we gather during that first vote to step across the hall, leave party labels at the door and ask God, like Solomon did in the Old Testament, for wisdom for that week for those decisions that we make.

We hear so much about partisanship. And having gone through an election recently that partisanship was in its full glory, I think it's reassuring to the citizens of this country to know that there are those of us who do want to reach across the aisle and who realize that faith and prayer transcends the partisan divide that we too often hear about here in Washington.

We pray together each week because we recognize, as our Founders did, that the true source of power is not found in the Halls of Congress or in the Oval Office of the West Wing or in the Chambers of the Supreme Court, but on our knees before the throne of grace before Almighty God. And it's with that bold truth in mind that we gather this week with thousands of people of faith during the National Prayer Breakfast. And it's in this spirit that Members of this body gather every week just across the hall in room 219 to reaffirm our trust in God and recognize the profound reconciling power of prayer and to ask God for His grace and His guidance.

I hope for those of you who are here in this Chamber and those who may be listening back home that you will join us, particularly this week, as we pray for God's blessing upon our Nation, for His will to be done throughout the world, for His peace to dwell in all of us, His children, as we gather for the National Prayer Breakfast. But I also hope you'll go to a Web site beyond this week, the Congressional Prayer Caucus Web site, and say, Yes, Mike, yes, Randy, yes, we do want you, men and women up there, to make the right decisions, you better believe it, because our country is that important, our future is that important, and we do want to make sure that we go forth as one Nation, under God, with liberty and justice for all.

With that, I will also submit a copy of a prayer from Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence and, as we know, our third President, and pray that God's blessings will be upon this great Nation, not only this week during the National Prayer Breakfast, but with the work of the Congressional Prayer Caucus and those of you who will join us back home, individually, through your families, your churches, your places of worship, your fellowship groups or prayer groups, that you too will join us in making sure that we are building a wall of prayer around our Nation's Capitol, just as Nehemiah built the wall in the Old Testament.

Almighty God, Who has given us this good land for our heritage; we humbly beseech Thee that we may always prove ourselves a people mindful of Thy favor and glad to do Thy will. Bless our land with honorable ministry, sound learning, and pure manners. Save us from violence, discord, and confusion, from pride and arrogance, and from every evil way. Defend our liberties, and fashion into one united people, the multitude brought hither out of many kindreds and tongues. Endow with Thy spirit of wisdom those whom in Thy name we entrust the authority of government, that there may be justice and peace at home, and that through obedience to Thy law, we may show forth Thy praise among the nations of the earth. In time of prosperity fill our hearts with thankfulness, and in the day of trouble, suffer not our trust in Thee to fail; all of which we ask through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I pray God's blessings upon our Nation, and I yield back to our great leader and co-chairman of the Congressional Prayer Caucus, Congressman FORBES.

Mr. FORBES. Thank you so much for your leadership and your courage and your friendship, and we appreciate your words tonight and we'll treasure them.

Mr. Speaker, one of the true leaders in the House of Representatives is a lady from North Carolina. It's often said, when VIRGINIA FOXX speaks, everybody listens, and we're delighted tonight to have her here and to listen to her speak.

With that, I would like to yield the floor to the gentlelady from North Carolina.

Ms. FOXX. I would like to thank the gentleman from Virginia for that nice introduction, but especially thank him for leading this Special Order tonight and for being such a leader with our Congressional Prayer Caucus. He has given great illustrations of the ways the Congressional Prayer Caucus has taken action.

Mr. PEARCE, the gentleman from New Mexico, has given us an excellent history lesson, and our colleague, Mr. MCINTYRE from North Carolina, has helped to round out with information about the National Prayer Breakfast, and one of the reasons why we're focusing on the topic of the Prayer Caucus this week. I think they've given great context.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that we realize that God, the author of freedom, has given us a free land, and we praise Him for it. That freedom is the basis of everything else that we do in this country. This week, many people of faith will gather in Washington, D.C., to pray to Almighty God for wisdom and guidance and, above all, for obedient hearts to carry out His will.

The size and scope of the challenges before us would overcome a faithless people, so we acknowledge our desperate need for continued blessing and direction. We ask God to make us thankful, because ours is a country founded upon religious freedom and deference to our Creator and not to government. We enjoy a societal understanding that dissent is not disloyalty. The United States upholds the God-given rights of its citizens to believe as they are called and to live their faith in accordance with their convictions. That individuals may set their own course so boldly is why creative excellence and individual property are capstones of citizenship.

We ask God for hearts vigilant to observe the numerous blessings He has given. And we ask for mercy not to stray from being good stewards of His gifts, to visit orphans and widows in their distress, to always protect liberties of conscience, to seek justice, love mercy, and follow humbly after God.

Only by His grace do we, who serve in this Congress, have any hope of being able to humble ourselves in service to others.

□ 1940

Only by His grace can we be safeguarded from trite competition and self-exaltation. Only by His grace can we do what my constituent Rob Lee encouraged and go outside our pride to ''pray for our leaders, regardless of their political ideologies.''

Our God is a loving God, and He is our defense. We ask Him often to keep a hedge of protection around our men and women deployed throughout the world for freedom's sake. We know it is the example of our Savior Jesus Christ, who lived the words ''greater love hath no man than this, that he lay down his life for his friend,'' that inspires the brave generosity of so many of our warriors.

Our Lord is faithful to be near the brokenhearted when evil and sorrow have temporary triumphs in this world. We pray that His justice will be swift, and His righteousness our great relief.

To have even the slightest chance of living up to our oath and doing right by the people we serve, we need the help of Almighty God. This week, as ever, we reflect on that reliance and declare our thanks once again that we continue to be beneficiaries of His most awesome grace.

Mr. FORBES. I would like to thank Congresswoman FOXX for those remarks and for her leadership.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have a gentleman from Oklahoma who has been a longtime leader in religious freedom and religious liberty issues. It is my privilege to yield the floor to him now, Mr. JAMES LANKFORD.

Mr. LANKFORD. It is my pleasure to be here. Thank you.

The National Prayer Breakfast coming up this week is a great reminder to us as a Nation just to be able to slow down, not as Republicans and Democrats, but as Americans, to be able to come together and do what we always do: to pray. It's what we've done from the very beginning. We are a people of prayer.

I enjoy getting a chance to tell people at home in Oklahoma about how Members of Congress get together to be able to pray in the Prayer Caucus time. We gather privately just to be able to sit down and pray. The House and the Senate both open every day in prayer.

Sitting on the platform of the inauguration just a few weeks ago, President Obama asked two different individuals to pray during that ceremony time. It should put to rest forever the debate whether we have prayer in public places when you see it in the House, in the Senate, in the executive branch, prayers repeated over and over again, and have from the very beginning.

We have our national optimism because we believe that this world and this Nation, they were created with a purpose, and that the Creator cares for His creation. From our founding documents, we believe that all people are created equal and are given certain rights from God, including life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We're different as America because we believe that our rights come from God, not from men, and our core values come from something greater than ourselves.

For many Americans, prayer is just a normal part of their day. It's like breathing in and out for them. As they go through the course of the day, they pray. That's no different for our many elected leaders, as well. We don't walk away from God because we're elected. We challenge our fellow Americans to do the same. We need His wisdom. We need His love. And it is in the moment when we are most arrogant and think that we meet our own needs that we forget to pray. But it's in the moment when we are needy as a Nation, as we are right now, we remember to pray.

At 8 years old, I remember extremely well sitting in church up in the balcony of our big church and realizing for the first time in my life there is a God and I don't know him. I spent the rest of that day thinking and processing through what it means to know God. As an 8-year-old boy, I laid in bed that night and I prayed to Jesus for the first time in my life that I would be forgiven of my sin, and I began a relationship with this God who made me. It was my first prayer, but it's definitely not been my last.

As a Nation, we understand how it begins, as well. If you walk out in the rotunda here in the Capitol, you'll see a huge painting hanging in the rotunda that's called the ''Embarkation of the Pilgrims.'' It was a painting done and hung in the rotunda in 1843, and it's supposed to depict the beginning of America. You know what the painting is of? The painting is of a group of Pilgrims gathered on the deck of a ship praying. It is the painting that is the beginning of America.

Last week at a town hall meeting in Konawa, Oklahoma, as they're gathered around to deal with a very difficult water issue in their town, do you know how they started their city council meeting? With a prayer. It's quite frankly the same way that I ended my day last night before I headed to Washington, D.C., kneeling beside my daughter's bed to pray. It's what we do as Americans. It's quite frankly when we're at our best. And it's a good thing for us as a Nation to slow down and remember, it's good to pray.

God bless our Nation this week as we do exactly that as a nation in this National Day of Prayer: to pray.

Mr. FORBES. I would like to thank Congressman LANKFORD for his words and for his strong work throughout the year on these issues.

Now it is now my privilege to yield to another individual that's been a passionate leader on religious freedom and religious liberty, Congressman LOUIE GOHMERT from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Virginia for having this time tonight. There's no better occasion than the National Prayer Breakfast.

My dear friend from Virginia leads each week when we're in session the first night of the week with bipartisan prayer. There is so much disagreement on this floor. I know my good friend from Texas, AL GREEN, and I have disagreement on issues, but he is my Christian brother and we prayed together tonight. It's a great honor to do that.

There's so much misinformation out there about the starting of this country, and there are always plenty of mistakes made. When you look back to the very beginning, after the rocky start with the Articles of Confederation, 4 years later they talked Washington into coming back and coming to Philadelphia and presiding over a convention. He was very reluctant to do that. He thought he had done his part. But after 4 or 5 weeks of nothing but rancor and a lot of yelling, very difficult times within Independence Hall, finally 80-year-old Benjamin Franklin stood up and was recognized by the president of the Constitutional Convention, George Washington.

Franklin had enjoyed life a great deal, but at that point he was overweight, had arthritis, gout. He was in a lot of trouble, but his mind was quite sharp. He was 2 to 3 years away from meeting his Maker. But he pointed out, we've been going for nearly 4 or 5 weeks, and we have more noes than ayes on virtually every vote. Then he says these words.

Now Madison entered notes to what he said, but Franklin wrote out his whole speech, and that is part of our archives. He said in his own words:

> How has it happened, Sir, that we have not once thought of humbly applying to the Father of lights to illuminate our understanding?
>
> In the beginning of the contest with Great Britain, when we were sensible of danger, we had daily prayer in this room. Our prayers, Sir, were heard, and they were graciously answered.

And he goes on to point out that all of them should be able to remember specific prayers that they had prayed that were answered. Then he said these words, his words, his handwriting we have, as he spoke to the convention:

> I have lived, Sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth: that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid? We have been assured, Sir, in the sacred writings, that unless the Lord build the House, they labor in vain that build it.

He urged his colleagues to believe it as he did, and he made a motion that they begin each session with prayer, as they had during the Constitutional Convention. Mr. SHERMAN seconded it. There was a lot of debate. I heard someone call in to Sean Hannity's show a few months ago, and they were saying, Well, gee, prayer meant nothing in the early days. In essence it was his point that that motion was defeated.

□ 1950

If you go back and look at the history, during the Constitutional Convention, they had money and they hired a chaplain. They agreed on the chaplain, and the chaplain led the prayer. During the Constitutional Convention, as was pointed out after Franklin's motion, they didn't have any money to hire a chaplain. They had no money. So they ended up not passing it because they didn't have money to hire a chaplain; and if they didn't hire a chaplain, they didn't see how they could agree on who would do the prayer.

They ultimately went together to hear a sermon on the anniversary of our independence. They prayed together; they worshiped together; and they came back. Ultimately, the result was our Constitution. When the Congress began to meet, they did have money; they did hire a chaplain; and they did start each session with prayer.

It was interesting when, back a few years ago, we were called into session on a Sunday to vote on the President's health care bill. Well, it was the first time I'd been called into session on a Sunday, and I greatly appreciated my friend from Virginia's leadership. We had a discussion: if we're going to be forced to come to Congress, called into session on a Sunday—what many of us call the Lord's day—then it doesn't seem like there should be a problem reviving a tradition that spanned most of the 1800s, and that was to have church right down the hall here—in Statuary Hall as it's called now—but in what was the House of Representatives for most of the 1800s, until around 1858, when they moved into this Chamber, although it did not look like this. During those years, they had church service every Sunday. It was the largest Christian church service—nondenominational—in Washington, D.C.

Now, those who know the Constitution know there is no mention of the words ''separation of church and State,'' ''wall of separation.'' That was in a letter that Thomas Jefferson

wrote to the Danbury Baptists. It had nothing to do with whether or not there should be discrimination against a Christian church as we often see now by the government. It seems that Christians are the only group that is politically expedient to be prejudiced against anymore—too often. The man who used the words ''separation of church and State,'' Thomas Jefferson, we had verified by the research that the Congressional Research Service did.

When I just glanced at the report they provided, I saw that Madison didn't do this, and I thought, gee, that's weird. I thought Jefferson and Madison as President both went to church in the House of Representatives down the hall, so I looked more intently at the report. It said that Thomas Jefferson did go to church, and, in fact, Jefferson would often bring the Marine Band to play the hymns for the church service down the hall. That's a little different definition of the ''separation of church and State'' that's often given now. Just down the hall, they had open prayer and they had open worship, and nothing about any of that offended their sense of the First Amendment.

It turns out what the report said was Jefferson would normally ride to church each Sunday that he was President up to Capitol Hill on horse, on horseback. It pointed out that Madison didn't do this. Madison normally came to church every Sunday here in the House of Representatives in a horse-drawn carriage—he didn't ride a horse; he rode in a carriage—but the man who is given the most credit for the most work of our Constitution, James Madison, was not at all offended, and he didn't think the Constitution was offended by having church down the hall.

So I'll always be grateful to my friend from Virginia (Mr. FORBES) for suggesting let's have church, and we came together. They set it up, and it just reminded us of what it must have been like except they wouldn't have had steel and plastic chairs, but we had a worship service. What was particularly great, I thought, was that the prayers, both from Democrats and Republicans, were historic prayers that had been prayed in this Capitol many, many years ago as part of our history. It was a historical service, but there it was in the same place that the voice of Thomas Jefferson and James Madison would have echoed in song and in verse and in prayer. Such a rich history we have.

I'm sure my friend from Virginia has heard people call and write nasty notes, saying, Keep your religion at home. This is when I have read historical prayers, historical proclamations by George Washington, Abraham Lincoln and all in between—Adams, John Quincy Adams—by all of these historical heavyweights in our past. People write, Keep that stuff out of government, not realizing, because of their lack of proper education, that those were part of our history. They were part of what made this country the greatest country in the world. It was part of what inspired John Quincy Adams, who Abraham Lincoln credited as having such an impact on him for that brief year they overlapped in the House of Representatives, to ultimately come back and become President—to end that blot, that blight, on this country's history called ''slavery.''

Of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., whose statue is just down the hall in the Rotunda, the man was an ordained Christian minister. He spent his life, I've heard some say, in order to have all races created equal, and I would go one further as a young Christian white boy: he freed young Christian white boys to treat Christian brothers and sisters like Christian brothers and sisters. He did a great service for all of America.

So I thank my friend from Virginia for hosting this time to talk about the historical importance of prayer. I look forward to this Thursday's prayer breakfast. It's an honor to be the Republican co-chair on the House side, and I look forward to the breakfast on Thursday.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you and all within the sound of the voice of the Members of Congress will be there with us this Thursday morning.

Mr. FORBES. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of humility that we always take the floor in this Chamber. Tonight especially, as I look over your head, I see the inscription of our national motto: ''In God We Trust.'' Most of the individuals watching from home don't get to see that because the cameras are fixed below it, so they normally don't show it.

You have heard remarks tonight from Republicans and Democrats, and one of the truly great privileges of serving in this body is that we get to serve with some wonderful people. They come from a lot of wonderful States, and each of those States has its own history. We're not only proud of that history, but we learn so much from that history. I come from Virginia. When we look at our history, even before the first colonists ever stepped foot on the shores in Virginia, it was drafted in the charter of Virginia that one of the major purposes of that colony was going to be to propagate faith and to propagate religion.

As they made that arduous journey across an ocean and didn't know if they were going to live or die, they had a ragtag group of people, and they weren't exactly the people that you'd have teaching Sunday school classes. They were tough individuals. When they landed on the shores, their chaplain, Robert Hunt, was able to convince them to come together and do their first organized act, which was to take an old sail and create a makeshift church, to get on their knees and thank God for delivering them over here and to ask for His wisdom and His blessing. With all of the challenges that they had, Mr. Hunt was able to convince them to come morning and afternoon and have those same prayers. They didn't have to think a lot about what they would pray for; it was just that they could make it to the next day. They did make it to the next day and to the next year.

About 10 years later, they selected the first legislative body in the new world in 1619, and the first act of that body was to go into the church in Jamestown, to get on their knees and to ask for God's blessing and His wisdom and His guidance.

□ 2000

It doesn't surprise us then that 2 years later when they would draft the first charter of the first Constitution of Virginia, that they would have as one of its primary purposes in its dedication for the advancement and service of God and the enlargement of His kingdom. And those years turned into decades and they moved that capital from Jamestown to Williamsburg, and it was a tough several years. They would have great men of faith. Some of them would spend 13 hours a day studying the Bible, praying.

One of those individuals was a guy named Samuel Davies. He would get up oftentimes at his church and preach. One lady liked him so much that she would bring her son and daughters to hear him on a weekly basis. Her young teenage son would sit at his feet and he would learn principles that he would talk about, about God and rights that came from God and not from men. That lady was Sarah Henry, and her son was Patrick Henry.

And when Patrick was 29 years old on his birthday, the first day he was in the Virginia General Assembly, they were debating the Stamp Act. He was supposed to be there and seen and not heard. He was a freshman. He sat there and he listened, and it looked like Virginia was going to do nothing and allow the acts that had taken away so many rights just to slip right between their fingers. And as he listened and listened, he opened up a law book and there was a blank page and he started making notes. And finally he stood up and he started talking about rights that we had.

Another young man that heard Patrick Henry was a guy by the name of Thomas Jefferson. He said that Patrick Henry was the greatest orator he'd ever heard. And Patrick Henry replied, no, the greatest orator, the person he'd learned all of those concepts of freedom from, was that fellow by the name of Samuel Davies.

Years later, Patrick Henry, Thomas Jefferson, Richard Henry Lee, they would find themselves in that same Virginia General Assembly, but the port of Boston was about to be closed, and the King had issued that order. They came together with a makeshift caucus and they asked themselves: What can we best do to help our fellow

colonists in Boston? Of all of the things they thought of, you know what that group came up with? They said the most important thing they could do was ask Virginians all across that Commonwealth to go down and pray for the colonists in Boston.

They spent that night writing a prayer resolution. They didn't know how to do it. They hadn't done it in years. They looked back at old puritan resolutions. They wrote one and went into the General Assembly, and they didn't know how it was going to be received. The next day, the Virginia General Assembly voted it unanimously and didn't change a word. The Governor was so irate, how dare they ask and pray against the King himself, that he stormed in with that proclamation in his hand and he dissolved the Virginia General Assembly.

Well, they were a group of individuals that didn't like the word ''no,'' and so they walked across the street—Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, Peyton Randolph, Richard Henry Lee, and a guy by the name of George Washington and several others, and they wrote a resolution that changed the world, a resolution that said that an attack on one colony was an attack on all of them, and they called for the first ever Congressional Continental Congress.

That Congress, as you know, would meet. And as Mr. GOHMERT pointed out, when they couldn't agree on anything else, the one thing they agreed on was opening with prayer. That Congress led to the Second Congress. In the Second Congress, they appointed a committee—Ben Franklin, John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, Robert Livingston, and Roger Sherman—to write a declaration that would birth this country. And as we are proud of in Virginia, the scrivener of that declaration was Thomas Jefferson. He would later say that he didn't write any new ideas or principles. He wrote concepts that had been heard and preached from pulpits across the Commonwealth and across this Nation, concepts that said this: Our rights didn't come from any act, any king, any committee, but they came from the Creator himself; and if they came from Him, they could never be taken away.

They went on to win that war, to win their freedom, but it didn't last long before it was challenged. And in 1812, in that war, as you know, Francis Scott Key penned that great poem that became our national anthem, the Star-Spangled Banner, and he wrote what is right behind you, and he said: Our motto will ever be ''In God We Trust.''

As we went into another great war that would split this country, the Civil War, this Congress declared that that motto, ''In God We Trust,'' could be on our coins. Later, the Supreme Court would have it challenged, but in the 1890s would recount the great history of faith in this country. And almost a half century later, when the greatest battle of freedom that ever was fought on the shores of Normandy was about to take place, Franklin Roosevelt led this entire Nation in prayer asking for blessings upon us.

After that great war and our victory, we came back in this Congress and asked where are we going to put our trust. Are we going to put it in that great atom bomb, in our resources and in our economy? This Congress said, no, our motto would be ''In God We Trust,'' and they adopted that as our motto.

And when I was a young boy, John Kennedy, facing the Cuban missile crisis, came out and said: The guiding principle of this country has always been, is today, and will forever be, in God we trust.

So, Mr. Speaker, with that great history of faith, why is it that faith is under attack so much across this Nation? Well, Mr. Speaker, tune in, because in a few weeks we'll be back on this floor. We'll tell you who's doing it, why they're doing it, and what we need to do to stop it.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

CBC HOUR: IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAINES). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 days to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Today we are here as members of the Congressional Black Caucus to weigh in on the important issue that confronts this Nation as it relates to the need for comprehensive immigration reform. It's my honor and my privilege to represent the Eighth Congressional District anchored in Brooklyn and parts of southwest Queens, one of the most diverse districts in the country; a district that has blacks and whites, Asians, Latinos, and immigrants from every corner of the world. I recognize in the capacity of my representation in that district the significance that immigrants have given both to the communities that I represent as well as to the city of New York, the State, and the Nation.

I'm proud that we've been joined by several distinguished members of the Congressional Black Caucus which, for more than four decades, has been known as the conscience of the Congress. And in that capacity, the Congressional Black Caucus has, year after year, spent time trying to perfect our democracy and create a more perfect Union. We confront that moment right now, here, in this great country of ours as we try and figure out how we deal with creating a pathway towards citizenship for the more than 11 million undocumented immigrants who are forced to toil in the shadows.

We've been joined today by a co-anchor for this next hour, a distinguished classmate of mine from the great State of Nevada, the gentleman STEVEN HORSFORD, who had the opportunity, I believe, last week to be present while President Barack Obama delivered his remarks as they relate to immigration reform. And so I'd like to ask Mr. HORSFORD if he might comment on the President's remarks and weigh in on the immigration debate from his perspective as a representative from the important State of Nevada.

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, first I'd like to thank my classmate and colleague and say I look forward to serving with him in this historic 113th Congress as we work together to make this a more perfect Union.

I also represent one of the more diverse districts in the United States Congress. My district is 25 percent Latino, 16 percent African American, 7 percent Asian American, 2 percent Native American. It is a district that reflects both the urban as well as the rural components and communities of our great State of Nevada.

□ 2010

In fact, Congressional District 4 reflects the State of Nevada, and Nevada increasingly reflects all of America. And so I believe that is why President Obama decided, of all places that he could visit, he visited Nevada last week to discuss the fierce urgency of now in adopting a comprehensive immigration reform by this Congress; the fact that Nevada reflects the changing demographics of our country, but it also reflects the broken system which is our immigration system.

And so, as I listened to the President, and as we honor today the 100th birthday of Rosa Parks, I reflect on these issues as a basic fundamental civil right, a human right that is guaranteed to us. So today does mark the 100th birthday of Rosa Parks, an icon in the struggle for justice, a woman who was known as the mother of the civil rights movement.

As an African American woman confronting prejudice and unequal treatment under the law, Mrs. Parks remarked that what pushed her to say ''no'' on that fateful day in Montgomery was the simple fact that her ''mistreatment was just not right,'' and she was ''tired of it.''

She said, and I quote:

> I did not want to be mistreated; I did not want to be deprived of a seat that I had paid for. It was just time . . . There was opportunity for me to take a stand to express the way that I felt about being treated in that manner. I had not planned to get arrested. I had plenty to do without having to end up in jail. But when I had to face that decision, I didn't hesitate to do so because I felt that we had endured that too long. The more we gave

in, the more we complied with that kind of treatment, the more oppressive it became.

It was not complicated. It was prejudice. It was unfair, and she was sick of it. She was tired of the constant drumbeat of injustice directing every minute of her day. She was tired of facing inequality in a country founded on principles of liberty and justice for all. Her act of civil disobedience sparked a social movement that changed our country forever, and she did it because ''it was just time.''

So today, we honor her courage and her bravery. We remember her legacy and draw lessons from her actions. We take up the cause of promoting more just, fair and humane policy for all, because that's what we owe Mrs. Parks and all our civil rights leaders.

It is our tribute to those larger-than-life pioneers. As Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. said, ''Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.'' It is that creed of the civil rights movement that still motivates us today.

So today we take up the cause of joining arms with our immigrant brothers and sisters in that spirit. The time is now to lend a hand to those who confront injustice as a result of a broken immigration system. It is just time.

For many undocumented immigrants in our country, they are waiting to start their lives. They are waiting to start a business. They are waiting to reunite with their families, often for years on end.

And while they wait, children see their parents deported. Students get stuck in an educational purgatory and can't attend college and better their lives or get a job in the country that trained them. And mothers and fathers can't provide for their family or care for their loved ones without keeping them in the shadows.

So they can't wait any longer. We can't wait any longer. And as Rosa Parks said, It is just time.

From Africa to Europe to Asia, our dysfunctional immigration system is a disincentive to the best and the brightest worldwide from coming to our great country. We throw talent away. We tear families apart. We show disregard for those trying to live the American Dream.

For far too long, we have put off comprehensive immigration reform, but now we are taking up the opportunity to do something about it. And we cannot let this moment pass. It is in that spirit that we hold today's discussion.

We will not wait any longer. We have to continue strengthening our border, but we will act on comprehensive immigration reform without delay. We will crack down on employers, but we will make sure that there is a pathway to citizenship for those who are here at no fault of their own. And we will fulfill our heritage as a Nation of immigrants and a Nation of laws.

Justice, compassion, and equal protection are our common cause. We have an opportunity to embrace dynamism that immigrants bring to our country, and now is the time to do it.

As I said, this is a civil rights issue. In fact, it is the civil rights and human rights issue of our generation. Just like the civil rights issues of the sixties that were fought by African Americans, and the women's rights issues before that, this is a civil rights issue that must be advocated by all who believe in a sense of justice, opportunity and equality for every person.

And as we work together, we can move forward on immigration reform for the good of our country and for the good of all of us as human beings.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the gentleman from Nevada.

We've been joined by the distinguished chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentlelady from Cleveland, Ohio, Representative MARCIA FUDGE. I yield her such time as she may consume.

Ms. FUDGE. I thank you so very much. It is indeed a pleasure for me to be with these young gentlemen here today. I want to thank the gentleman from New York, and I look forward to his leadership as he anchors this hour for the 113th Congress, and I'm certain that other members of his class will be joining him on a regular basis.

Mr. Speaker, with that I thank him again. This is a lot of work, which you know, to come down to this floor every week and talk about issues of importance to our Nation. So I thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to lend my voice to those of my colleagues on the importance of comprehensive immigration reform.

The United States is a Nation of immigrants. Most Americans trace their lineage beyond our borders. The promise of the American Dream is what brings people from all corners of the world to this Nation. This country was founded on the principle that here lies the land of opportunity, and that anyone can achieve success through hard work.

But for the millions of undocumented immigrants of Hispanic, Asian, and African descent living in America today, the American Dream is just a promise, a promise they hope their children may one day realize.

Many immigrants are confronted with the same harsh realities that plague communities of color every day, namely, racial profiling based on unreasonable suspicion, systematic criminalization in order to fill private prisons, economic injustice that holds many in the bondage of poverty—all examples of pitfalls that unfairly, yet intentionally, trap, uproot and destroy far too many individuals and families.

Children in immigrant families also continue to struggle. According to the Pew Research Center, there are an estimated 1 million unauthorized immigrants under the age of 18 in the United States, and as many as 4.5 million U.S.-born children whose parents are unauthorized. These children live in fear.

Every year, nearly 200,000 non-citizens, many with children who are U.S. citizens, are deported and torn away from their families.

□ 2020

As families are torn apart, children are forced to choose between separation from their parent or leaving the only place they've ever called home.

How does America end the culture of fear among immigrant communities and help preserve families? First, we must create a pathway to citizenship that encourages, not discourages, legalization. Second, we must address the issues of mass detention and unjust criminality of immigrant populations. Third, our laws and justice system must place a premium on keeping families together. By creating flexible and equitable immigration policies that prioritize the unification and stability of immigrant families, we strengthen the fabric that holds our communities together.

Lastly, as a former mayor, I would be remiss if I did not mention the important role our States and local governments will play in immigration reform. As undocumented immigrants come out of the shadows of society, our State and our local governments will need our support more than ever. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., once said:

> History will have to record that the greatest tragedy of this period of social transition was not the strident clamor of the bad people, but the appalling silence of the good people.

Today, we are in a period of social transition. As the ''conscience of the United States Congress,'' the CBC cannot and will not stand by in silence. When history is recounted, the record will reflect the stance that the CBC took in supporting comprehensive immigration reform—reform that not only includes individuals of Hispanic and Asian descent, but also thousands of immigrants from within the African diaspora, and reform that dignifies the struggles of the undocumented and reconnects broken family bonds.

I urge my colleagues to unite behind comprehensive immigration reform.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the gentlelady from Ohio, the distinguished CBC chair, for her remarks and her observations.

I think there were several important points that were raised by our chair, Congresswoman FUDGE. First, sometimes the immigration reform debate has been characterized as perhaps just a Latino issue. At other times it's been characterized as perhaps an Asian issue. There are times that the immigration reform debate is characterized as an Eastern European issue. But really, immigration reform is an American issue. It cuts to the heart of who we are and what we will become. It affects every community. And as Congresswoman FUDGE indicated, there are black immigrants in the United States to whom the issue of creating a pathway towards citizenship is extremely important.

It's estimated that there are 3 million black immigrants in this country. Approximately 400,000 are undocumented. Who are these immigrants of African descent? Some are from the Caribbean, two-thirds of which are from nation states such as Jamaica, Trinidad, and Haiti. Others are from the continent of Africa. They are from countries like Nigeria and Ghana, Sudan, Ethiopia, and Eritrea.

I'm pleased that we've been joined by the distinguished gentlelady from the Ninth Congressional District in New York, who represents one of the largest immigrant populations for a congressional district not just in the city of New York, but anywhere in this Nation. She's been a dynamic leader on this issue.

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to add my voice to the CBC and amplify the message of support for true and real comprehensive immigration reform. First, I would like to thank our newly elected colleagues, the gentleman from Brooklyn, New York, Congressman HAKEEM JEFFRIES, and the gentleman from Las Vegas, Nevada, Mr. STEVEN HORSFORD, for hosting this evening's CBC hour.

Mr. Speaker, I commend President Obama for his commitment to comprehensive immigration reform, and I reaffirm my commitment to working with his administration and our colleagues to make true reform a reality. Having said that, I want to challenge the President and all of our colleagues to expand upon the face and the voice of immigration, adding new dimensions to the unfolding debate.

When two major immigration speeches such as those that President Obama made in El Paso, Texas, in 2011, and last week in Las Vegas, Nevada, in Mr. HORSFORD's part of the country, omit the contributions of immigrants from the continent of Africa, it paints an incomplete picture of the idealized gorgeous mosaic or melting pot, if you will, that the United States of America represents. We must embrace the diversity of those who are impacted by reform and understand that this debate cannot solely rest on the shoulders of our Latino sisters and brothers.

The stigmatization of the Latino population as the target immigrant population has resulted in a skewed depiction of the true diversity of the immigrant population resident in our country. We have immigrants represented from almost every Nation around the world, and we must recognize all of those who are building communities and strengthening our Nation.

Since 2009, I've been working with my colleagues to diversify the voice and the face of the immigration debate. The burden of a broken system does not encumber one group of immigrants alone. There are approximately 3 million immigrants from the African diaspora in the United States, the vast majority of whom entered the country with legal documentation. The impact of immigrants of the African diaspora from the continent of Africa, the Caribbean region, and South and Central America has been massive in scale. As the representative of the Ninth Congressional District of New York, I am proud to serve a very significant Caribbean, South and Central American, and continental African immigrant community whose immigration experience is as diverse as the countries from which they've come. In fact, I represent one of the most diverse, immigrant-rich districts in the Nation, with people who have come from the Middle East, South Asia, Asia, Russia, the Eastern European nations. It's a virtual United Nations.

Many entered our shores with student visas, like my parents did, to pursue careers in medicine, science, education, and other professions. Many are proud business owners of law firms, restaurants, grocery stores, shipping companies, and hair braiding venues. There are those who come as asylum seekers, fleeing the tumult of war, famine, and genocide. No matter their reason for immigrating, they've come to the U.S. to be productive, taxpaying members of our civil society and to attain the American Dream.

Unfortunately, immigrants of the African diaspora, like so many other groups from around the world, are dealing with backlogged immigration processing; families being ripped apart; falling ''out of status'' because they have aged out of the legal immigration process; racial and status discrimination; unfair criminal aggravated felony laws that prohibit judicial review; deportation processes that violate civil and human rights; an insecure and prohibitive student visa program; limited access to work permits; and much, much more.

You see, many immigrants arrive on our shores during a time in their lives when they are the most productive. Any delay in processing these individuals, in bringing them to the fore, denies us the opportunity to access their talents, their skills, and their ability in the prime of their lives.

□ 2030

Additionally, African Americans, those descendants of the slave trade—whom I fondly call long-time stakeholders of this Nation—have been affected by the broken system as well. Working-class Americans of all backgrounds, races, and ethnicities are adversely affected with a broken immigration system. They are facing depressed wages due to unscrupulous and illegal corporate hiring practices. Urban communities aren't being adequately counted by the Census and other surveys, resulting in the reduction of adequate government services and Federal resources to meet the needs of the actual population in the communities and increasing the strain on current public services.

Urban communities are exposed to more crime, as the undocumented are more reluctant to report crimes; and African Americans are dealing with increased racial and status discrimination, as many are subjected to interrogations based on citizenship.

This is why, as a child of the Caribbean—second-generation American—and a sister of the African diaspora, I believe that it is my duty and that of the Congressional Black Caucus to ensure that the voices of immigrants of the African diaspora will be at the forefront, shoulder to shoulder with the Congressional Hispanic Caucus and the Caucus of the Asian and Pacific Islanders; that the voices of the immigrants of the African diaspora will be heard. We will make sure that this debate is as diverse as the population it encompasses.

The effectiveness of the immigration reform debate will rely heavily on the diversity of its support. That is why I call upon my sisters and brothers within the African diaspora to join with the members of the CBC, myself and our colleagues, in making sure that our voices are heard and our needs are adequately addressed.

Mr. Speaker, the time is now to pass a comprehensive bill that includes streamlining the immigration process, humane enforcement strategies that address the needs of children and other vulnerable people, use alternatives to detention, create enforceable detention standards, safeguard our investments in our DREAM Act kids, and outline essential due process reforms.

Our national security is at stake. Our moral standing in the world depends upon it. And the American people—many of whom are first- and second-generation immigrants—have demanded it. If we turn our backs on those law-abiding contributors to our civil society that come to our shores only to embrace the American Dream, to labor in rebuilding our great Nation, to strengthen our economy, to serve honorably in our military, we turn our back on ourselves and our future. You don't have to believe me. Just ask the people of Japan, where population growth has been stagnant as a result of a prohibitive immigration policy.

It is time for people of good will to stand for those who fear or are unable to stand for themselves. Let us stand together for comprehensive immigration reform.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Thank you, Congresswoman CLARKE, for those very eloquent and thoughtful remarks.

The Congressional Black Caucus consists of 42 members representing a variety of communities all across this great Nation. We've been joined today by two Representatives from the Lone Star State, one of whom, Representative SHEILA JACKSON LEE, has distinguished herself in many different areas, but has been a thought leader in the area of comprehensive immigration reform.

She is currently the ranking member on the House Committee on Homeland Security Subcommittee on the Border

and Maritime Security, and also is a senior member of the House Committee on the Judiciary and the important Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security. We're thankful that she's been a long-time champion of a fair and humane immigration system, and I yield the floor to Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I'd like to thank the distinguished gentleman from New York and the distinguished gentleman from Nevada. I particularly want to thank them for hosting this vital discussion, this Special Order, and pay tribute to them for doing a service to the Nation.

When we speak on the floor of the House and we come from disparate States, from New York, Nevada, Texas, and Ohio—in fact, I think we have just about covered America—it has an amazing impact on our colleagues, and certainly constituents. So I owe and we all owe you a debt of gratitude for the forward thinking, and particularly since today has a double meaning. This is the 100th birthday of Rosa Parks. She is often called the Mother of Civil Rights. And then our President, over the last couple of weeks, and as the gentleman from Nevada knows, spent time with him, to speak eloquently about the need for this pathway of access to legalization going forward.

So I am grateful again for your willingness to host this and to begin to surge forward, collaborate with members of the Congressional Black Caucus, and giving them information in their respective districts, and collaborating with the Asian Pacific Caucus, the Caribbean Caucus, and as well the Hispanic Caucus. I think there are three of us, but we now have a new Caribbean, on which a number of us serve, and as well the African diaspora, which includes our brothers and sisters that have been mentioned already on the floor. We can go vastly beyond them. It's my effort today, and I thank both the gentlemen from New York and from Nevada for some potent posters that I hope that I will share with all of you.

Let me share both words from President Obama and some abbreviated words from Dr. Martin Luther King. But the words from President Obama stated, as it relates to the question of immigration reform, that our journey is not complete until we find a better way to welcome the striving, hopeful immigrants who still see America as the land of opportunity, until bright young students and engineers are enlisted in our workforce rather than expelled from our country.

I think the important part of this discussion tonight is to make sure that the landscape of immigration reform is a landscape of many faces, many heritages, many backgrounds, many regions in the United States, many continents, and that it is important for all of us to have a commitment to better opportunity for all. But as we do that, I think education is crucial. For as this discussion goes forward, I want my friends to know that there will be moments of great contention, there will be moments of disagreement, and there will be moments of misrepresentation.

It is important for the broad diaspora to understand that we are in this leaking boat together, and that when we utilize the term of ''civil rights'' or we use Rosa Parks or we speak to the words that Dr. King said on April 3, 1968, that said that he could see a Promised Land and that he might not get there with us, but he knew that we as a people would get there some day, I cannot imagine in the 50th year of his ''I Have a Dream'' speech that he could not foresee that America's diversity would be its strength, and that African Americans who came first to this country as slaves could then join with others who came in fishing boats, in airplanes, that walked across the border for greater opportunity and make America the dream, the great Nation, the Promised Land of which he predicted.

That is what immigration reform is. It is not to take from someone else and to give to someone else. It is not to diminish the civil rights struggle of the African American population. It is not to ignore the history of others, but it is to say that we have a common ground. That is the way that we're going to pass immigration reform.

□ 2040

If you are a Southerner and a Republican from the South, you have as much invested in an America that gives opportunity to all as you may be from the wonderful districts that are represented on this floor. And until we understand that in the House, and until the Speaker understands and accepts it, that this is not taking away, this is not undermining anyone's view of America, it is to say that the view of America is a promised land that so many come for. It is a recognition that Americans have come through the 1800s when the Irish came because of the famine, the Italians came in the early 1900s. Other groups have come since then, large numbers of Hispanics, Asian Americans, South Asian Americans, those who have come from the Asian Pacific area, those who have come from Pakistan, India and Bangladesh, those who have come from the Caribbean, those who come from Africa. They have all come, and we have to recognize that.

One of the issues that seems to be coming up over and over again as we look at this issue, and I will speak specifically to the Senate's proposal, the general path to citizenship, it talks about the 11 million undocumented individuals, that the path of citizenship will only take place if the border is secured and visa overstays are effectively combated.

Let me be clear that great progress has been made over the Clinton administration, moving into the Bush administration, George Bush, and then on to the Obama administration, particularly in the Obama administration because you can begin to see any suggestion that we have not worked to secure the border is based upon lack of information and lack of facts. So I want to thank my colleague for a poster that, in fact, says that the number of Border Patrol agents has more than doubled in the past 10 years.

When I first began writing legislation in 2004, 2003, 2005, we were shortchanged on border security agents. Working with the Senate and working with Presidents, we funded the increase of border security or Border Patrol agents, and we can see now that the majority of agents are assigned to the U.S.-Mexican border, more than 16,000, and more—and it's growing—that are basically at the border now. I think we can do more, if you will, for the northern border; and I look forward to working with my chairperson of the subcommittee on that issue.

But we cannot let the discussion get bogged down in talking about we can't provide some access to citizenship. In my legislation, I called it ''earned access to citizenship,'' which means there were fines to be paid, charitable issues to be paid, you must be vetted; but here on the Senate proposal, it talks about securing the border.

I want to be able to be responsive to their concerns, but they should also look at the facts, and they can see that between ICE and CBP, ICE is the internal enforcement, CBP, you can see the increase in the amounts of money that have gone up in the billions of dollars, now close to $18 billion between ICE and CBP, CBP being a little bit under $12 billion, that we have truly under the Obama administration been serious about border security. In fact, there is a poster board here that suggests that the deportations have gone up. That's not the right way to proceed.

So my point today is that there must be common ground. In the Senate, they talk about young, undocumented immigrants who were brought to the U.S. when they were children will have a more direct path to citizenship. That must be clear because those are the DREAM Act kids. And, in fact, those individuals are the talent that we are throwing away, young people who are in college who are contributing to society who can help bring their families, reunite their families, have been forced to deportation.

I want to congratulate the President for his executive order that provided a deferred adjudication for DREAM Act youngsters as a basis of saying that the ICE should enforce deportation on those who are a threat to our community and prioritize those distinctive from those who are here who are not doing us any harm who are being educated. So the Senate proposal talks about young people. It talks about the backlogs of legal immigration and family reunification and the employment visa process.

It also allows more immigrants performing lower-skilled occupations to

enter the country when we were created. I want to change that word. I don't like the idea of lower skilled. People come to work, if they are skilled, they have something to contribute, that is the basis upon which we should look at it. But I think for the Congressional Black Caucus it is always important to say because our communities suffer unemployment in many parts of the country more so than others, that it is important in any immigration reform that we ensure that the employer has looked very hard for a person who is eligible for that job here in the United States.

That's how we educate our population. That's how we bring together the right kind of collaboration. High-skilled immigrants should be all of us. High-skilled individuals should be those in historically black colleges, Hispanic-serving colleges. We should encourage them to be part of science, technology, engineering and math. However, when there is an immigrant that is graduating from our top universities, or any of our universities, we should not ask them to leave. It is very important to do. And we should ensure that they have opportunities.

The President's general path to citizenship provides a pathway to citizenship. These immigrants can register for provisional legal status. And his point is, which I believe we should join in, that we should not let border security get in the way of making sure that we move forward on a legal status process. Young people who, again, were brought here as children should have an expedited path to citizenship by attending college or by serving 2 years in the military. Slight differences that we can find a common ground, legal immigrants, he speaks to the plan would increase the percentage of family-sponsored immigrants coming into the country over every 7 years, from 7 to 15 percent.

This goes to a complaint that you will hear from those in Nevada, those in New York, those in your very diverse districts, they complain about—not complain—let me say it differently. They want to be reunited with their family members. And one of the starkest things that happens to any of us who visit with immigrants in our congressional office, what about the immigrant who wants to go home for a dying relative, or the relative wants to come because there is a dying relative here in the United States.

I had that happen in my district. I had a South Korean student who was shot on the streets of Houston, and tragically he became paralyzed. When his father came here to be able to comfort him, his father had been here, he went back out, he was held and detained. We finally got that resolved. But we must find a way to have this punishment, this pain, that so many of our immigrants are experiencing, we must find a way to be able to work on this in a productive and smart manner. This speaks to the fact that we have not been slouches, we have not been slouches as it relates to border security.

I want to speak to the issue of the diversity visa program, which was a target of our friends who maybe did not understand what that means. But the diversity visa program was to allow people who did not get in the normal visa system. It has proven to be a way of helping those who come from the continent of Africa, those who come from a number of other areas where it is very difficult to get a visa. Nearly 15 million people representing about 20 million with family members included were registered late last year for the 2012 diversity visa program under which only 15,000 visa winners were to be selected.

That shows the intensity of the diversity visa. And some want to get rid of it. It's a lot of African immigrants; it's a lot of people trying to come to be with their families. Diversity visa immigrants succeed and contribute to the U.S. economy. According to the Congressional Research Service, in FY 2009, diversity visa immigrants were 2.5 times more likely to report managerial and professional occupations.

The founder of it, Representative Bruce Morrison, said that the heart of the definition of America is what this program is about. All nationalities are welcome. Ambassador Johnny Young said the program engenders hope abroad for those who are too often without it, hope for a better life. And so I hope as we look at immigration reform we will not attempt to eliminate opportunities to bring families together.

Finally, with respect to security issues, there's no significant evidence of a security risk with the diversity visa. The GAO found in 2007 no documented evidence.

These points about the issue of where we can come together and where there are distinctions is to raise the specter of how serious and difficult this process may be. The Congressional Black Caucus will be pivotal in its role, one, because it is the conscience of this Congress; two, because we have the uncanny ability of seeing from a broader perspective what we have gone through in our lifetime, what our communities go through. We've seen discrimination, and we are sympathetic and sensitive to how we can help others.

So I think the challenge is as we proceed on this process that all of us be included in this discussion, that the working group includes members of the Congressional Black Caucus and that as we encourage legislation to come to the Judiciary Committee, which is the committee that I sit on, the Immigration Subcommittee that ZOE LOFGREN chairs and which I'm second on that committee, and as it goes through Homeland Security where the ranking member, Mr. THOMPSON, and Mr. MCCAUL share the leadership, in Judiciary Mr. CONYERS and Mr. GOODLATTE, where I am the ranking member on the Border Security Subcommittee, that we, through the Congressional Black Caucus, find a way to uphold the values of our ancestors, uphold the values of the pioneers and leaders who have traveled through the journey of civil rights that we can see the plight and the pain of those who come now.

□ 2050

I want to say in closing that as a Member of the Congress having the privilege of serving the 18th Congressional District, even in a city like Houston, it is enormously diverse, having a large number of counselor offices, and people who have come from all walks of life, who have come through outdoors in the 18th Congressional District begging for help, pleading for their children not being deported, and I would say to my colleagues you can not, and those of you who come from this diverse background, fully understand what it's like to hear a mother's shrill scream in your office when you said to them that we are going to stop the deportation of your child. We've all understood that pain if we've encountered immigrants who do nothing more and want nothing more than to live the American Dream, who are paying taxes, building houses, and working for the betterment of us all, serving in the military and shedding blood.

For this reason I think it is crucial that we try to overcome the hurdles, the differences of opinion, the tension that will rise, and have a common place to start from and a common ending. And that is the betterment of all people who contribute and make America great.

Comprehensive immigration reform will not hurt those of us who stand on this floor, and we will not allow it to hurt those who we represent. It will be a focus roadmap for all of us to work for a great and wonderful promised land that Martin King dreamed about and spoke about a few years ago.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the gentlelady from Texas for her very pointed observations on a variety of different issues concerning the comprehensive immigration reform issue.

I would just like to amplify for a moment one point that was made as it relates to the significance of the diversity visa lottery program. It's a program that in its conception is designed to make sure that immigrants from underrepresented parts of the world have an opportunity to come to America and participate in the American Dream. And in the context of this diversity visa lottery program, approximately 20 percent of the African immigrants who are here in this country are here as a result of participating in that program.

It has been an instrumental vehicle for ensuring diversity as it relates to the presence of immigrants from the African continent, who by the way, statistics have shown, tend to be more educated in their attainment of college degrees than any other immigrant

group. As a result, they are very much contributing to moving the society forward. And for that reason I believe it will be important for the CBC to continue to stand up for this program as we move forward with comprehensive immigration reform, and so I thank the gentlelady for those observations.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Will the gentleman yield for just one quick moment. I want to applaud him for that and just add two groups that we did not mention yet that will really be impacted by comprehensive immigration reform: Liberians who came here on deferred enforcement, who are now still in limbo and worked with us over the years. We've been, if you would say, advocates for them. And Haitians, who have a distinctive pathway into citizenship, who have certainly been contributing, fought with us in the Revolutionary War.

And you are absolutely right, the diversity visa has been a lifeline, not for terrorists, but a lifeline for hardworking immigrants. And I hope that when we debate this, as I said, mountains of tension or disagreement, that we can find common ground to include all these groups that will help better America and grow America strong.

Mr. JEFFRIES. One of the things that we hope to accomplish today as we move forward in the context of advancing this immigration reform debate is making sure that the facts surrounding the issue of immigration are well known. This is a Nation of immigrants, and it's a Nation of laws. And some have articulated the concern that we must secure the border before we can move forward and create a pathway toward citizenship for those who are in the country and undocumented.

Much has been made about the southwestern border in particular. And the gentleman from Nevada, I believe, has some statistics that he can speak to as to the progress that has been made in securing the border, points that were also made by the gentlelady from Texas.

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, again, I would like to thank the gentleman from New York for yielding and to expound on some of the points that the gentlelady from Texas made in regards to the tremendous progress that has been made on strengthening the border.

She touched on the doubling of the number of Border Patrol agents from 10,000 to 21,000 agents in just the past year. That's a doubling since 2004 of resources. And this is tremendous in that it actually is the largest per year enforcement of any other federal law enforcement combined. It's $17.6 billion worth of enforcement on our border. And so progress has been made. And the deportations signify that. Half of these deportations have been to individuals who committed crimes, illegal crimes, and were deported for that reason.

But let me also touch on another element, which the gentlelady also discussed. And that is immigration, and the history of immigration policy in our country has always focused on the family and keeping the family together and reuniting family members. And so we have to be careful when we talk about deportation, what that means for individuals, because this is a human rights issue.

In my district, in Congressional District 4, I met with a group of citizens on Sunday before the President came, and there was one family there who explained to me a situation where the mother had been deported and the children now are in foster care. They cannot be reunited with their family because of the status issues. And that is something that is having a human toll because we have a broken immigration system that must be fixed. That has always been a cornerstone of our immigration policy in this country, the focus on keeping our families together, not just on labor or economic issues, which should be at the forefront as well.

And so enforcement has been a big cornerstone, and should be a major cornerstone, of the policy going forward. But the pathway to citizenship is the cornerstone. And I believe the Congressional Black Caucus as a stakeholder in this discussion, working with our colleagues on the other side and in the other Chamber, must articulate why there cannot be a precondition, a litmus test on border security, in order to provide for a pathway to citizenship that so many individuals depend on.

Let me also discuss one other element of a comprehensive immigration reform that is necessary, and it's important to my district, in Congressional District 4, and that's the focus on enhancing travel and tourism.

The administration under President Obama is committed to increasing U.S. travel and tourism by facilitating legitimate travel while maintaining our Nation's security. Consistent with the President's executive order on travel and tourism, the President's proposal securely streamlines visa and foreign visitor processing. It also strengthens law enforcement cooperation while maintaining the program's robust counterterrorism and criminal information-sharing initiatives. It facilitates more efficient travel by allowing greater flexibility to designate countries for participation in the visa waiver program, which allows citizens of designated countries to visit the United States without obtaining a visa.

□ 2100

Finally, it permits the State Department to waive interview requirements for certain very low-risk visa applicants, permitting resources to be focused on higher risk applicants, and it creates a pilot for premium visa processing.

So these are all of the components that have to be part of the comprehensive immigration reform. These are the tenets which the Congressional Black Caucus, in working with the Congressional Hispanic Caucus and the Congressional Asian Pacific Caucus, believes to be the cornerstones and the principles by which any comprehensive immigration bill should be passed.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Thank you, Congressman HORSFORD.

We have been joined by our distinguished classmate, the gentleman from Texas, Congressman MARC VEASEY, who represents an extremely diverse district in the Dallas area and who has been a tremendous thought leader on this issue, and it is my honor to recognize him.

Mr. VEASEY. I want to thank my colleague HAKEEM JEFFRIES, who is from the great State of New York, and Mr. HORSFORD for their leadership on this issue. They, too, understand how important it is that we speak out on this issue. It is not only important to our constituents and our States but to the entire country.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to address the Chamber on the very important topic of comprehensive immigration reform. I would also like to express my gratitude to the Congressional Black Caucus for not only their leadership on this issue but also for allowing me, as a member of the caucus, to continue this meaningful and urgent discussion. As Members of Congress, it is our duty to be the voices of our constituents by creating and passing legislation that addresses their concerns.

For much too long, 11 million voices have waited for Congress to work together on comprehensive immigration reform. They're in neighborhoods like the ones I represent in Dallas and Fort Worth and Oak Cliff, which is in Dallas on the north side of Fort Worth. This is an issue that is very important, not only to those neighborhoods, but to the neighborhoods in the entirety of the district that I represent. The consensus on this issue has never been stronger, and I am proud to see Members on both sides of the aisle working together and finding a practical solution to this problem while President Obama leads the way.

I applaud the comprehensive immigration reform efforts, including the proposals put forth by the President and bipartisan groups of Senators, which call for protecting our borders while respecting the unity and sanctity of our families. Our undocumented immigrant community includes DREAMer schoolchildren, who are excelling in math and science, wanting to attend college in the only country they've ever known. It also includes hardworking men and women who are only trying to make an honest living and provide for their families.

Comprehensive immigration reform is about accountability and responsible public policy. It is not feasible, economical, or moral to propose the deportation of 11 million people who are living and working hard in our country. What reform calls for is responsible

public policy that provides certainty to employers that the people wanting to work are legally eligible to do so, thereby bringing a significant population of our country out of the shadows.

Mr. Speaker, our borders are more secure than ever before. Border security is a serious issue, and we must continue to enforce our laws, but we can also enact a fair immigration system by working together. Providing appropriate protections to undocumented workers, including fair wages and safe working conditions, is the right thing to do to ensure the development of our economy and our Nation's security.

As the Congressman from the Dallas-Fort Worth metroplex, I understand the necessity of bipartisanship on this issue. My first days in office have been devoted to relationships and coalition-building on both sides of the aisle. I look forward to continuing those efforts, and I will not stop until we achieve a fair and comprehensive immigration reform plan. I will work closely with my friends in the Congressional Hispanic Caucus and in the Congressional Black Caucus and with all of my colleagues who would like to join this effort. The voices of those in my district and across the country are being heard. It's time to make comprehensive immigration reform a reality.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

As he indicated, the time is now for us to move forward—to find common ground and to figure out how we can advance this issue in a manner that respects the security concerns that have been articulated but which also recognizes that, 6 years ago, several benchmarks were set forth for security measures to be reached in order for comprehensive immigration reform and a pathway towards citizenship to be created.

Six years ago, there was a call for at least 20,000 border protection agents. Right now, there are 21,400 border protection agents. Six years ago, there was a call for a fence to be constructed along the southern border of approximately 670 miles, although our border security folks have said they believe a fence would be adequate that is 652 miles, 651 miles of which have already been constructed. There was a call for video surveillance assets—these are cameras and radar—deployed along the borders of this country. Six years ago, the call was for 105 such video surveillance assets. Mr. Speaker, right now, there are more than 250 deployed in the United States of America. We have met or exceeded the security benchmarks that have been set. That's why it is time for us to move forward with comprehensive immigration reform.

We have also been joined by another distinguished colleague of ours, the gentleman from Newark, New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), and I recognize him at this time.

Mr. PAYNE. Let me first say ''thank you'' to the gentleman from New York, the gentleman from across the river with whom we are looking forward to having a great working relationship, as well as with the gentleman from Nevada, who has also distinguished himself very early in this Congress.

As we debate this issue, we must not forget that we are a Nation of immigrants, and it is our rich history of immigration that has strengthened this country generation after generation. Yes, we must secure our borders, but we must also recognize that there have been a record number of deportations and seizures over the last 4 years. This issue of border security cannot be used as a fear tactic to prevent progress. In my district, people migrate from all over the globe, not just from Latin America, but from the Caribbean and Africa and Asia as well, and they are all in search of the same thing—the American Dream.

Children who were brought here through no fault of their own and who think of themselves as Americans wait in limbo, so we have a moral obligation to fix our broken system. It is not only the right thing to do, but it is the practical thing to do. Over 11 million undocumented workers live in our communities. They go to our schools, and they work among us every day. It is time for Congress to provide these 11 million people their chance to come out of the shadows without the specter of deportation hanging over their heads.

It's also time to streamline the legal immigration process and to make it more efficient for high-skilled workers and those working in science fields to be able to stay and keep their talents here.

In my district—the 10th district of New Jersey, and in every corner of America, immigrants are receiving degrees in science, technology, engineering, and math. They are the business leaders and innovators of the future. But when they graduate, they are sent home.

If we want to remain the pre-eminent country in the world—If we want to continue to attract the best talent—If we want to continue to out-innovate the rest of the world—if we want to continue to be a just nation. Then we must act now.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his comments. I also want to thank the distinguished members of the CBC, including my colleague from Nevada, Congressman HORSFORD, for his leadership, for his eloquence, and for the facts that he has brought to bear.

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of commonsense immigration reforms that will foster economic growth, keep our families and our communities together, and protect workers' rights. America's immigration system is broken, and we must forge a bipartisan agreement to fix it.

As a member of the Congressional Black Caucus, I will ensure that the needs of all communities are addressed in immigration reform. Many undocumented immigrants were brought here as children and know the United States as their only home. I support the DREAM Act to allow these bright young people to build their futures here and contribute to our nation's prosperity. Strong families are the cornerstone of our Nation, and I believe provisions to guarantee family unity must be included in any serious immigration reform bill. I am dedicated to keeping families together by supporting a pathway to citizenship for undocumented immigrants.

At the same time, Congress must ensure that immigration reform positively impacts economic and employment opportunities for all Americans. I will prioritize improving access to adult education programs and increasing job training opportunities so that all Americans can pursue their dreams and provide for their families.

It is time to come together to enact fair and reasonable immigration reforms that advance our national interests and honor our history as a country of immigrants. I will work hard in Congress to ensure that these reforms strengthen our communities and drive our economy forward.

CORRECTION TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 2013 AT PAGE H309

(e) OTHER COMMITTEE PUBLICATIONS.—

(1) *House Reports.*

(i) Any document published by the Committee as a House Report, other than a report of the Committee on a measure which has been approved by the Committee, shall be approved by the Committee at a meeting, and Members shall have the same opportunity to submit views as provided for in Rule IV(b).

(ii) Not later than January 2nd of each year, the Committee shall submit to the House an annual report on the activities of the Committee.

(iii) After an adjournment sine die of a regular session of a Congress or after December 15th, whichever occurs first, the Chairman may file the annual Activity Report for that Congress with the Clerk of the House at any time and without the approval of the Committee, provided that a copy of the report has been available to each Member of the Committee for at least seven calendar days and that the report includes any supplemental, minority, or additional views submitted by a Member of the Committee. [See House Rule XI 1(d))]

(2) *Other Documents.*

(i) Subject to paragraphs (ii) and (iii), the Chairman may approve the publication of any document as a Committee print which in the Chairman's discretion he determines to be useful for the information of the Committee.

(ii) Any document to be published as a Committee print that purports to express the views, findings, conclusions, or recommendations of the Committee or any of its Subcommittees, other than a report of the Committee on a measure that has been approved by the Committee, must be approved by the Committee or its Subcommittees, as applicable, in a meeting or otherwise in writing by a majority of the Members, and such Members shall have the right to submit supplemental, minority, or additional views for inclusion in the print within at least 48 hours after such approval.

(iii) Any document to be published as a Committee print, other than a document described in subsection (ii) of this Rule, shall:

(a) include on its cover the following statement: ''This document has been printed for informational purposes only and does not

represent either findings or recommendations adopted by this Committee;'' and

(b) not be published following the sine die adjournment of a Congress, unless approved by the Chairman after consultation with the Ranking Member of the Committee.

(iv) A report of an investigation or study conducted jointly by the Committee and one or more other Committees may be filed jointly, provided that each of the Committees complies independently with all requirements for approval and filing of the report. [House Rule XI 1(b)(2)].

(v) After an adjournment of the last regular session of a Congress sine die, an investigative or oversight report approved by the Committee may be filed with the Clerk at any time, provided that if a Member gives notice at the time of approval of intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views, that Member shall be entitled to not less than seven calendar days in which to submit such views for inclusion with the report. [House Rule XI 1(b)(4)]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. FARR (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today through February 25 on account of medical reasons.

Ms. GABBARD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of reporting for National Guard training duty.

Mr. ADERHOLT (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of attending a funeral.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on January 29, 2013, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 152. Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, to improve and streamline disaster assistance for Hurricane Sandy, and for other purposes.

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on February 4, 2013, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 325. To ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until May 19, 2013, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 5, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

179. A letter from the Director, Policy Issuances Division, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Uniform Compliance Date for Food Labeling Regulations [Docket No.: FSIS–2012–0039] (RIN: 0583–AD05) received January 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

180. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Approved Tests for Bovine Tuberculosis in Cervids [Docket No.: APHIS–2012–0087] received January 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

181. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Golden Nematode; Removal of Regulated Areas in Livingston and Steuben Counties, NY [Docket No.: APHIS–2012–0079] received January 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

182. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Traceability for Livestock Moving Interstate [Docket No.: APHIS–2009–0091] (RIN: 0579–AD24) (RIN: 0579–AD24) received January 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

183. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of State, transmitting a letter strongly supporting Senator Leahy's amendment included as Section 1107 in H.R. 1 of the 112th Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

184. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of 19 officers to wear the authorized insignia of the grade of brigadier general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

185. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy, Department of Defense, transmitting a proposed change to the Fiscal Year 2011 National Guard and Reserve Equipment Appropriation (NGREA) procurement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

186. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Community Reinvestment Act Regulations (RIN: 3064–AD90) received January 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

187. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Lost Security holders and Unresponsive Payees [Release No.: 34–68668; File No. S7–11–11] (RIN: 3235–AL11) received January 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

188. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Relocation of and Spectrum Sharing by Federal Government Stations — Technical Panel and Dispute Resolution Boards [Docket No.: 120620177–2445–02] (RIN: 0660–AA26) received Janaury 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

189. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — Modifications to the HIPPA Privacy, Security, Enforcement, and Breach Notification Rules Under the Health Information Technology for Economic and Clinical Health Act and The Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act; Other Modifications to the HIPPA Rules (RIN: 0945–AA03) received January 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

190. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modifications to the HIPPA Privacy, Security, Enforcement, and Breach Notification Rules Under the Health Information Technology for Economic and Clinical Health Act and The Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act; Other Modifications to the HIPPA Rules (RIN: 0945–AA03) received January 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

191. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the FY 2011 Superfund Five-Year Review Report to Congress, in accordance with the requirements in Section 121(c) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

192. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a certification of export to China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

193. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a certification of export to China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

194. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

195. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report pursuant to section 3 of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

196. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Applicable Federal Rates — February 2013 (Rev. Rul. 2013–3) received January 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 297. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize support for graduate medical education programs in children's hospitals (Rept. 113–3). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 225. 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 (Rept. 113–4). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 235. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants to States to streamline State requirements and procedures for veterans with military emergency medical training to become civilian emergency medical technicians (Rept. 113–5). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 267. A bill to improve hydropower, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–6). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 316. A bill to reinstate and transfer certain hydroelectric licenses and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of certain hydroelectric projects (Rept. 113–7). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WOODALL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 48. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 444) to require that, if the President's fiscal year 2014 budget does not achieve balance in a fiscal year covered by such budget, the President shall submit a supplemental unified budget by April 1, 2013, which identifies a fiscal year in which balance is achieved, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–8). Referred to the House Calendar.

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 Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 452. A bill to prevent gun trafficking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. PALAZZO):

H.R. 453. A bill to provide tax relief with respect to the Hurricane Isaac disaster area; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, 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. FATTAH (for himself, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. SCHWARTZ):

H.R. 454. A bill to designate the medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 3900 Woodland Avenue in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, as the ''Corporal Michael J. Crescenz Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. POLIS, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 455. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to direct certain coeducational elementary and secondary schools to make available information on equality in school athletic programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 456. A bill to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to prescribe regulations to reduce helicopter noise pollution in certain residential areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 457. A bill to amend section 276 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to impose mandatory sentencing ranges with respect to aliens who reenter the United States after having been removed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 458. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for nonimmigrant status for an alien who is the parent or legal guardian of a United States citizen child if the child was born abroad and is the child of a deceased member of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 459. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to promote innovation, investment, and research in the United States, to eliminate the diversity immigrant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. MORAN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. TONKO, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. FARR, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. CRENSHAW):

H.R. 460. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to limit co-payment, coinsurance, or other cost-sharing requirements applicable to prescription drugs in a specialty drug tier to the dollar amount (or its equivalent) of such requirements applicable to prescription drugs in a non-preferred brand drug tier, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah (for himself, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. STEWART):

H.R. 461. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to increase the maximum age limit for an original appointment to a position as a Federal law enforcement officer in the case of any individual who has been discharged or released from active duty in the Armed Forces under honorable conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah (for himself, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. STEWART):

H.R. 462. A bill to require the conveyance of certain public land within the boundaries of Camp Williams, Utah, to support the training and readiness of the Utah National Guard; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 463. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to reform the provisions relating to status under section 101(a)(15)(U) of that Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 464. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reduce the limit on the amount of certain contributions which may be made to a candidate with respect to an election for Federal office; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 465. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit the conversion of leadership PAC funds to personal use; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 466. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to prohibit the Commissioner of Social Security from publishing the social security numbers of deceased individuals in the Death Master File, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 467. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to redistribute Federal funds that would otherwise be made available to States that do not provide for the Medicaid expansion in accordance with the Affordable Care Act to those States electing to provide those Medicaid benefits; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 468. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that payments under the Federal employees' group life insurance program shall be made in a lump sum, unless the insured or the recipient elects otherwise; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 469. A bill to reduce the heat island effect and associated ground level ozone pollution from Federal facilities; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 470. A bill to improve the efficiency of Federal Executive Boards to enhance the coordination, economy, and effectiveness of Federal agency activities, including emergency preparedness and continuity of operations, in geographic areas outside the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 471. A bill to provide for the more accurate computation of retirement benefits for certain firefighters employed by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 472. A bill to reduce Federal expenditures associated with data center real estate and electricity consumption, to implement savings reductions proposed by Federal employees, to reduce energy costs across Federal Executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Transportation and Infrastructure, and 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. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 473. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act with respect to the qualification of the director of food services of a Medicare skilled nursing facility or a Medicaid nursing facility; 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. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 474. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for qualified conservation contributions which include National Scenic Trails; 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. GERLACH:

H.R. 475. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include vaccines against seasonal influenza within the definition of taxable vaccines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia (for himself and Mr. CONAWAY):

H.R. 476. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to require the President to submit with the budget an estimate of the deficit using generally accepted accounting principles, and to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to require the Congressional Budget Office to submit the same with its report to the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia (for himself, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. JONES, Ms. FOXX, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. NUNNELEE):

H.R. 477. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make changes related to family-sponsored immigrants and to reduce the number of such immigrants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia:

H.R. 478. A bill to amend the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note) to make the E-Verify Program permanent and mandatory, and to provide for certain changes to procedures for participants in the Program; 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. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. FARR, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 479. A bill to prohibit the transfer of defense articles and defense services to the governments of foreign countries that are engaging in gross violations of internationally-recognized human rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H.R. 480. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to disallow a deduction for amounts paid or incurred by a responsible party relating to a discharge of oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HECK of Nevada:

H.R. 481. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to accept certain documents as proof of service in determining the eligibility of an individual to receive amounts from the Filipino Veterans Equity Compensation Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. CHU, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HONDA, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. HAHN, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. POCAN, and Ms. MENG):

H.R. 482. A bill to prevent harassment at institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HUDSON:

H.R. 483. A bill to repeal the Federal estate and gift taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. MULVANEY, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. RADEL, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, and Mr. LONG):

H.R. 484. A bill to recognize a primary measure of national unemployment for purposes of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HOLT, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 485. 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 Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. BUCHANAN):

H.R. 486. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to incentivize the development of abuse-deterrent drugs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS (for herself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 487. A bill to provide for a Medicare primary care graduate medical education pilot project in order to improve access to the primary care workforce; 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. PEARCE (for himself and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico):

H.R. 488. A bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to clarify that uncertified States and Indian tribes have the authority to use certain payments for certain noncoal reclamation projects; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. PINGREE of Maine (for herself and Mr. MICHAUD):

H.R. 489. A bill to expand the HUBZone program for communities affected by base realignment and closure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. KEATING, Mr. AMASH, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. FOSTER):

H.R. 490. A bill to amend section 217 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the visa waiver program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 491. A bill to prevent United States businesses from cooperating with repressive governments in transforming the Internet into a tool of censorship and surveillance, to fulfill the responsibility of the United States Government to promote freedom of expression on the Internet, to restore public confidence in the integrity of United States businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Financial Services, 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. STUTZMAN (for himself, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana):

H.R. 492. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to remove the mandate on the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Open Market Committee to focus on maximum employment; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HONDA, Ms. CHU, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RUSH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. MOORE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BASS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. WATT, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. COHEN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama):

H. Res. 49. A resolution recognizing the significance of Black History Month; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REED, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. SPEIER):

H. Res. 50. A resolution expressing support for designation of February 4, 2013, as National Cancer Prevention Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. POLIS):

H. Res. 51. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that adding art and design into Federal programs that target the Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) fields encourages innovation and economic growth in the United States; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, 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.

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 Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 452.

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. CASSIDY:

H.R. 453.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 454.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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 Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 455.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 456.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Los Angeles Residential Helicopter Noise Relief Act is constitutionally authorized under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper Clause. The Necessary and Proper Clause supports the expansion of congressional authority beyond the explicit authorities that are directly discernible from the text.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 457.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 5, Clauses 4 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 458.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4; 14th Amendment.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 459.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, which states that Congress has the power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 460.

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 Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 461.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution which grants Congress the power to provide for the general welfare of the United States; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for organizing the militia, and to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces, and to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the foregoing powers.''

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 462.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 14 (relating to the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces), clause 16 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia), and clause 18 (relating to the power of Congress to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress); and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 463.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the Constitution of the United States, Congress has the power to establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 464.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 3, Clause 1: ''The Congress shall have the 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;''

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. CAPUANO:

H.R. 465.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 3, Clause 1: ''The Congress shall have the 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;''

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. CAPUANO:

H.R. 466.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: 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 any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 467.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 468.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 469.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 470.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 471.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 472.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 473.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

16 By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 474.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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. GERLACH:

H.R. 475.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia:

H.R. 476.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7, that states ''. . . a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.''

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia:

H.R. 477.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4 of the Constitution, which states that Congress has the power ''to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States.''

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution, which states that Congress has 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. GINGREY of Georgia:

H.R. 478.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, which states that the Congress has the power ''to regulated Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 479.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §1 and 8.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H.R. 480.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the Constitution of the United States, including but not limited to Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 3.

By Mr. HECK of Nevada:

H.R. 481.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, 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. HOLT:

H.R. 482.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HUDSON:

H.R. 483.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Enumerated Powers of Congress. Article I., Section 8. The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 484.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clauses 1 and 18

''The Congress shall have the power to . . . provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.''

''To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers. . .''.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 485.

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. KEATING:

H.R. 486.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 487.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority in which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to regulate Commerce as enumerated by Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 as applied to healthcare.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 488.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the power to enact this law.

By Ms. PINGREE of Maine:

H.R. 489.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 490.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 491.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. STUTZMAN:

H.R. 492.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 5 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 11: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BARBER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. KEATING, Mr. HOYER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 22: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. STOCKMAN.

H.R. 32: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MICA, and Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 44: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 61: Mr. HENSARLING and Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 69: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 71: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 102: Mr. DINGELL.

H.R. 117: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 124: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 146: Mr. HOLT, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 148: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 149: Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 164: Ms. HANABUSA.

H.R. 165: Mr. GRIMM.

H.R. 182: Mr. GIBSON, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 200: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 217: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 229: Mr. LEWIS and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 235: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 236: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 258: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. YODER, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 269: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 279: Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 282: Mr. NUGENT, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 285: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 297: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. LATTA, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. DENT, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 300: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. RADEL, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. FOSTER, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 305: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 311: Mr. NUNNELEE and Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 317: Mr. WESTMORELAND and Mr. AMASH.

H.R. 321: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 333: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 334: Mr. RADEL.

H.R. 335: Mr. BENISHEK and Mr. STOCKMAN.

H.R. 341: Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 342: Mr. LATTA, Mr. STEWART, Mr. FORBES, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. ENYART, and Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 346: Mr. JONES, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. HARPER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 351: Mr. COTTON, Mr. HALL, Mr. BARR, and Mr. STOCKMAN.

H.R. 357: Mr. JONES, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 366: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. LANCE, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 367: Mr. CULBERSON and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 370: Mr. HENSARLING and Mr. STUTZMAN.

H.R. 377: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. MAFFEI.

H.R. 427: Mr. CICILLINE and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 435: Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 444: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MESSER, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. POSEY, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. STEWART, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. HENSARLING, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, AND Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. ROSS, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. BARR, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. JONES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. BONNER, and Mr. CHABOT.

H.J. Res. 20: Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.J. Res. 21: Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H. Con. Res. 4: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H. Res. 24: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. OLSON, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H. Res. 47: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Budget in H.R. 444, Require a PLAN Act of 2013, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1. The SPEAKER presented a petition of The Township of Edison, New Jersey, relative to Resolution R.839-122012 urging the President, Governor, and Legislators to enact more stringent gun laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2. Also, a petition of The Borough of Roselle, New Jersey, relative to Resolution Number 2012-435 supporting Gun Control; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 2013 No. 16

Senate

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Lord God, You are infinite, unchangeable, and holy. Thank You for this day and the opportunities to be stewards of Your love, grace, and compassion. Use our Senators to respond to the needs in our world, infusing them with a willingness to do Your will. Invade their hearts and minds with Your peace as they envision Your plans and purposes. Lord, give them power to handle the pressures, light for their path, and patience for their challenges. Let Your wisdom guide them, Your hand guard them, and Your shield protect them.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable PATRICK J. LEAHY led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am going to have to get used to the President pro tempore presiding over the Senate. That is not the script we have followed for quite a few years. I am very happy to see him here, as usual.

Following leader remarks, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 5 p.m. Following morning business, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 47, the Violence Against Women Act. At 5:30, the Senate will vote on the motion to proceed to the bill.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 201 and S. 204

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there are two bills at the desk due for a second reading.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the titles of the bills for the second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 201) to prohibit the sale, lease, transfer, retransfer, or delivery of F–16 aircraft, M–1 tanks, or certain other defense articles or services to the Government of Egypt.

A bill (S. 204) to preserve and protect the free choice of individual employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, or to refrain from such activities.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, with these two bills, I would object to any further proceedings.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The measures will be placed on the calendar.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, in the two decades since the Violence Against Women Act passed—it passed with a very strong vote, a bipartisan vote here in the Senate, and then in the House at the time—incidents of domestic violence have fallen by more than half, by as much as 53 percent. The law has helped millions of women and children escape their attackers and get the justice they deserve. It is a landmark piece of legislation. That is why Congress twice reauthorized this legislation without a hint of controversy or a moment of delay.

But despite the overwhelming evidence this legislation saves lives and protects women, House Republicans used every procedural trick known to Congress to block its reauthorization last Congress. Despite strong bipartisan support here in the Senate, Republicans in the House refused to join the effort to renew our national commitment to ending domestic violence.

Allowing partisan delays to put women's lives at risk is simply shameful. If House Republicans believe domestic violence is no longer a problem in this country, they are wrong. Every day three women in America die at the hands of their abusers. Every day many women escape with their lives but with the physical and emotional scars of the abuse that exists.

More than one-third of women in this country have been victims of violence, sexual assault, or stalking by a partner—one-third of the women in this country have been victims of violence, sexual assault, or stalking by a partner. It is in our power to help, and it is unthinkable that Republicans in the House would prevent us from taking action and again refuse to do anything, as they did last Congress.

Victims of violence and law enforcement officials who support them have already waited too long for Congress to act. This week, the Senate will pass a strong bipartisan reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act. This is something that was put forward by the chairman of that committee, the Judiciary Committee, Senator LEAHY. He has worked hard on it. He did everything possible last Congress to get this done. Because of the House's intransigence, they refused to do anything in spite of his work.

I thank Chairman LEAHY, Senator MURRAY, and the women of the Senate for their leadership on this issue. I am pleased so many of my Senate colleagues have expressed support for swift action on this legislation, and especially so many Senate Republicans have supported this legislation. The Senate will not allow women to be denied the protection they need and deserve.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

We must ensure law enforcement has the means to stop these horrible crimes. We must guarantee communities have the resources to support victims regardless of sexual orientation, immigration status, or where they live, as they heal. Every victim of domestic violence deserves the same vigorous protections under the law. Because of the unique nature of the crime, combating domestic violence and protecting those affected also requires unique tools. Reauthorizing this act would help law enforcement continue to develop effective strategies to prosecute cases involving violent crimes against women. It would provide funding for shelters and transitional housing programs for victims of domestic violence and sexual assault and help victims become independent. It would make legal assistance available to victims of violence and safeguard children and youth affected by dating violence and stalking.

Although the Violence Against Women Act expired in 2011, many of the programs established under the law have been funded by continuing resolutions. But not everything. A full reauthorization of this law is necessary to ensure authorities have all the resources they need to fight domestic violence. So I hope the Senate's bipartisan action this week will send a strong message to House Republican leaders that further partisan delay is unacceptable.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). The Republican leader is recognized.

SPENDING CONTROL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the American people are deeply unhappy with the way Washington operates these days. They are tired of people telling them what they want to hear instead of what they need to hear. They are tired of all of the political games and gimmicks that substitute for real action on the problems we face as a Nation. Given what we have seen from the White House and Congressional Democrats, frankly, it is hard to blame them. As I have said repeatedly in recent weeks, we need to find a way to control runaway Federal spending and debt. We need to do it quickly. This is absolutely essential if we are to avoid a European-style catastrophe. It is what we need to do if we are serious about removing government obstacles that stand in the way of a robust recovery and new jobs.

Reducing the debt will throw off a wet blanket that has been weighing on our economy for entirely too long. This is a serious challenge. It demands serious spending reforms from both parties here in Washington. Yet if you were to listen to the Democrats, you would think all of our ills could be solved by raising taxes on private jets or energy companies.

These are not real solutions. They are poll-tested gimmicks. Just take the tax hike on so-called corporate jets. It would not raise enough revenue to offset more than 1 week—1 week—of the decade-long sequester—1 week. Of course, anytime you have a tax hike, there are going to be negative repercussions for growth and jobs. We do not have to look too far into the past to see how disruptive those consequences can be. In 1990, Washington politicians tried to enact a ''luxury tax'' on just about everything you could associate with the upper class, including yachts and aircraft. It was a total failure. Not only was it linked to the destruction of literally thousands of jobs in the boating industry, but, according to one study, the government actually—listen to this—spent more in unemployment benefits and in lost taxes than it was able to raise through the luxury tax itself. In other words, while the tax may have seemed to serve as a useful wedge issue for Democratic politicians, it made just about everyone worse off than they were before it passed. Workers, consumers, taxpayers, and the government were all worse off. That is why a number of Members of today's Senate Democratic caucus voted to repeal that particular tax a few years later in 1993. They even agreed to send refund checks to some of those impacted by it.

So why are they proposing to go down this same sorry road one more time? Well, in a variation of the old saying, you can conclude that they do not want the facts to get in the way of a good political talking point.

But the larger point is this: The challenge we face right now is the fact that government spending is completely and totally out of control. So to focus on a tax of any kind is to miss the point entirely. The amount of revenue we bring in as a percentage of GDP is set to return to the historical average of the past few decades. Spending, on the other hand, is way above historic norms, and spending is projected to actually get much worse in the years to come; that is, unless we do something about it today.

The American people elected a divided government. They expect it to work. That means both parties need to engage and offer serious solutions. Proposing a return to failed tax gimmicks of the past is not by any measure a serious solution. If White House officials want to replace the same sequester they themselves proposed in 2011, it is their responsibility to lay out what concrete spending cuts they would be willing to consider as potential offsets, as House Republicans already have. If they do, then we Republicans are happy to hear them out and to work collaboratively on effective reforms. But if this is just another opportunity to trot out the Democrats' focus-group-approved policy stunt, if this is another fake fight designed by the White House to push us to the brink, then Republicans are not interested in playing along. We are going to keep fighting for real spending reform, because that is what the American people expect us to do.

Every day spent talking about corporate jets is a day wasted. Given that the President again missed the deadline to submit a budget on time this year, there is not much time to spare. The clock is ticking. It is past time to get serious.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 5 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, 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. ROBERTS. I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. ROBERTS. I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized to proceed as in morning business.

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

REMEMBERING ADELE HALL

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to a most remarkable woman. In just a few hours, a celebration of life service will be held at St. Andrew's Church in Kansas City for Adele Hall, described by the Kansas City Star in a front-page headline as ''first lady'' of Kansas City.

Adele was in Hawaii with her husband Don Hall, chairman of Hallmark Cards, when she passed away. To say they were a remarkable couple is an understatement. They met when she was 3 years old and Don was 6. Adele said: I don't ever remember falling in love with Don. I just grew up being in love with him.

As the Star reported, her priorities were always with her husband and her three children. In addition to her love and caring for her family, Adele Hall had a unique ability to lead, and lead she did. Living a life of caring and contribution, making a difference and demonstrating to all whose lives she touched and made better, she was a wonderful example of honor and respect.

Adele's many accomplishments were almost legendary. She would demure from that description with her wonderful smile and give credit to others. It

was how she accomplished so much that serves as such a wonderful example and why she was so beloved.

The friends of Don and Adele and those with whom she worked describe her best. Henry Bloch, the founder of H&R Block and a lifelong friend, said:

> If there ever was a first lady of Kansas City, it was Adele. She was honored and respected by everybody. It's a major loss for this community.

Irv Hockaday, a former CEO of Hallmark and a friend of Adele and Don's for close to 50 years, said:

> She was like a magnetic sun . . . whose constant warmth and magnetism just had a pull. And people gravitated to her. To me, her most compelling quality, of many, was her empathy.
>
> They say that no one is indispensable. That's true in a way. But she comes about as close to being someone we can never, ever forget or replicate.

Irv Hockaday certainly captured Adele, as did Steven Doyal, spokesman for Hallmark Cards:

> We lost a great human being. Her greatest passion was in the area of children. She believed passionately in the potential of every child.

At Children's Mercy Hospital, Adele moved easily from rocking sick babies in the nursery to running board meetings and leading multimillion-dollar fundraising campaigns. One of the best known was with Tom Watson, with whom she established the Children's Mercy Golf Classic.

Jack Ovel, the hospital board chairman, said:

> She was quick to give others credit. She was always telling other people, ''You are the wind beneath my wings.''

Perhaps her most notable collaborative effort was bringing the University of Kansas and Children's Mercy together. Early on she realized what that would mean for residents of Kansas City.

Jim Heeter, president of the Greater City Chamber of Commerce, described the news of Adele's passing, which came in the middle of the monthly chamber board meeting:

> The entire room fell into stunned silence when it was announced. She was known and loved by virtually everyone around our board table. We observed a long moment of silence in her honor and her memory.

Mary Shaw ''Shawsie'' Branton, who was her copartner and close friend in one charitable and/or civic event after another said of Adele:

> I have lost a close friend. She touched all our lives. There was an aura around Adele, 'How can I help? What can I do? . . . How can I find a solution?'

''This is a great day of sorrow,'' said Sarah Rowland, chairwoman of the Nelson-Atkins board of trustees.

Jane Chu, CEO of the Kauffman Center for the Performing Arts said:

> Everything she did was about inspiring Kansas City residents. She so believed in these projects because she so believed in this city, she cared about making it a great place to live.

One can clearly see by the many comments of Adele's friends and leaders in Kansas City, with regard to their sense of personal loss, expressions of admiration of love and respect for the world of achievements Adele accomplished, there is only one Adele Hall.

In my case, Mr. President, I was on the floor of this body last Monday during a series of votes taking place when a cloakroom attendant gave me a message to call my office immediately. I did, and my chief of staff, Jackie Cottrell, came over to the cloakroom and told me of the news of Adele's untimely passing.

There are certain people in life where you feel you are privileged just to know them—people who make a difference, really nice people who give you a certain sense of awe, people who are really not aware of their special and unique persona. Adele had that certain something—a unique charisma, comprised of a wonderful smile, charm and grace, but also the determination and ability of a leader.

When she came into a room, those present knew things would get done. She always stood ready in friendship and support and love. Unfortunately, given her strength of purpose, she was also the kind of person you might well take for granted.

Jackie and I immediately called Annie Presley, a good friend and companion-in-arms with Adele. Annie and I couldn't say too much during that phone call, but I did blurt out, ''Well, it's the end of an era.'' And it is. Adele, in addition to all of her civic and art works, had tremendous influence, serving as an adviser, a friend, and supporter to Presidents, Governors, Senators, Congressional Members, and city leaders. Annie was right by her side in these endeavors. Her passion for politics made both Kansas and Missouri a better place to live. Her advice, her guidance, and support were invaluable to so many. Don and Adele's Kansas home was the setting for countless benefactor receptions. The list represents a Who's Who in politics, from both Presidents Bush, Senators Bob Dole, Kit Bond, Nancy Kassebaum, and, yes, somebody by the name of PAT ROBERTS.

My friendship with Don and Adele began more than 20 years ago. I admit I was a bit nervous the first time I was invited to their home. I arrived early and Adele warmly greeted me, welcomed me in. Don took me into the study, and after some discussion we all ended up listening to the Andrews Sisters—I don't know why—until we were informed it was time to greet the other guests. I think Don and I would have been there a lot longer if Don had his way. We have been great friends ever since.

Perhaps the highlight of our efforts together was when First Lady Laura Bush came to Kansas, and together we welcomed her to our great State.

Finally, Mr. President, when I talk about Adele's respect and her humility, I am reminded of the story when President Bush came to Wichita on my behalf. The White House staff and security, God bless them, had names on the floor in the reception room, and those who were greeting the President had to stand on the right name. God knows what would have happened if you didn't stand on the right name.

Adele stood exactly as instructed on her name, without any hesitation. I did not do that. I didn't follow orders quite as well. I met with the President's vehicle and hurriedly told him our special guests were standing at attention at their appropriate spot, which amused the President greatly. The secret, of course, was that Don and Adele often stayed at the White House as guests of both George H.W. Bush and President George W. Bush.

When President Bush came in the room, he asked: Adele, are you standing in the right place?

She replied quickly: Why, Mr. President—George—I will stand wherever you want me to.

That really produced a lot of laughs and prompted a big hug.

Mr. President, today's obligations in the Senate prevent me from attending the celebration of life service, but I am there in spirit. To Don, Don Jr. and Jill, David and Laura, Margaret and Keith, and Adele's nine grandchildren, our thoughts and prayers are with you.

I feel compelled to say if all of the people in the Kansas City area could be in attendance, those who loved Adele or who have benefited from her many endeavors, the numbers would fill Arrowhead Stadium and then some.

Helen Steiner Rice may well have summed up what Adele would be telling us now:

> When I must leave you for a little while, please go on bravely with a gallant smile. And, for my sake and in my name, live on and do all things the same. Spend not your life in empty days, but fill each waking hour in useful ways. Reach out your hand in comfort and in cheer, and I, in turn, will comfort you and hold you near.

Mr. President, the heavens are a little brighter now because they have a shining star in Adele Hall.

I yield the floor, and upon careful study 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. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

FEDERAL SPENDING

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I come to the Senate floor today, as I have virtually every day since we have been back in session, to address what is perhaps the most critical question facing this Nation: how to rein in the out-of-control Federal spending that threatens to bankrupt the country and saddle future generations with a burden of

debt that will dramatically reduce the quality of their lives.

Yesterday morning on ABC's ''This Week with George Stephanopoulos,'' Senate Majority Leader REID claimed:

''The American people need to understand that it's not as if we've done nothing for the debt.''

I would argue that the American people do understand, but what they disagree with is the majority leader's statement that we have done something to reduce the debt we are accumulating at a record rate. We all know we are spending nearly $40,000 of taxpayer money per second. We know it has now been 1,377 days since we passed a budget in the Senate or one has even been offered by the Democratic leadership. Our debt continues to accumulate and now stands at nearly $16.5 trillion, and anybody who looks at the debt clock sees that the numbers are rotating faster than the eye can see. So, no, I don't agree. I don't think we have done much to address our debt. And rather than recognize the real problem of our debt, which is spending, the majority leader talked about the need for yet more taxes and higher revenues.

After all the debate about making the wealthy pay more in order to pay down our debt, the fiscal cliff deal barely changed the Nation's long-term fiscal outlook, particularly if spending continues on its present course.

A report from the Peterson Foundation released this week puts U.S. debt on a track to reach 200 percent of gross domestic product by 2040. Keep in mind that many respected economists—economists without a partisan position to promote, those who have looked at this impartially—have said to us that historically, without exception, once a nation's debt reaches 90 percent of GDP, it becomes very damaging to the economy, and it is something I believe we are now experiencing the early phases of in America. So 200 percent of GDP, if we stay on the present course, will take this country and our economy down, and it will take away our ability to provide the needed and necessary functions of the Federal Government.

The plain fact is that our debt is going to continue to spiral upward until Washington tackles its spending addiction.

The President and some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are claiming that in the last few years they have already cut the budget to the bone. These so-called savings they talk about are savings anticipated by drawing down troops in Afghanistan and Iraq that are already set to wind down. So we can't just simply say: Well, we have solved the problem because we are now going to take this money which we anticipate we won't have to spend.

By the way, that assumes there will be no more overseas contingent operations that will have to take place in the next 10 years. If we look at what is happening around the world, if we look at the instability and threats that are happening around the world, it is pretty hard to assume we simply don't or won't need to spend any money over the next 10 years to address something that is a direct threat to the United States.

All of this basically says it is pretty hard to take seriously the suggestion by the majority leader and the President that we have done our job in cutting spending to reduce the debt.

If I were able to take the time to list the wasteful catalog of duplicative spending and wasteful spending of the taxpayer dollars on this floor, I would use up the rest of the day—and more. But let me mention a few examples from my colleague from Oklahoma, Senator COBURN, who I think has done this body and the American public a great service by delineating and outlining some of this unnecessary spending of taxpayer dollars and giving us a route and a roadmap and a pathway towards addressing unneeded wasteful spending of tax dollars, particularly at a time when we are having to borrow nearly 40 percent or more in order to keep our government functioning. This spending Senator COBURN has listed comes out of official government reports—the Government Accountability Office, the Congressional Research Service, and other government entities. These have been documented by our own official national government agencies:

There is $1.6 billion spent annually to maintain unneeded Federal property. If it is unneeded, why do we have to maintain it year after year at a cost of $1.6 billion? Let's put a ''for sale'' sign up there and receive some revenue from these assets that are documented as being unneeded.

Another $1.6 billion is spent by the Federal Government to provide free cell phone service. Now, the Congress passed legislation for certain categories of low-income people to receive free cell phones. Whether you are for that or against that or voted for it or voted against it, what has been laid out here is the fact that many of these phones are going to people who don't qualify for this handout, and hundreds of thousands of those go to people who already have at least one phone. Offer somebody a free second phone, and they are going to grab it. But do they need it, and does the taxpayer need to pay for it?

Also, $50 million of taxpayer money went to the IRS for a public relations effort to try to improve its image with taxpayers. Good luck with that PR program. I think we know their opinion of the IRS. And is this really a necessary expenditure?

The IRS sent a prisoner who filed a bogus tax return a refund for $327,456, and they even sent it to the correctional facility. You would think that somewhere along the line, somebody would say: Maybe we ought to look into this. Hopefully we will be able to get this one back, along with $30,000 that was sent to a jail where a murderer collected $30,000 in claimed unemployment benefits. Well, yes, he was unemployed, but that is not exactly what our unemployment system is designed to do. So while we are going after the $327,000, maybe we can collect this $30,000 on the way.

Every day we hear of reports of food stamps being used to pay for beer, cigarettes, cell phone bills, and even cars. That hardly needs to be mentioned because it is something we have come to understand—there is a lot of misuse of tax dollars.

On and on it goes, and I could list more and more.

Just the other day, Senator COBURN listed some duplicative programs, and he thought: Well, maybe we don't need multiple numbers of these. Maybe we can consolidate.

We have 18 domestic food assistance programs, 45 separate job-training programs. And I love this one, my personal favorite—more than 50 financial literacy programs provided by the Federal Government.

The first question we need to ask is what does the Federal Government have to say about financial literacy, given our current financial situation? Hopefully it is using its own dysfunction as an example of what not to do.

These outrageous spending items and duplicative Federal programs are not isolated examples. Just a few weeks ago the Treasury Department issued its year-end report for fiscal 2012. One of the bombshells in this report that has received virtually no coverage or commentary is the estimate by the Government Accountability Office that $108 billion was lost to improper payments by the Federal Government.

Since over one-third of all Federal spending wasn't even examined yet by the GAO, the total amount lost obviously will be much higher. The fact that this escaped the notice of much of the media and many of my colleagues is very telling. Unfortunately, we are so used to the notion of inefficient or wasteful Federal spending, a government report verifying over $100 billion in waste, fraud, and abuse doesn't even register.

When my colleagues come down to offer amendments and are voted down, amendments to offset spending for new programs such as disaster relief and a cacophony of rejections comes their way saying, ''How dare you even think about trying to offset this, you are taking money away from babies and children and mothers and essential functions of the Federal Government?'' Then you start to read down the list of wasteful programs and duplicative programs and they say they cannot come up with a dime to offset needed expenses.

Let me say we are not here to undermine or destroy the necessary function of running an efficient government. But the key word is efficient. We want to spend taxpayers' dollars in a way so taxpayers understand we are doing the

best to spend their hard-earned dollars on essential programs.

I have suggested to the Appropriations Committee that each program for which we appropriate money be put through a system of what I call triage. We ask each agency before it presents its budget to us, annually, for the appropriations to pay for their expenses and distributions, that they first address this question: Is this an essential function of the Federal Government? Is this a function we might like to do but can no longer afford to do? And separate that from those we no longer need or never should have been put there in the first place.

At a time when we are suffering from the plunge into deficit spending and debt, should we not apply some standards and principles as to where and how we allocate funds that are sent to us by the taxpayer? I have asked each agency to do that. We have not received any reports back. All we hear, from a number of voices around the town, is: Oh, no, we cannot touch any of this; every dime we spend is absolutely necessary.

I think what Senator COBURN has begun to do and what I hope to do, and to work on with him and others, is to identify some of those areas and literally ask the question to my colleagues and to the American people: Do you think this is an essential function of the Federal Government? Is this something that maybe we would wish to do but do not have the money to do? Or is this something that, frankly, has not lived up to its promise, is wasting money, or is this something that never should have been passed in the first place?

If we do not apply those principles to our future spending, we are going to continue down this road. We all know the big three—Social Security, Medicaid, and Medicare—have to be reformed to save these programs, but have to be reformed because they are unsustainable in their current form. I will be talking much more about that later. But what I do want to acknowledge here today is that without getting to those programs, which we have to do if we are going to solve our long-term problem, we also need to seriously look at how we spend money on all the discretionary spending that comes before this body. We have to look at those things that simply do not measure up in terms of a responsible way of handling our taxpayer revenues.

I am going to continue coming to the floor, I am going to continue pointing out areas where I think we can save money, and continue to make the case that this Congress has not begun to do the job it needs to do in terms of dealing with our spending.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

DEBT CEILING EXTENSION

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, last week the Senate passed legislation that had already been approved in the House that extended the debt ceiling until late this summer. It was the right thing to do. It was the right thing to extend the debt ceiling of our Nation because it allows us to pay the bills we have already incurred. There is not one dime of new spending that is authorized under the legislation we approved. My only regret is that we did not extend it for a longer period of time, giving greater certainty to the financial markets.

If we were ever to violate the debt ceiling, the consequences would be that the taxpayers of this country would have to pay more for the obligations of our Nation in interest costs. It would permanently damage the reputation of this Nation as far as our ability to pay our bills. It would be counterproductive to everything we are trying to do to help the taxpayers of America. It was the right thing for us to do, to extend the debt ceiling, but we still have a lot more work we need to do.

Our current accumulation of debt is not sustainable. We cannot continue to spend what we are spending today and collect what we are collecting today in revenue and sustain the fiscal integrity of the United States. We spend too much and we do not bring in enough revenue. That is the issue we need to address. It was not addressed in the debt ceiling. The debt ceiling should have been extended. But we now need to deal with the fundamental problem that our spending and revenues are not in line.

We could talk about the cause of how we got here. We could talk about how the Congress reduced tax revenues while we were at war, a policy I spoke out against and voted against. But our responsibility is to figure out how we go from where we are today, with budget deficits that are not sustainable, to how we can bring our country into better fiscal balance. We need a balanced approach. We need an approach that looks at spending, looks at revenues, that acknowledges that job growth is, first and foremost, our objective. We have to create more jobs in our economy—more people working, less people needing governmental services, more people paying tax revenues; all that helps generate the growth in our economy.

We have to protect the middle class. The middle class has been particularly vulnerable during this slowdown in our economy from which we are now recovering. It has to be real, what we come up with. That means it really does deal with the deficit problems of this country and should be long term. I think all of us are tired of these short-term extensions. They may avoid an immediate problem but they do not give the type of predictability that is necessary for our economy to take off and grow.

If you are an investor, it is tough to invest if you do not know the ground rules, if you do not know what the Tax Code is going to look like, what the Federal budget is going to look like. How do you invest in expanding a plant to deal with expanded Federal needs when you don't know what the budget is going to be? How do you deal with the Tax Code if maybe you want to develop an energy company when you do not know what the tax provisions are going to be for that operation? We need to give predictability. Therefore, long-term solutions are better.

And it needs to be truly bipartisan. I was here on New Year's Eve at midnight. I saw the Democrats and Republicans come together in a true compromise that I think put the Nation's interests first rather than our partisan interests. I would have wished to see us do things a lot differently than in that agreement, but it was bipartisan, we compromised, we listened, and did it in the best traditions of the Congress.

I wish to take us back 2 years ago when we started to struggle with how we would deal with our fiscal problems. President Obama appointed the Simpson-Bowles Commission, and we know a lot about that. They made their recommendations. Some of the recommendations' specifics were pretty controversial, but I think as to the overall framework of the Simpson-Bowles recommendations—the amount of additional revenue we need to bring in, the types and parameters of the spending cuts—I think there was general national agreement that that was the framework which would allow us to move forward in the best interests of our economy. I point out in the last Congress the Democrats on the Senate Budget Committee adopted that approach as our framework to move forward. I think that is what we need to look at.

Let me make a couple of points, because I have listened to a lot of my colleagues come to the floor and talk about how we have not made progress, that our deficits are too large. We have made progress. We have. We have gotten about halfway there. Simpson-Bowles was somewhere between $4 and $5 trillion of deficit reduction over a 10-year period. We are about halfway there. We have about $2.5 trillion we have gotten done. We got that done because we passed the Budget Control Act, and the Budget Control Act put in lower caps on discretionary spending on the domestic side. That is now the law of the land. Over $1 trillion of deficit reduction was accomplished because of the Budget Control Act.

We did another $1 trillion of deficit reduction on New Year's Eve, the fiscal cliff agreements that brought in more revenue by making permanent the 39.6-percent tax rate for high-income taxpayers and bringing in some additional spending cuts. That is real.

My colleagues say we still have these large deficits and they are larger than they were before, but if we did not do the Budget Control Act and we did not do the fiscal cliff agreements, the deficit would be much higher. Again, using some common baseline, such as Simpson-Bowles did, we have done

about half of what, if you agree on the framework of Simpson-Bowles, we need to do. We have to get more done; we are not there yet. The revenues of this country traditionally have been about 19 percent of our economy. That is what it was under President Clinton when we balanced the Federal budget. We actually had surpluses. Our economy was growing. There was job growth. We were moving in the right direction.

Our revenues have dipped to about 15 percent of our economy, so we are not anywhere near having as much revenue as we need in order to have a balanced approach that allows for job growth. And, yes, our spending is too high, particularly on what we call the mandatory side. We agree with that. If you look at our health care costs in this country, they are much higher than those of any other nation in the world and we do not have the health results that would demonstrate why we are spending so much more. We need a more efficient system. That is why a lot of us supported the Affordable Care Act, because we see in it delivery system reform that will make our health care system more efficient, bring down the cost of hospital care by reducing readmissions, bring down the cost of hospital care by reducing hospital infection rates, bring down the cost of high-cost interventions by dealing with people with complicated issues, multiple issues, in a much more managed way; using health technology more efficiently; using preventive care to actually reduce health care costs. We know early intervention saves lives, saves costs, and when you bring down the cost of health care you bring down the cost of Medicaid, you bring down the cost of Medicare, and you help our budget get into better balance.

We also believe we can save money in the military. The baseline for military spending assumes the high level of military operations in Afghanistan. Well, our troops are coming home. I think we can now safely assume that our Active military needs will not be at the high levels they have been over the last decade, and that will save money. I personally think we need to look at a BRAC-like process for our international military facilities, as we did for our domestic military facilities. All of that can save money.

So what do we need to do? We need to get together, Democrats and Republicans, on a balanced approach. We need to do it in the month of February because on March 1 these automatic cuts, known as sequestration, take effect. The automatic cuts were put in during the Budget Control Act as a way to get us to act. None of us wanted to see across-the-board cuts to both our domestic and our military budgets; we didn't think that made a lot of sense. After all, some programs are more important than others, and we should make the hard choices. We should not be using an across-the-board cut.

We need to come together. As I have indicated, there are areas in the spending where I hope we can come together so we can make our system more efficient, particularly on the delivery of health care. There are certain reductions we can make in the overseas contingency accounts in our military.

On the revenue side, we have brought out areas where there are loopholes and shelters in our Tax Code. We can do a better job. It is interesting that the top 1 percent of the taxpayers of this country receive 25 percent of the benefits on what is known as tax expenditures. I heard my colleagues come to the floor and talk about how we have to bring down the cost of spending. Well, yes, we do spend through appropriations bills, but we also spend through tax expenditures, which are provisions we put in the Tax Code to give breaks to some—not all—of our constituents. When we add up all those tax expenditures, it comes to $1.2 trillion a year. That is what the tax expenditures come to. That is larger than our entire discretionary spending. We are spending more through the Tax Code than we are through appropriations bills. We can certainly find some savings in those tax expenditures, and we can use that in a balanced approach to be able to avoid the across-the-board cuts and get our budget back into better balance. That is where we need to move as a Congress and as a nation.

It is important for us to take timely action. Let me underscore that. We need to act in February. We don't want to go through the uncertainty of what sequestration means. I have talked to a lot of businesspeople who depend on Federal contracts. Will that contract be let? They don't know. We need to give predictability so that our economy can take off.

I hope we all put our Nation's fiscal interests ahead of any of our partisan objectives, and that means listening to each other. Democrats and Republicans need to listen. My colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle have made some good points in regard to mandatory spending. My colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle have made some very valid points about the need for revenue. I hope we will listen to each other, resolve our differences, and put a proposal forward that brings our Nation back to a stable fiscal future, which will allow us to create the types of jobs we need by investment and fiscal prudence so our economy can continue to lead the world. We need to act in a responsible, balanced, bipartisan, and timely way.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am honored to be an original cosponsor of the bipartisan legislation to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act. Let me thank the two leaders of that important bill, Senators LEAHY and CRAPO, for their work to ensure that the Senate makes renewing this important law a high priority early in this Congress.

I also wish to acknowledge the work of the many advocates who have delivered so strongly the message to Congress and to the public that we must do more to prevent violence from occurring in our homes and in our communities. Our law enforcement officers, counselors, social workers, health care professionals, public educators, and community service providers are truly on the front lines of the effort to help those who are the victims of violence and to help prevent violence from occurring in the first place. Their advocacy on behalf of these victims has helped to make this bill a priority. I commend them all for the work they are doing each and every day.

In my home State of Maine, we are fortunate to have a very low crime rate, but law enforcement officials tell me that the two greatest areas of concern are domestic violence and drugs. Often, these two go hand in hand. In fact, a 2011 study by the University of Southern Maine's Muskie School of Public Service found that 65 percent of victims of crime in Maine believe the offender was under the influence of drugs or alcohol at the time.

Over the last decade, occurrences of domestic violence have resulted in nearly half of all homicides in my State. Nearly half are the result of incidents of domestic violence.

According to statistics from the Maine Department of Public Safety, there were 5,360 reported domestic assaults in the year 2011, which is nearly a 5-percent increase from the previous year. This equates to one domestic assault every 1 hour and 38 minutes, and this is in a State with a very low crime rate.

Nationally, one in four women and one in seven men experience severe physical violence at the hands of an intimate partner.

In addition, Maine's 10-year average is 364 rapes per year. Think about that. That is almost one rape per day in a State with a very low crime rate. Those are only the reported crimes. I suspect the actual number is even higher. According to the Maine Coalition Against Sexual Assault, an estimated 13,000 Mainers will experience some form of sexual violence this year alone. Currently, rape has the lowest reporting, arrest, and prosecution rate of all violent crimes in the United States.

So I am very pleased that this year's reauthorization bill also includes the provisions of the Sexual Assault Forensic Evidence Registry—or SAFER—Act, which was authored by our colleague, Senator JOHN CORNYN. I commend the Senator for his leadership in that area, and I am pleased to be a cosponsor of his bill, which unanimously passed in the last Congress in the Senate and has been incorporated into the Violence Against Women Act reauthorization. This bipartisan bill, the

SAFER Act, would authorize the Attorney General to award grants to State and local governments to audit and reduce the backlog of untested rape kits.

Mr. President, I think you will share my shock and alarm at the number of these kits which are sitting in the possession of law enforcement agencies and which could contain DNA evidence that would lead to prosecutions and help get rapists off the streets and yet have not been analyzed. The estimate is that between 300,000 and 400,000 of these kits are just sitting in the possession of law enforcement agencies but have not been analyzed. That is totally unacceptable.

The reauthorization bill we introduced last week would help ensure that Maine and every other State has the necessary resources to support victims of violence and, whenever possible, to prevent violence from occurring in the first place.

Elizabeth Saxl, the executive director of the Maine Coalition Against Sexual Assault, recently wrote to me in support of the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act. She noted this in her letter:

> By reauthorizing and making significant improvements to these important programs, this legislation will help fulfill the critical unmet needs of victims of violence and expand protections to currently under-protected populations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that her letter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Ms. COLLINS. The Violence Against Women Act has made a significant difference in combating domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking, through grants to State and local governments and nonprofit organizations. Since it was first passed in 1994, the programs authorized under this law have provided State and local partners with more than $4.7 billion of assistance. This assistance helps to ensure that the victims of violence get the help they need to recover and has prevented incalculable suffering by stopping violent crimes before they happen.

It is extremely important to pass this legislation because all men and women—and men are victims as well as women. In some ways, the name of this law should be changed. But all women and men, regardless of race, religion, sexual orientation, or disability deserve to be safe and protected from physical violence, and that is what this reauthorization would help to do.

Finally, this is not and never should be a partisan issue. Violence and domestic assaults do not discriminate between Republicans and Democrats, Independents and Greens, or people who are not politically active at all.

This is an equal opportunity crime that harms people regardless of their political affiliation, their profession, their location, or their status in life. It is an issue that deserves bipartisan support. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will come together and pass this important bill.

I recognize there may be some provisions of this bill which are controversial; but, surely, we can come together in support of the goal of this vital legislation. We can work out differences if not on the Senate floor then in conference with the House; but, surely, we can come together and reauthorize this law that has made such a difference to so many in our country.

EXHIBIT 1

MAINE COALITION AGAINST SEXUAL ASSAULT,
Augusta, ME, February 4, 2013.

Hon. SUSAN M. COLLINS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS: On behalf of the Maine Coalition Against Sexual Assault (MECASA), and the sexual assault crisis and support centers we represent, I am writing to express our strong support for S. 47, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act (VAWA) of 2013. By reauthorizing and making significant improvements to these important programs, this legislation will help fulfill the critical unmet needs of victims of violence and expand protections to currently under-protected populations.

VAWA has provided invaluable support for law enforcement, courts, sexual assault crisis and support centers, domestic violence service providers, prevention efforts, and community outreach. In the past decade, nearly half of Maine's homicides have been the result of domestic violence, many of which included elements of sexual violence. Additionally, nearly 13,000 Mainers will experience sexual violence this year alone while Maine's ten-year average for rapes reported to law enforcement is only 364. The cost of these crimes to Maine is enormous. VAWA helps control these costs by enabling support centers to provide free, necessary, quality services to victims who need help, not to mention the incalculable suffering that these programs help prevent.

Since the original passage of VAWA, Maine has strengthened laws regarding domestic violence, sexual violence, and stalking and has implemented programs which continue to yield tangible results for victims and for public safety. Despite VAWA's success, its criminal justice and community-based programs remain acutely necessary. According to a recent study by the University of Southern Maine's Muskie School of Public Service, nearly one in five Mainers reported having been the victim of sexual assault or an attempted sexual assault in his or her lifetime. Nationally, the Center for Disease Control and Prevention estimates that nearly one in five women and one in 71 men have been raped at some time in their lives, and one in four women and one in seven men experience severe physical violence by an intimate partner.

MECASA supports efforts to further strengthen and improve the response of the criminal justice, legal, and victim support systems for survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. We are grateful to you for your steadfast support of VAWA and your commitment to violence prevention and response.

Thank you for all you do on behalf of Maine and our nation.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH WARD SAXL,
Executive Director.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, seeing no one seeking recognition, 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. CORKER. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Senator CORKER pertaining to the introduction of S. 215 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I notice the absence of a quorum, and I thank the chair for the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING.) Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I speak as in morning business.

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

DOD REFORM

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, this past year, our national debt passed a staggering $16 trillion, more than $51,000 for every man, woman, and child in America. Today, several very serious fiscal matters that would seriously impact the Department of Defense and the U.S. defense industrial base, including budget sequestration, the debt limit, and disposition of the defense budget for fiscal year 2013 remain unresolved. Underpinning all of these matters is the larger issue of why the culture of how the Department of Defense does business must change. While daunting, this question provides us with a valuable prism through which Senator Hagel's nomination, now pending consideration by the Armed Services Committee, should be considered.

By ''culture,'' I mean that the mindset that has for years pervaded how the Department of Defense buys goods and services and manages assets and resources without regard to either their affordability or what our service men and women actually need to defend the Nation.

After years of developing legislative initiatives intended to reform how the Department does business, I am convinced that the single most effective agent of cultural change at the Department is the right leadership: leadership that recognizes that the Department owes to the taxpayer a stewardship obligation to extract maximum value for every defense dollar spent, and a moral responsibility to the warfighter that these dollars are being spent wisely, to effectively procure desired combat capability.

We need strong fiscal leadership to reject the use-or-lose mentality that incentivizes managers of the Department's programs and activities to spend every dollar, no matter what our priorities really are, and replace it with a process that actually rewards sound program management, incentivizes efforts to cut costs, and rewards those who use entrepreneurship and ingenuity to meet mission requirements, while returning taxpayer funds to the U.S. Treasury. In other words, cultural change needs leadership that not only rejects ''business-as-usual'' but also challenges it. Where Senator Hagel is on this is not clear.

One area that reflects how desperately the Department of Defense needs to change its culture of inefficiency is how it procures goods and services, in particular, how it acquires major weapons systems. While reforms in this area have been attempted for more than 25 years, the same deplorable outcomes—major cost overruns, schedule slips, or failures to perform as promised—all persist. Why? It is because despite these efforts, the underlying culture within the Department of ''business-as-usual,'' which predisposes its largest programs to these outcomes, has been allowed to live on.

In how the Department procures its largest and most expensive weapons systems, this translates into a mindset that so fails to recognize the need for affordability that it has made the Department more willing than it should be to accept (at any cost) more risk than it can responsibly manage. There are far too many examples of where the Department begins a major program without knowing what it really wants or how these requirements should translate into technical specifications that are designed to generate the combat capability it really needs. Also, all too many times, there is no traceability between these specifications through a test regime that is sufficient to ensure that the system the Department is procuring is operational effective, suitable, and survivable before entering operational testing or early production. So what happens? These systems stay ''on rails''; blow through their original cost and schedule estimates; and, at the end of the day, bear little resemblance to what the war-fighter actually needs.

But program management, fixated on ''keeping the money flowing'', push the program—many times, reimbursing the contractor for its costs throughout, and with the parochial support of Members of this body—down the development pipeline, offering facile excuses for poor performance and, ultimately, less-than-desired capability. All of this happens within an overall management system that is overly cumbersome and costly and provides for no meaningful accountability.

In the aggregate, this has been a ''perfect storm''. A defense procurement culture that is content with promises of exquisite solutions over actual affordability has squandered literally billions of taxpayer dollars. According to a recent study, since 2004, programs canceled by the Army alone consumed between $3.3 billion and $3.8 billion per year. That is 35 to 45 percent of the Army's annual budget for development, testing, and engineering over this period. Obviously, this is simply unacceptable and unsustainable.

Yet it happened again just recently. A couple of months ago, the Air Force, quite rightly, decided to kill a huge logistics supply chain management business system called the Expeditionary Combat Support System, ECSS. But it did so only after, one, sinking about $1 billion into the program since its start in 2005; two, recently finding that another $1.1 billion would be needed to field just 25 percent of ECSS's promised capability; and, three, extracting from the taxpayer's total $1 billion investment less than $150 million in usable hardware and software. I repeat: A total $1 billion investment, less than $150 million was obtained in usable hardware and software. This is a travesty. In terms of how little benefit we realized compared to how much was spent, it is one of the most egregious examples of mismanagement in recent memory.

Some reforms have helped, but much work needs to be done. The Weapons Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 and its prescription to ''start programs off right,'' was a move in the right direction. I am pleased to report that in its last of the three reports focused on how effectively the Department has been implementing that act, the Government Accountability Office recently found that the Department has been taking positive steps to implement this reform act.

It did so having sampled 11 weapons acquisition programs, including the KC–46A tanker, the SSBN(X) *Ohio*-class ballistic, missile submarine replacement, and the Ground Combat Vehicle, GCV. But getting rid of poor cost-, schedule-, and performance-outcomes and how the Department procures goods and services will require the sustained and enduring change that only a change in culture can provide. When it comes to defense procurement, a change in culture is possible only with leadership that recognizes that for government to act as a responsible steward over defense dollars, it must be as knowledgeable, skilled, and sophisticated a buyer as industry is a seller.

Whether Senator Hagel would serve as the right leader at the Department of Defense to foster needed cultural changes in the Department's procurement practices is unclear. What we do know is that the right person must embrace the following principles: Set realistic requirements early and manage changes to those requirements aggressively. The Department must enforce better discipline and achieve greater accountability in how it meets its most critical military needs by dismantling stovepipes among the requirements, acquisition policy, and budgeting communities and ensure clear lines of authority within acquisition organizations. With the benefit of robust participation by the uniformed military, requirements should be frozen early, allowing for sufficient trade-space among the program's cost- schedule- and performance-variables to ensure that it is effectively managed throughout its lifecycle. Exquisite high-risk, next-generation solutions should be spiraled out over time. In other words, programs should be set to shorter acquisition timelines and should be managed to them.

Improve the Department's ability to price risk—effectively and independently of industry—and budget to that cost. By ''risk,'' I mean the risk that a system is exposed to throughout its life cycle: technical-, software-, development-, integration-, manufacturing-, and sustainment-risk—all of them. Acquiring weapons systems thoughtfully vis-a-vis risk would minimize funding instability which can absolutely decimate a program's ability to deliver required capability on budget and on time and ultimately result in reliable systems that will be affordable to own and operate.

Revitalize, and where necessary, build-up the Department's ''organic'' workforce in areas most vital to ''buying smart'', like cost-estimating, technical- and systems-engineering, developmental testing, et cetera. The Department must be able to conduct proper should-cost analysis to inform its positions when it negotiates contracts and conduct engineering trade-off analysis to manage programs effectively over their lifecycles. With the benefit of this capability, the Department will be able to more effectively target affordability and control cost growth.

Require the use of the type of contract that is most appropriate to the level of risk to be managed in the fee structure that is most appropriate to the type of performance to be incentivized. This requires the Department to know what it needs and, in connection with that requirement, exactly what kind of contractor performance it wants to incentivize. To that extent and as quickly as possible, the Department must get its programs into a low- to moderate-risk environment where it can use fixed-price contracts to effectively incentivize cost control.

Better incentivize productivity and innovation. Rationalize profit policy and effectively use performance-based contracting and other tools in the contracting toolkit to incentivize and reward contractors for effectively managing costs, successfully managing their supply chains and indirect expenses, and actually delivering promised capability.

Promote real competition, instead of ''checking the blocks''. Nothing drives costs down and enhances quality more effectively than competition. The Department has to make sure that competition, or the option of competition,

is brought to bear on a program throughout its lifecycle, at both the systems and subsystems level. To the extent that the Department has been recently successful with some of its large, high-profile procurements, it is because it has been able to leverage competition aggressively.

Improve how the Department acquires services. Military departments that have started diving into this area have already found massive opportunities for savings and efficiency- easily amounting to billions of dollars. This initiative should not only continue; it should expand throughout the defense enterprise.

Reform how the Department procures information systems, especially, major automated information systems. While the technical aspects of these products are, of course, fundamentally different from major weapons systems, the basic tradecraft, especially those that reflect best business practices, shouldn't be that different. Procuring cyber-security capability may, however, require greater agility and flexibility than what can be provided under the long and slow ''deliberative'' acquisition process.

Improve the ''rapid acquisitions'' process. In support of on-going operations, the war-fighter cannot rely on the ''deliberative'' acquisition process to satisfy its needs. The process by which these sorts of urgent operational requirements are satisfied reliably and cost-effectively needs to be reformed.

Rein in the Department's ability to reprogram funds. I have been appalled that in fiscal year 2011 alone, the Department of Defense transferred nearly $27 billion among Defense accounts and that only $11 billion, or 40 percent of these transfers, received any type of congressional oversight. That oversight was limited to just 8 Senators out of 100. The oversight of the transfer of billions of dollars is confined to the oversight of eight Members of the U.S. Senate. I happened to be one of them for the last 6 years, but I don't think it is appropriate to transfer that kind of money without all 100 percent being apprised of the need to do so. Despite that the Department cannot be audited—the Department of Defense has never been audited—we continue to provide it with the flexibility to engage in what amounts to budget gamesmanship where certain accounts, such as operation and maintenance and base-operations support, which are intended to satisfy ''must-pay'' bills, are historically underfunded in the President's annual budget request, with the understanding that the Department will be able to transfer funds between accounts down-the-road. In my view, this type of budget gamesmanship is a big reason why the Department cannot annually produce auditable financial statements and frustrates objectively assessing the priority or urgency of the Department's requirements.

This brings me to the other major area of how the Defense Department ''does business'' that underscores the need for cultural reform, defense financial management, and the most significant thing that can be done in this area is finally getting the Department auditable.

There can be no doubt that the ability of the Department to be audited independently would help ensure that the defense dollars are not wasted, lost, or otherwise misused. Absent auditability, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) has, since 1995, designated the Department's financial management as ''high-risk''.

Today's fiscal challenges bring new urgency to the issue of auditability at the Department of Defense. To navigate successfully through this period of austerity and fiscal uncertainty without inadvertently impinging on military readiness, the Department will have to make management decisions that are fully informed and carefully calibrated. To ensure intended results, the Department has to make sure these decisions are being executed as planned.

From well-managed companies in the private sector, which have to make decisions like this all the time, we know that reliable financial data, effective internal controls, efficient business processes, and sound business systems are needed to support an organization whose finances can be audited.

Granted, the Department won't use auditable financial statements themselves to make important management decisions, but the high quality of the financial information that feeds into financial statements that are ready-for-audit would be incredibly valuable, indeed indispensable, for identifying opportunities for savings and efficiencies; successfully implementing initiatives and management controls to realize these savings and efficiencies; and making sure that increasingly scarce defense dollars are redirected to higher defense priorities. This would give the primary stakeholders in how the Department is managed—the war-fighter and the taxpayer—confidence that the defense management decisions can be relied upon to produce intended results. Given the state of financial management at the Department of Defense today, we do not now have that confidence.

One big reason why we don't is that to date the Department's commitment to achieving financial auditability has been characterized by blown-deadline after blown-deadline. Various statutes, including the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990, the Government Management Reform Act of 1994, the Federal Financial Management Improvement Act of 1996, and other provisions in various Defense authorization and appropriations acts, have required financial improvements at the Department of Defense for the Department to produce auditable financial statements. After continuous failure, we are at a point now where, for example, when then-Secretary of Defense Gates was trying to find efficiency and reduce waste at the Department a few years ago, he said what he was doing was ''something akin to an Easter egg hunt''. He explained, ''[M]y staff and I learned that it was nearly impossible to get accurate information and answers to questions such as '[h]ow much money do you spend?' and ''[h]ow many people do you have?'''

For this reason, after succeeding Secretary Gates, Secretary Panetta immediately elevated financial improvement to a top priority of the Department by directing the Department to cut in half the time to make a key financial statement, called the Statement of Budgetary Resources (SBR), ready-for-audit. This goal must be achieved by fiscal year 2014. Seeking to leverage Secretary Panetta's initiative and with the assistance of Senator AYOTTE, the Senate Armed Services Committee included a provision in its authorization bill this year that formalizes this goal.

I am pleased to say that while much work needs to be done for the Department of Defense to achieve its audit-readiness goals, the Department has made some limited progress, particularly through its Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness (FIAR) plan, which the Senate Armed Services Committee legislated as a requirement a few years ago. The House Armed Services Committee's Panel on Defense Financial Management and Auditability Reform found early this year contained a ''reasonable strategy and methodology.''

In my view, it is no longer the case that top defense managers ''just don't get it'' or that they are dragging their feet because they don't see financial improvement as a priority. Indeed, perhaps the silver-lining in today's fiscal challenges is that it seems to have united top management at the Pentagon into finally realizing how important it is for the Department to become financially auditable.

Indeed, over the last few years, some agencies within the Department, such as the Army Corps of Engineers, the Military Retirement Fund, Defense Contracting Audit Agency, and TRICARE's Contract Management Activity have received clean audit opinions. As GAO's Director of Financial Management and Assurance Asif Khan recently said, Secretary Panetta's directive has resulted in a ''change in tone at the top'' that has ''reset'' the Department's efforts to achieve an unqualified audit opinion. How exactly would Senator Hagel, if confirmed, further Secretary Panetta's efforts here?

This is not an academic question. As the Department of Defense's Deputy Inspector General for Auditing Dan Blair recently noted, for the Department to achieve an auditable statement of budgetary resources (SBR) by 2014, it must run what amounts to ''a big checking account with thousands of people being able to write checks'' and that capturing an ''auditable universe''

within it will require reconciling between a general ledger and subsidiary ledgers.

A big problem is ongoing delay in implementing very expensive business computer systems called ''enterprise resource planning'' or ERPs, which perform a number of business-related functions vital to transforming the Department's business operations. The ECSS system I mentioned a few minutes ago is one of these ERPs.

As of December 2009, the Department of Defense has invested over $5.8 billion in these ERPs and will invest billions more before they are fully implemented. Most of them are over budget and behind schedule or haven't provided promised capability. Yet these ERPs make up more than half of the Department's entire expenditure in the area of business transformation, costing the taxpayers more than $1 billion per year.

This is vitally important. If the Department doesn't get ERPs right, like a system known as ECSS that cost $1 billion dollars, not only will the Department have squandered monies that it had already sunk into these programs but it will also severely undermined its ability to improve the efficiency and the effectiveness of scores of business- missions such as logistics and supply chain management, et cetera, that are key to supporting those service-men and -women who defend the Nation.

What needs to be done? From the top down, lines of authority must be clarified. The relevant workforce must be well-versed in government accounting practices and standards and be experienced in related-information technology. Given how vitally important these ERPs are to this mission, people who have actual experience successfully implementing global business systems must be properly mixed into the workforce, and contractors hired to integrate these business systems into the Department must be the best-qualified partners and held to the same high performance standards that should apply to any other major defense acquisition.

Within this overall structure, there must be sufficient oversight and accountability vis-a-vis a well-defined and federated business enterprise architecture that ensures that, in terms of organizational transformation and systems modernization, all the different elements of the Department are moving in the same direction toward a single goal. These kinds of issues need to have the day-to-day attention of the Department's Chief Management Officer, that is, the Deputy Secretary of Defense and the chief management officers within the military departments.

At this point, I am of the view that, with all of the congressional reforms and mandates in the area of financial improvement over the past few years, the Department of Defense has all the tools it needs to have in its tool-kit to achieve audit-readiness on time and on budget. The issue is leadership and execution. As the House Panel on Financial Management and Auditability Reform noted, a vital part of that is ''ensuring that senior leaders are held accountable when audit readiness goals are not met, and conversely, rewarded when goals are achieved''. Also, defense financial improvement must no longer be regarded as an activity important only to the Department's financial community. Field commanders have to be fully engaged and interested in driving change outside the Pentagon. If Senator Hagel is confirmed, his setting this tone from the top will be vitally important.

Is all this enormously challenging? It absolutely is, as befits an organization of the size and complexity of the Department of Defense. With an annual budget equal to the 17th largest economy in the world, as the Institute for Defense Analyses recently noted, the Department's ''business'' of achieving its unique and disparate missions worldwide on an ongoing and contingency basis equates more to an economy than a commercial business.

Be that as it may, with an annual federal budget deficit of $1.3 trillion and defense reductions of at least $487 billion and possibly, with sequestration, another $500 billion over the next 10 years, the Department needs to have reliable financial management data to help it distinguish between defense budget cuts that are prudent and necessary, and those that may impinge on military readiness and, therefore, endanger our national security.

Only a Department that can be audited can give us the assurance that the Department is moving in the right direction in terms of identifying the right opportunities to save defense dollars and eliminate waste, and redirecting increasingly scarce defense dollars to higher defense priorities.

All I have discussed today illustrates how important sound leadership at the top of the Department of Defense is to ''buying smarter'' and getting the Department ready-for-audit. Without leadership fundamentally and unalterably mindful of the Department's responsibility to the American people to use defense dollars wisely, this cultural change will forever remain elusive. For this reason, this body's consideration of the President's nominee to serve as the next Secretary of Defense will be more important than it has been in recent memory.

I would like to give credit to the present Secretary of Defense, Mr. Leon Panetta, who brought his knowledge and expertise on budgetary matters to his work at the Pentagon. I will say more about him later on, but I am very appreciative of the outstanding service present Secretary of Defense Panetta has provided to this Nation, with many long years of service both in elected as well as appointed office. We are proud to have Americans such as Secretary Panetta serving our Nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am glad the Senate is now having some discussion among Members not yet on the floor about the issue of immigration because it is a very important problem that we have to deal with. I look forward to the debate that I think is coming up this year on immigration, and I would like to share my thoughts and my past experiences on this issue. I particularly want to share my personal experience from the 1980s amnesty law and what we can learn from that debate.

But before I go into that history, I wish to commend many Senators who are working together to forge a consensus and produce a product on this terribly difficult issue. I commend them for sitting down and agreeing to a set of principles that were put forth in a news conference last week. As ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, I expect to play a role in brokering an even broader consensus with additional Members.

I have read the bipartisan framework for immigration reform this group has written, and the one thing that struck me—in fact, it is the last sentence in the preamble—is this:

> We will ensure that this is a successful, permanent reform to our immigration system that will not need to be revisited.

In other words, the group understands we need a long-term solution to the problem. We need a serious fix so future generations don't have to deal with 11 million or 15 million or 30 million people who have come illegally. That sentence is the most important part of that document, and we must not lose sight of the goal expressed by the eight Senators who enunciated that.

But we need to learn from our previous mistakes so we truly don't have to revisit the problem. So let us discuss the 1986 amnesty under President Reagan. There are few of us in the Senate today who were present during that debate. In 1980, President Reagan campaigned on a promise that he would work to reform our immigration laws and legalize foreign workers in the United States. The President's policies were further shaped by the Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy that was created in 1978 under President Carter.

President Reagan signed a bill into law on November 6, 1986. So 6 years after he first ran for President, he signed a law. This law was known as the Immigration Reform and Control Act. The process to finalize the bill was long and arduous. It took years—6 years, to be exact.

In 1981, when I was a freshman Senator, I joined the Judiciary Committee and was a member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Refugee Policy. Back then, subcommittees did real work. They actually sat down and wrote legislation. We had 100 hours of hearings and 300 witnesses before we

marked up a bill in May 1982—a markup 4 years before the President ever signed it.

Senator Simpson chaired the subcommittee, and other members included Senators Thurmond, Kennedy, and DeConcini. Senator Thurmond was called to the White House and Senator DeConcini had just been hospitalized, so Senators Simpson, Kennedy, and I brought up amendments and we actually voted on them. Senator Kennedy, on that day, said:.

> Immigration reform is one of the most complicated and difficult issues; it involves human beings, it involves families, it involves loved ones, children and the separation of those individuals.

His words would still resonate today.

In 1982, I told my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee that I wanted to do the right thing for the United States, and this is what I said at that time:

> The real issue here is what is best for United States citizens. In trying to maintain that perspective, I have come to the conclusion through the course of attending many hearings on this issue, that increased border and interior enforcement along with employer sanctions and a secure worker eligibility identity system is necessary to regain control of our borders.

This is a philosophy that continues to guide me on this issue of immigration yet today. But I expressed my concerns with the legalization component at the time. I echoed the recommendations of the Select Commission on Immigration. That Commission said a legalization should, No. 1, be consistent with U.S. interests; and, 2, the program should not encourage further undocumented migration. The commission believed that a legalization program should not begin until new enforcement measures had been instituted.

The Commission knew then, as I did and as I know now, that ''without more effective enforcement, legalization could serve as a stimulus to further illegal entry.'' Those are the words of the Commission. You see, I didn't think permanent residency should be granted until we had a worker eligibility system. I offered an amendment on that point in 1982, but that amendment failed.

The Judiciary Committee and the full Senate passed a bill in 1982, but it did not pass the House of Representatives. We tried again in the next Congress. The Senate passed a bill in 1983, and the House followed in 1984. We convened a conference committee between the House and the Senate, but Walter Mondale came out opposed. So we adjourned for the elections and failed to finalize a bill that year—2 years before President Reagan finally signed a bill.

We returned in 1985 to pass our bill again. That year, Senator Simpson included a provision to trigger the amnesty program only after enforcement measures to curtail illegal immigration were in place. Doesn't that sound familiar? Congress passed a final bill in November 1986. The vote in the Senate was 63 to 24 and the House vote was 238 to 173.

Over the years, many Members have offered amendments to water down the enforcement provision in the Simpson-Mazzoli Act. That was the name of the legislation. Senator Simpson and Congressman Mazzoli were the leaders of that effort in 1986. There was a lot of opposition to employer sanctions, especially by Senator Kennedy. He wanted, in his words, ''criminal penalties to be based only upon injunctive finding of a pattern or practice.'' He tried to sunset the employer sanction. Senator Kennedy also fought hard to move the legalization cutoff date from 1980 to 1982 so more people could benefit from the amnesty.

The 1986 bill was supposed to be a three-legged stool: control of illegal immigration, the first leg; a legalization program, the second leg; and the third leg, reform of legal immigration. We authorized $422 million to carry out the requirements of the Immigration Reform Act and created a special fund for States to reimburse their costs. The 1986 bill included a legalization program for two categories of people: one for individuals who had been present in the United States since 1982; and the second for farm workers who had worked in agriculture for at least 90 days prior to enactment. A total of 2.7 million people were given amnesty.

We also had enforcement. For the first time ever, we made it illegal to knowingly hire or employ someone here illegally. We set penalties to deter the hiring of people here illegally. We wrote in the bill that ''one essential element of immigration control is an increase in the border patrol and other inspection and enforcement activities of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in order to prevent and deter the illegal entry of aliens into the United States and the violation of the terms of their entry.''

So let me again repeat one of the principles the Gang of 8 included in their framework enunciated last week: ''We will ensure that this is a successful permanent reform to our immigration system that will not need to be revisited.''

Unfortunately, the same principles from 1986 are being discussed today. Legalize now, enforce later. But it is clear that philosophy doesn't work. Proponents of amnesty today argue we didn't get it right in 1986. I agree the enforcement mechanism in 1986 could have been stronger. That is why they need to be strong this time around. But I am already concerned some will attempt to water down the principles that have been put forth on enforcement measures. President Obama doesn't seem to favor triggers.

The senior Senator from New York said just last week that border security wasn't going to stop legalization. In his words, he said:

> We're not using border security as an excuse or block to the path of citizenship.

Advocacy groups are already talking about ensuring that a border security commission doesn't stand in the way or have veto authority over a legalization program.

One theme from 1986 is shining through today. Some say we need to legalize the millions of people who are already on U.S. soil. They say we need to bring them out of the shadows, know who is here, and give them a chance at U.S. citizenship. They imply that this would be a one-time deal because we would get it right this time—like we thought we got it right in 1986 but didn't.

In the 1980s Senator Simpson was convinced that what we did then would be a permanent solution to our immigration problems. He stated:

> We are attempting to assure that this is a one-time only program. . . . The purpose of legalization is not to award or reward or include the largest number of persons available. It is to bring forward into a legal status those most deeply entrenched in a society they would be least likely to return home to when the job opportunities no longer are available.

Senator Simpson said that a one-time amnesty would prevent us from a continuing series of amnesties. He said:

> The major reason for legalization is to eliminate an illegal sub-class within our society. This is the legislation that will eliminate this exploitable group. Some people like to say that they hope it will clean the slate; that is what we are trying to do is clean the slate.

Well, those are good intentions by Senator Simpson, but, as I said, they obviously haven't worked. And it is an admonition to those who want to do it right, once and for all, to learn from the mistakes of 1986.

Senator Simpson also said:

> The American people, in my mind, will never accept a legalization program unless they can be assured this is a one-shot deal and that this is it, this is a one-time occurrence. And the policymakers in this country are not going to allow it to happen again and will prevent the situation which gave rise to it.

Well, as smart as Senator Simpson is—and he is a smart person. I like to see him on television, particularly when he is talking about why the President didn't back the Simpson-Bowles Commission on budget reform and fiscal reform. But here is a person who worked 6 years to get it right so we would never have to visit it again, when we had 3 million people who had come here, illegally violating our laws—get it fixed once and for all and thought he did. But I think now he would admit—and I have to admit because I was on the subcommittee—we didn't get it right. I voted for that.

So now, as I am looking at a group of eight trying to say in the preamble of their working paper: We are going to fix this once and for all, well, you better check that it is not very easy to do that, and you better do it better than we did.

The INS Commissioner at the time in 1986, Alan Nelson, told the committee that the legalization program was ''realistic and humane'' and said further that ''it is clear that this is meant to

be a one-time proposal, and not intended to recur.''

In 1986, the committee report said:

. . . the solution lies in legalizing the status of aliens who have been present in the United States for several years, recognizing that past failures to enforce the immigration laws have allowed them to enter and to settle here.

Also, according to the report, the committee '' . . . strongly believes that a one-time legalization program is a necessary part of an effective enforcement program and that a generous program is an essential part of any immigration reform legislation.''

In 1986 the Congress passed the Immigration Reform and Control Act. At the time, President Reagan hailed it as the most comprehensive reform of our immigration laws since 1952. He stated that the legislation was a major step toward meeting the challenge to our sovereignty while at the same time preserving and enhancing the Nation's heritage of legal immigration—a heritage of which we all ought to be proud.

What Congress, the public, and the President did not envision or did not want was another amnesty debate. The American people were told in 1986 that this would be a one-time shot. The incentive to buy in to the argument was the promise of enforcement.

In 1985 Senator Simpson said:

If legalization should occur before more effective enforcement is available, the illegal population is only going to grow very swiftly again, and that will create pressures for additional legalization. And it will not be a one-time only legalization; it will be a continuing series.

Many believed that employer sanctions were the only way to curtail illegal immigration. One committee report stated that ''unless employer sanctions are enacted, the Committee is concerned that the situation will continue to worsen.''

In 1985 Senator Metzenbaum of Ohio said:

When push comes to shove, there is only one realistic way that you can stop illegal immigration into this country, and that is by making it illegal and being tough enough that illegal immigrants cannot work in this country.

Knowing what we know now, an immigration reform bill must include tough enforcement measures. We must stop flow at the border. We must expand and enhance legal avenues so that people are not coming here illegally. We must have a strong employment verification program.

Unfortunately, we aren't enforcing the laws we have on the books today. The American people don't trust that we will enforce these laws in the future. We provided amnesty overnight in 1986 and didn't fulfill the other parts of the equation. Border security, enforcement measures, and legal immigration reform need to be the first things on our agenda in 2013.

I chose to talk about this topic today because I believe we can learn from the past. We can learn from our mistakes. This isn't just about our history, it is about our future. Today, people in foreign lands want to be a part of this great Nation. We should feel privileged that people love our country and want to become Americans.

We must make sure the decisions we make with regard to our immigration policies follow our longstanding ideals. We want to welcome new Americans, but we need to live by the rules we have set. We cannot let our welcome mat be trampled on or our system of laws be undermined.

Let me end by echoing the words of President Reagan:

Distance does not discourage illegal immigration to the United States from all around the globe. The problem of illegal immigration should not, therefore, be seen as a problem between the United States and its neighbors. Our objective is only to establish a reasonable, fair, orderly, and secure system of immigration into this country and not to discriminate in any way against particular nations or people. Future generations of Americans will be thankful for our efforts to humanely regain control of our borders and thereby preserve the value of one of the most sacred possessions of our people: American citizenship.

My hope is that we will preserve the value of American citizenship, as President Reagan said. The path we take today will shape our country for years to come. It is my hope that we can find a solution while learning from our mistakes and ensuring that future generations don't have to revisit this problem down the road.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to be here today to highlight my support for a program that is improving life in Idaho and across the Nation—the Violence Against Women Act.

I appreciate joining my colleague Senator LEAHY, who will be here on the floor in a few minutes, to formally open debate on this legislation, and hopefully we will be able to get this over the finish line this year, as it is so critical to so many people in this country.

For nearly two decades, the Violence Against Women Act has been the centerpiece of our Nation's commitment to ending domestic violence and dating and sexual violence. The Idaho Coalition Against Sexual and Domestic Violence uses vital funds, among many other things, to promote the awareness of healthy relationships in middle and high schools in Idaho. It is heartening to hear that the number of Idaho high school students reporting that they have experienced dating violence has dropped by 5 percent from 2007 to 2011. However, I am sad to report that since just January 1 of this year, four deaths have occurred in my State from the result of domestic violence. And even one is too many. These tragic events serve as a reminder that while we are improving, we are far from ending this terrible abuse.

I am a lifelong champion of the prevention of domestic violence because I believe that while we are improving, we can and will do better. I stand behind this act as it provides critical services to victims of violent crime as well as agencies and organizations that provide important aid to those who are often victims in their own homes. This legislation provides access to legal and social services for survivors. It provides training for law enforcement, prosecutors, judges, attorneys, and advocates to address these crimes in our Nation's communities. It provides intervention for those who have witnessed abuse and are more likely to be involved in this type of violence. It provides shelter and resources for victims who have nowhere else to turn.

There is significant evidence that these programs are working not just in Idaho but nationwide. The U.S. Department of Justice reported that the number of women killed by an intimate partner decreased by 35 percent between 1993 and 2008. In 2012 it was reported that in 1 day alone, 688 women and their children impacted by violence sought safety in an emergency shelter or received counseling, legal advocacy, or children's support.

While we may not agree on all of the specifics of this reauthorization—and there are portions we will continue to negotiate on and to refine—we all do agree on one very important idea; that is, violence should not happen to anyone. This critical legislation is very effective in helping to address that abuse in our society.

As I said, there are parts of this legislation about which there are still concerns. I am committed, as is Senator LEAHY, to working with those who have concerns to make the bill better and more workable so we can move it through to become law in this session of Congress. But after we debate and after we have worked and refined the legislation, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the authorization of this program and to continue the life-changing work this Chamber has been committed to for so many years.

I see my colleague Senator LEAHY is on the Senate floor. I started a little before he got here. I know he is here to open the debate on this legislation. I again thank him for his work on this issue and look forward to working with him in this Congress as we move forward.

Mr. LEAHY. I have enjoyed working with the senior Senator from Idaho. If he wants more time—

Mr. CRAPO. I have concluded my remarks. I yield my time.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 47, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to (S. 47) a bill to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 5:30 p.m. will be equally divided and controlled in the usual form.

The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from Idaho for his comments. He has been not only a stalwart supporter, he actually has been essential in the drafting of this legislation. We all share this concern of finding ways to stop violence against women. I realize different parts of the country have different problems, different stresses. I am pleased to have a western view to go with this eastern view. But also, I think, it is a case of the best legislation in this body, legislation supported by both Democrats and Republicans. When we come together as Senators, things get done.

That is one of the reasons we are turning to this bill, S. 47, the Leahy-Crapo Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act, as one of our first bills. It has bipartisan support. I thank Majority Leader REID for making this unfinished business a priority for the Senate.

Congressional enactment of our strong bipartisan bill to help all victims of domestic and sexual violence is long overdue. Our bill has more than 60 bipartisan Senate cosponsors. I think this week we can finally finish what we started last year by passing the bill in the Senate, sending it to the other body, and having them take it up. I know I am deeply indebted—we all are—to the women and men around the country who have been working with us. They have been steadfast in their commitment to the victims and to our efforts to combat domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, and sexual assault.

There is a pressing need to update the Violence Against Women Act. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's 2010 National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey found that one in four women has been the victim of severe physical domestic violence. One in five women has been raped in her lifetime. More than half of the homicides in my State of Vermont are related to domestic violence.

Let me emphasize that just a bit. Vermont has one of the lowest crime rates in the country. But when I look at the source of the crime, more than half of the homicides are related to domestic violence. Those percentages are very high in almost every State. That is simply unacceptable. While the Judiciary Committee has been preparing to consider legislation on the subject of gun violence at the end of this month, we can act now, without delay, in the Senate to strengthen the protections of the Violence Against Women Act.

All of the provisions in our bill passed the Senate last year. In fact, 9 months ago the Senate passed the Leahy-Crapo Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act with 68 votes. The Senate often has a hard time coming together with 51 votes, but here we had 68 votes from Members of both parties, across the political spectrum.

Last December we worked out with Senator CORNYN and Senator GRASSLEY additional provisions to amend the Debbie Smith Act, which we passed, to reduce the backlog of untested rape kits in order to provide for additional audits and reporting, and increase the capacity of State and local law enforcement to perform DNA analysis. Those provisions are now incorporated into this VAWA bill.

I hope those few Senators who opposed the bill last year will now join with us to enact VAWA reauthorization. I think we should act quickly and decisively to pass this bill, and send it to the House. I know if it reaches the President's desk, from what he has told me, he will sign it without delay.

Our bill will support the use of techniques proven to identify high-risk cases and prevent domestic violence homicides. It is going to increase VAWA'S focus on sexual assault and push colleges to strengthen their efforts to protect students from domestic and sexual violence. It will allow us to make real progress in addressing the horrifying epidemic of domestic violence in tribal communities. A recent study found almost three in five native women had been assaulted by their spouses or intimate partners.

Our bill will allow services to get to those in the LGBT community who have had trouble accessing services in the past. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention released a few weeks ago that found the rates of domestic and sexual violence in these communities are equal to or greater than those of the general population. We also have key improvements for immigrant victims of domestic and sexual violence.

I did note when we reintroduced this bill at the outset of this year that we will be pressing the increase of U Visas for those victims who assist law enforcement in the context of comprehensive immigration reform. Last year, the House of Representatives refused to consider the Senate-passed bill because the U Visa provision, while fully offset, was seen technically to affect revenues. We removed it from the bill this year. I don't want this bill to be slowed up because of a technical excuse.

When somebody is being abused, they don't need to hear about technicalities. They want us to stop it, and they want us to expedite action on this bill. I remain strongly committed to the U Visa increase. As I said, I will try to include it in the immigration legislation we will be considering in the next couple of months. The reason I will do that, of course, is it will benefit law enforcement and victims, and we should enact it.

I have said so many times on the floor of the Senate that I remember my days as a prosecutor in Vermont—let me state it this way: I remember going to crime scenes at 2 and 3 o'clock in the morning. I remember seeing people being taken out in an ambulance, barely alive, battered to within an inch of their life. But I especially remember those who did not even get that far, lying on the floor, up against a wall, waiting for the medical examiner to come and pronounce the person dead and allow the police to collect evidence and move them.

During that time no police officer ever said: Is this victim gay or straight? Is this victim an immigrant or Native American? They said, as I have said so many times on the floor: A victim is a victim is a victim. How do we stop this from happening to somebody else? How do we catch the person who did this?

Law enforcement wants tools for after the fact. But even more, they want what we have in here: something to stop the abuse from happening in the first place. Every day we do not pass legislation to prevent this violence and assist victims, people are suffering.

I hope all Senators—Democrats, Republicans, Independents—will join us. I have spoken of Senator CRAPO's longstanding commitment to victims. But, also, I have spoken often of the support of Senators MIKULSKI and MURKOWSKI and MURRAY and KLOBUCHAR and COONS and COLLINS and SHAHEEN and FRANKEN and HAGAN and CASEY and so many others who have joined to help to shape this legislation and work to pass it. I also appreciate the support and assistance of the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence Against Women and its many member organizations whose insight has been so critical.

I thank the Vermont Network Against Domestic and Sexual Violence. I am so proud of them. They have done great work helping victims in Vermont with support from the VAWA programs. They have been a leader in developing and supporting this legislation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my statement a letter organized

by the National Task Force and signed by more than 1,300 local, tribal, and national organizations supporting this important bill.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. LEAHY. Since we first passed the Violence Against Women Act nearly two decades ago, States have strengthened criminal rape statutes, and every State has made stalking a crime. The annual incidence of domestic violence has dropped more than 50 percent. We have something here that has been a success. We have helped to provide victims with critical services, such as housing and legal protection.

We have to remember, these are not just statistics. These are thousands of lives made immeasurably better. I might say because of this work these thousands of lives are still lives; they are not statistics of people murdered. All the provisions in our bill were developed with the help of victims and those who assist them every day. They are commonsense measures. They will help real people. Every prosecutor, every support group—all will tell you it is past time for Congress to enact this bill to provide help for victims of domestic violence and rape.

We can make these concrete, important changes in the law. We can do it this week. I have been involved in this for years, and I have seen the results of what we have done. I have seen the lives that have been made immeasurably better because of what we have done. I have seen the lives that have been saved because of what we have done. There is no excuse to delay further.

EXHIBIT 1

NATIONAL TASK FORCE TO END SEXUAL AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN,

February 4, 2013.

Senator,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: We, the undersigned local, tribal, and national organizations, represent and support millions of victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking throughout the United States, American Indian Tribes and territories. On behalf of the victims we represent, the professionals who serve them and the communities that sustain them, we ask that you support the Violence Against Women Act's (VAWA) reauthorization by co-sponsoring and voting for S. 47. As you know, VAWA is slated to come to the Senate floor as early as next week and we are asking you to take a leadership role in ensuring that this landmark bi-partisan bill will continue its important work.

VAWA's programs support state, tribal and local efforts to address the pervasive and insidious crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking. These programs have made great progress towards reducing the violence, helping victims to be healthy and feel safe and holding perpetrators accountable. This critical legislation must be reauthorized to ensure a continued response to these crimes.

Since its original passage in 1994, VAWA has dramatically enhanced our nation's response to violence against girls and women, boys and men. More victims report domestic violence to the police and the rate of non-fatal intimate partner violence against women has decreased by 64%. The sexual assault services program in VAWA helps rape crisis centers keep their doors open to provide the frontline response to victims of rape. VAWA provides for a coordinated community approach, improving collaboration between law enforcement and victim services providers to better meet the needs of victims. These comprehensive and cost-effective programs not only save lives, they also save money. In fact, VAWA saved nearly $12.6 billion in net averted social costs in just its first six years.

VAWA has unquestionably improved the national response to these terrible crimes. Nonetheless, much work remains to be done to address unmet needs and enhance access to protections and services for all victims. We urge you to sponsor and vote for S. 47 in order to build upon VAWA's successes and continue to enhance our nation's ability to promote an end to this violence, to hold perpetrators accountable and to keep victims and their families safe from future harm. Thank you.

Sincerely,

* * *

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues, as I will do, to support the motion to proceed to the Violence Against Women Act. I expect that many of my Republican colleagues will also vote to proceed to the bill.

There has long been bipartisan support for the Violence Against Women Act. Too many women are victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and dating violence. Federal support for services to these women, and sometimes even men, has been beneficial to our country.

There is overwhelming bipartisan support for 98 percent of what is contained in S. 47, so I favor proceeding to the bill and offering limited amendments. We can then have a Senate vote, allow the other body to work its will, resolve any differences between the bills, pass a compromised reauthorization bill through both Houses, and get it to the President.

The process on the Violence Against Women Act in the last Congress was very disappointing. Previously the Violence Against Women Act was reauthorized unanimously. Something similar could have happened again last year, but it didn't. New provisions were brought forth into the bill. Some of the provisions were very controversial. Some provisions even raised serious constitutional concerns, but those on the other side insisted on these provisions without any change and refused to compromise. It appeared that the debate was more about blame and politics than it was about providing help to women in need.

In the last Congress, both the Republican leader and this Senator offered that the Senate consent to striking a provision which violated the Constitution's origination clause, and then proceed to conference. The majority spurned those efforts on both occasions. Yet today S. 47 has removed the very provision which raised the blue-slip problem with the House of Representatives because, as we all know, under the Constitution all bills raising revenue must start in the House of Representatives. The majority did this only a few months after the majority refused to drop that very same provision and proceed to conference. So this bill could have been to the President last year. The willingness of the majority today to eliminate that very unconstitutional provision demonstrates that we could have had a bill to the President last year. That ought to be a terrible disappointment not only to this Senator but to all the people in the Senate.

It is not true that unless S. 47 is passed exactly as is various groups will be excluded from protections under the law. Would anyone care to know why? Because the current law protects all victims.

Vice President BIDEN wrote the current law. Every Member of the Senate who was a Member of this body when the Violence Against Women Act was last reauthorized voted for that bill. Neither Vice President BIDEN nor any other Senator passed a discriminatory bill then. It is not the case that unless the controversial provisions are accepted exactly as the majority insists without any compromise whatsoever that any groups will be excluded.

The key stumbling block to enacting a bill at this time is the provision concerning Indian tribal courts. That provision raises serious constitutional questions concerning both the sovereignty of tribal courts and the constitutional rights of defendants who would be tried in those courts. We should focus on providing needed services to Native American women. S. 47 makes political statements and expounds on Native American sovereignty. It raises such significant constitutional problems that its passage might actually not accomplish anything at all for Native American women while failing to protect the constitutional rights of other American citizens.

Even the Congressional Research Service has raised constitutional questions with the tribal provisions in this very bill. Negotiations are continuing, and I am quite confident that if we can reach an agreement on these questions, compromises on the other few remaining issues can also be secured and would allow the bill to pass with overwhelming bipartisan support. If we are unable to reach agreement in the next couple of days, then I intend to offer a substitute that is much more likely to be accepted by the House and become law.

In the meantime, for this very day, all we are talking about is getting to this bill so we can discuss these issues. I will vote for the motion to proceed, and I ask my colleagues to do so as well.

I yield the floor, and 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. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second. There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

DEMOCRATIC ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) is necessarily absent.

REPUBLICAN ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELLY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 85, nays 8, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 12 Leg.]

YEAS—85

Alexander	Fischer	Menendez
Ayotte	Flake	Merkley
Baldwin	Franken	Mikulski
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Murkowski
Baucus	Graham	Murphy
Bennet	Grassley	Murray
Blumenthal	Hagan	Nelson
Blunt	Harkin	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Pryor
Boxer	Heinrich	Reed
Brown	Heitkamp	Reid
Burr	Heller	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Hirono	Sanders
Cardin	Hoeven	Schatz
Carper	Inhofe	Schumer
Casey	Johnson (SD)	Shaheen
Chambliss	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Coats	Kaine	Stabenow
Coburn	King	Tester
Cochran	Kirk	Thune
Collins	Klobuchar	Udall (CO)
Coons	Landrieu	Udall (NM)
Corker	Lautenberg	Warner
Cornyn	Leahy	Warren
Crapo	Levin	Whitehouse
Donnelly	Manchin	Wicker
Durbin	McCain	Wyden
Enzi	McCaskill	
Feinstein	McConnell	

NAYS—8

Cruz	Paul	Rubio
Johanns	Risch	Scott
Lee	Roberts	

NOT VOTING—6

Begich	Moran	Toomey
Isakson	Sessions	Vitter

The motion was agreed to.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2013

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 47) to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

CONGRATULATING NEW ORLEANS

Ms. LANDRIEU. I know Senator HARKIN is on the floor with others to present several new pieces of legislation or to speak on items pending. I wanted to take a moment of personal privilege to say just a few words about the spectacular sporting event that took place in our country yesterday in the city of New Orleans. I want to, of course, congratulate the Baltimore Ravens, the Senators from Maryland, particularly Senator MIKULSKI and Senator CARDIN, and Governor O'Malley, who was there, of course, representing Maryland; the Senators from San Francisco and California, the 49ers, Senators FEINSTEIN and BOXER, former Speaker PELOSI was with us yesterday in New Orleans, and thousands of fans from all over the world and, of course, watching on television.

I wanted to make a note on this floor, not because it was just a sporting event, although it was one of the highest watched Super Bowls ever in the history of the game, but because of the role this Congress played and the administration in helping this great city and region and State rebound from what was a devastating body blow 7½ years ago with Hurricane Katrina and then Rita hit 3 weeks later and then the levees broke in over 52 places. The city went virtually underwater—at least two-thirds of the city.

To see, 7½ years later, the city rebound, the people of New Orleans and Louisiana are just foremost in my thoughts right now for their fighting spirit, their resiliency, their unwillingness to give up on this special place that will celebrate its 300th birthday in 2018. I want to say a special thank-you to Mayor Landrieu, John Young, president of Jefferson Parish, the leaders of St. Bernard and Plaquemines Parish. Those parishes were virtually destroyed, the lower part of Jefferson Parish. The whole region has come back. The world could see it for themselves yesterday—the civic leadership, the faith-based leadership. Again, a shout out to President Obama, his Cabinet and the Members on both sides of the aisle who stood by this region, the gulf coast, to rebuild after all these years.

In conclusion, it is my only hope that after passing the Sandy supplemental, we will stand united with the Northeast as they rebuild bigger, better, stronger, hosting the next Super Bowl which is a real symbol of resurgence and rebuilding and resurrection.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF FMLA

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, this week is a milestone for working families across America. Twenty years ago this week, President Bill Clinton signed into law the Family and Medical Leave Act. There are many laws we pass in Washington that most Americans never have reason to know or care about. The FMLA, by contrast, has changed this country in profoundly important ways.

It has touched the lives of millions of working families. It is almost hard to imagine today, but 20 years ago before this landmark law, workers had to risk their jobs and livelihoods when family needs arose. There was no national policy for maternity leave or paternity leave. New mothers were sometimes compelled to return to work just days after giving birth or to quit jobs they would otherwise have liked to keep.

There was no law allowing someone to take leave from work to care for an aging, potentially dying parent or to care for a child with a serious illness. Families had to leave their loved ones in the hands of others or quit their jobs and face dire economic consequences. There was no policy to allow a seriously ill worker to return to work after recovering from cancer or other serious health condition. All these workers risked being fired, having no job to return to, and losing their health insurance as well.

Countless hard-working Americans were forced to make wrenching choices between their or their family's health and their economic well-being.

The passage of the Family and Medical Leave Act changed all that. It has helped new parents bond with their children during those first magical few weeks of life. It has helped to give workers struggling with a difficult diagnosis the time and security they need to recover. It has allowed loving family members to care for relatives with disabilities and elderly parents.

It has ensured that family members of our wounded warriors can be there to help their heroes recover. Just as important, it has helped countless businesses across the country retain good workers and maintain an experienced and dedicated workforce.

The FMLA has been an unqualified success. It has made a real difference in the lives of millions of hard-working Americans. In fact, the FMLA has been

used more than 100 million times since its passage 20 years ago.

To be sure, the legislative path to the Family and Medical Leave Act was not easy nor quick. In the Senate, Senator Chris Dodd was the tireless champion of the Family and Medical Leave Act. From the time of its first introduction in 1986 to its final passage in 1993, we would not have the Family and Medical Leave Act without Senator Chris Dodd. He held multiple subcommittee hearings across the country, hearing from dozens of witnesses. He led the bill through multiple committee markups and led the floor fight year after year after year. He worked to override two Presidential vetoes and shepherded it to its final passage in 1993, after which it became the first law signed by a new President, President Bill Clinton.

Senator Dodd found a partner in Senator Kit Bond from Missouri, whose strong interest in shoring up the American family led him to work with Senator Dodd on a bipartisan compromise proposal that would garner significant political support in both political parties. As Senator Bond said upon introducing the final version of the bill in 1993:

> I believe the single most important step we can take to help all families in America is to try to reinstill individual and family responsibility. To do that, we as a society need to make family obligation something we encourage rather than discourage. That is why I believe we should enact the Family and Medical Leave Act.

Their bipartisan efforts have reaped huge rewards.

My office has heard from people around the country who have benefited from the Family and Medical Leave Act.

The Family and Medical Leave Act meant that Kimberly Jones of Wisconsin was able to help her developmentally challenged son, David, during a critical time. After years of struggling socially and in school, after a misdiagnosis that led to medications that made him worse, David finally received the correct diagnosis of Asperger's syndrome, which allowed him to get the right care and the appropriate treatment. The FMLA allowed Kim to take 12 weeks off from work so she could be with her son, David, to advocate for him, seek out professionals, learn how to help him, and support him through detoxification from his previous medications.

Thanks to the FMLA, Kim was able to get David situated and take the time to do what was best for him. Kim says parents shouldn't have to lose their jobs to do what is best for their children. She adds that children and families are in a better place because of the Family and Medical Leave Act.

Tonya Pinkston from Atlanta, GA, was diagnosed with lupus in 2009, but she was allowed only 3 sick days a year. As the sole earner in her household with her parents and daughter, she absolutely had to keep her job. Her boss suggested the Family and Medical Leave Act. Later, when her lupus flared, she was able to take leave for 4 weeks to allow her 1 week in the hospital and recuperation at home.

Without the Family and Medical Leave Act, Tonya would have been fired for missing so much time and she probably would have had to go on unemployment insurance. Tonya thanks God for the FMLA and feels fortunate that President Bill Clinton signed it and it was there when she needed it.

Right now at a Baltimore hospital, Michelle Marrocco is using FMLA leave to care for her son, Brendan, a wounded warrior injured while serving in the Army in Iraq in 2009. Brendan is the first surviving quadruple amputee and has already faced challenges few of us can imagine. In December, he underwent a double-arm transplant. It has been widely reported in the news media. Brendan will need years of rehabilitation and occupational therapy.

When Brendan was originally injured, Michelle's employer at the time voluntarily paid for 3 months of leave. Michelle's current employer adheres to the FMLA, allowing her up to 12 weeks of unpaid leave to care for Brendan following his transplants.

She expects to take 2 months of leave, followed by intermittent leave to be with her son once a week. Without the FMLA, Michelle would have had to quit her job. With the FMLA, she knows she doesn't have to worry about her job, which is a huge relief for her. The lack of income is a big concern, but it is something she and her husband will worry about later. Thanks to new regulations from the Department of Labor, Michelle will be able to take advantage of a new provision of the Family and Medical Leave Act, allowing up to 26 weeks of leave for the families of veterans injured in the line of duty.

The Family and Medical Leave Act is one of our Nation's most important laws. That is why I will introduce this week a resolution honoring the FMLA and the leaders who made the FMLA a reality.

There are so many. I mentioned those who were here in the Senate; there were those in the House who also helped shepherd this through. I would mention, of course, Connie Morella, a former Congresswoman who was so active in the bill.

I would mention also GEORGE MILLER, Congressman GEORGE MILLER, and Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO, who worked so hard to get this passed in the House. There were people on the outside, Judy Lichtman, in 1993, was the head of something called the Women's Legal Defense Fund. She and her colleague Donna Lenhoff played absolutely critical roles in getting the FMLA written, introduced, and across the finish line. I wanted to mention those heroes who worked so hard for this important bill.

There is still more work to do to ensure that families are fully able to meet their family responsibilities as well as maintain economic security.

Today, workers are ineligible to take FMLA for a variety of reasons. Some workers do not have enough tenure with their current employer, even if they have been in the workforce for years.

The FMLA requires 1 year of service, but in today's economy, workers more frequently change jobs and, of course, family emergencies happen without warning. Other workers are not able to accumulate the required 1,250 hours of work with a single employer in the preceding year. With the growth in part-time work, both by choice and by necessity, more workers may be ineligible for FMLA even though they are long-term dedicated employees. Millions of people work in businesses with fewer than 50 employees, which means their employer is not covered by the FMLA and does not have to offer that kind of leave.

This also makes it harder for smaller businesses to recruit the best employees because they are not on a level playing field with larger companies that must provide leave and where workers have come to expect it.

Still other workers are excluded from the law because of the nature of their relationship with a loved one. Workers may only take FMLA to care for their minor child, parents or spouses. Under certain circumstances, parents may care for their adult child with a disability. This excludes siblings, grandchildren and grandparents, domestic partners of the same or opposite sex, in-laws, cousins, and everyone else.

That is why the Family and Medical Leave Inclusion Act sponsored by Senator DURBIN is so important. This bill will expand and modernize the definition of family to include many currently excluded relationships. Too many workers will otherwise have no one eligible to care for them in a time of need or the person they rely on most will not be recognized as their family for purposes of the FMLA. This is a commonsense change we can and must accomplish.

One of the most common and critical challenges faced by families is the loss of income while taking unpaid FMLA leave. This obliges parents to cut short maternity and paternity leave. It forces cancer patients to work as much as possible, rather than taking time to fully recuperate or, worse, to forgo leave altogether. Still others are financially devastated when they have no choice but to take unpaid leave.

We cannot allow family responsibilities to jeopardize families' economic security. A social insurance program to provide some wage replacement during family and medical leave would allow families to maintain their economic security while seeing to their families. Research shows this could be done on a universal basis with very small, shared contributions by workers and their employers. Two States, New Jersey and California, have already implemented such paid leave systems, helping families in those States to be financially secure during family and medical leave.

Today is the day to honor the efforts of so many whose work led to the passage and signing of the Family and Medical Leave Act 20 years ago. This is a time to reflect on how transformative the Family and Medical Leave Act has been for our society. It is also time to look ahead to additional ways we can support families and allow them to stay strong, mutually supportive, and economically secure.

I look forward to future work to expand and strengthen the protections of the Family and Medical Leave Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I wish to thank my colleague Senator HARKIN for his leadership on the Family and Medical Leave Act, along with my predecessor Chris Dodd's very strong dedication to this cause and the historic difference he and Senator HARKIN have made on a truly transformative measure for the United States of America. The Family and Medical Leave Act has made a difference in so many lives and shaped so many futures for the better in our Nation. I will be honored to join his resolution and to support Senator DURBIN's Family and Medical Leave Inclusion Act and simply offer my thanks to him on behalf of Connecticut as well as the country for his leadership on this issue.

This measure is about human beings and the values that define us and make us great as a nation, the greatest Nation in the history of the world.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, the measure we have approved today to move forward, the Violence Against Women Act, so far as it defines us, states our values and articulates the vision we see of our Nation as caring for people who are victims of domestic abuse and sexual assault. I am proud of my colleagues for approving this measure today to go forward by an overwhelming bipartisan vote, 85 to 8.

I hope this day will be followed by final passage here and then in the House of Representatives, avoiding the fate that befell it during the last session, when I similarly supported this measure to reauthorize and strengthen a bill that has served us well for 18 years. It served us well in addressing a problem that is as horrific and heinous as any that afflicts our society, domestic violence and sexual assault, shapes futures and transforms lives for the worse, unless they are followed by the service and law enforcement that VAWA provides. VAWA is about the organizations that provide those services and need the support in Connecticut and around the country, organizations in Connecticut that provide services to 54,000 victims of domestic violence and sexual assault every year. In our State alone, $4 million provides those critical services to men and women and children so they can survive and even thrive after domestic assault. We have made great strides on this problem, but there is great work still to be done. We cannot be complacent or overconfident. We cannot be self-satisfied. We must press ahead with VAWA, and that is why today's passage is so important—at least the passage of the motion to proceed.

Groups and organizations in Connecticut and across the nation report to me about critical staff shortages, resources they need to respond to the hundreds of thousands of women every year who face these problems, and the protection they provide to children as well as women who are victims of this crime.

I have been very privileged to join with Interval House in an effort called Men Against Domestic Violence. Men make a difference. They are potential role models, and we have tried to provide those role models to go into schools and provide education—a group of men who are educators, police, and other kinds of leaders in their communities, in business. We helped to start this effort through Interval House, our major domestic shelter in the State. This is only a small example of how these efforts can have a ripple effect through VAWA.

We need to not only renew our commitment to end domestic violence but also to update and strengthen and expand the Violence Against Women Act. I am pleased to join my colleague Senator PORTMAN in offering an amendment that strengthens services for children and youth victims of sex trafficking. Yes, sex trafficking and human trafficking continue to exist in this Nation. It is sometimes invisible, unknown, one of the most heinous crimes imaginable—modern-day slavery, unspeakable indenture of children. We need to do more to ensure that children in our communities who are victims of sex trafficking have access to the life-saving services that are available to other youth victims of domestic violence or sexual assault.

We can make sure agencies and organizations that provide these services access grant funding available for this purpose. Again, this goal ought to be bipartisan, and it is with Senator PORTMAN and myself on this amendment. I hope my colleagues will support it.

Vulnerable communities ought to receive the same kind of protection through VAWA even though they are now overlooked by existing law, and those protections should be expanded. We have an obligation to ensure that all victims of domestic violence, regardless of their sexual orientation or gender identification, are covered by this law. So this legislation contains protection for gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender Americans. The LGBT community ought to know it is covered in the same way as every other part of our population, even though they face discrimination that prevents them from accessing those victim services now.

In fact, a recent survey found that 45 percent of LGBT victims were turned away when they sought help from a violence center. That is simply unacceptable. So this legislation will make sure they have access to these services and also make great improvements in the law enforcement tools available to Native American communities.

Our Nation's tribal communities are literally facing an epidemic of domestic violence and sexual assault. Nearly three out of five Native American women are assaulted by their spouses or intimate partners, and one-third of all Native American women will be raped during their lifetime. I know those statistics are hard to grasp. They seem incredible. Three out of five Native American women are assaulted by their spouses or intimate partners. One-third of all Native American women will be raped during their lifetime.

I wish they were wrong. I would be happy to be corrected. But those numbers tell a searing and unacceptable truth about our Nation. Tribal courts currently cannot prosecute domestic violence crimes against Native American women that are committed on tribal lands by a non-Native American. S. 47 closes that loophole so that all Native American women will have access to justice.

Finally, the 2000 reauthorization of VAWA contained landmark provisions to protect immigrant victims of domestic violence, and S. 47 significantly maintains and expands those provisions, sending a strong message that immigrant women deserve the full protection of the law, the full measure of American justice. It is the reason they have come to this country, the reason that millions of immigrants come to this country, the reason we are a nation of immigrants and strong because of the diversity and the talent they bring to this Nation. We must guarantee justice to immigrant women.

I am still frustrated and disappointed the last Congress did not approve VAWA; that this measure was stalled in the House of Representatives despite a similarly bipartisan vote in this body to approve it. I hope this year the vote in this body will be a prelude to bipartisan approaches on this measure and others where basic human values are at stake; that there will be no stalling again; that this measure will proceed in the House on a similarly bipartisan basis.

An inclusive bipartisan VAWA should not be postponed. Time is not on the side of victims. They need these services. Law enforcement needs the support to make sure anyone committing domestic violence or sexual assault in this country is held responsible and accountable, and that we send that message to women and children throughout this country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

TOBACCO CONTROL ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND TOBACCO TAX PARITY ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, last week I was joined by Senators LAUTENBERG and BLUMENTHAL to introduce the Tobacco Tax Parity Act, a bill aimed at closing loopholes in how tobacco products are taxed and reducing the incidence of tobacco use.

It wasn't that long ago when it was common to smoke in offices, airplanes, elevators or even here in congressional hearings. We have made progress since the landmark 1964 Surgeon General's Report showing the negative effects of smoking on health, but there are plenty of signs that the fight continues to protect future generations from suffering the terrible effects of tobacco.

According to a Surgeon General's Report issued in March 2012, tobacco use among youth is a ''pediatric epidemic'' and is the No. 1 cause of preventable and premature death in this country. Every year, tobacco products account for 443,000—or 1 out of 5—deaths. The report also found that every day, 1,000 young people become new regular smokers and, of these new smokers, one-third will eventually die from tobacco-related causes.

While our Nation pays the physical and financial burden of tobacco use through $96 billion in annual medical costs and $97 billion in lost productivity due to premature death, tobacco companies invent new ways to generate profits and entice young people to pick up this deadly habit.

In 2009, the Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act increased the Federal tax rate on cigarettes and set the tax rate for small cigars and roll-your-own cigarettes at the same level as cigarettes. Cigars, smokeless tobacco, pipe tobacco, and nicotine candies, however, remain at dramatically lower tax rates than cigarettes making them a cheap source of tobacco, particularly among young people. While cigarettes, roll-your-own, and little cigars are taxed about $1 for a pack of 20 cigarettes, pipe tobacco is only taxed 11 cents for what adds up to 20 cigarettes, a pouch of chewing tobacco is only taxed 9 cents, and a 12-pack can of nicotine tablets or lozenges is taxed less than 1 cent. Not surprisingly, as the tax for cigarettes has increased, cigarette sales dropped and the sales of undertaxed tobacco products went up.

This difference in tax rates doesn't make sense, and we are already seeing tobacco manufacturers abusing them by changing the labels on their products to avoid paying the higher tax. For instance, to avoid paying the higher tax on loose roll-your-own tobacco, some manufacturers simply change the label on that product to pipe tobacco. There are stores popping up across the country, including in Illinois, that allow people to buy undertaxed pipe tobacco or cigarette tobacco intentionally mislabeled as pipe tobacco and rent time on a cigarette making machine where customers can make 200 cigarettes in 8 minutes and not pay the $10 Federal cigarette tax.

A report released by the Government Accountability Office last year found that the difference in tax rates creates opportunities for tax avoidance and encourages consumers to use products with a lower tax. For instance, the monthly sales of pipe tobacco in September 2011 increased by over 1,200 percent compared to January 2009, while the monthly sales for roll-your-own tobacco dropped 600 percent. Over $1.4 billion in State and Federal revenue has already been lost due to manufacturers relabeling and selling roll-your-own tobacco as pipe tobacco.

The Tobacco Tax Equity Act will end the exploitation of these tax loopholes by taxing all tobacco products at the same level as cigarettes. Through this legislation roll-your-own tobacco and pipe tobacco would be taxed at the same level of $1 for 20 cigarettes worth of tobacco. It would also raise the tax on a package of smokeless tobacco from 11 cents or less to $1—the same as a packet of cigarettes. The same goes for cigars, which are currently taxed no more than 46 cents per a cigar. As new tobacco products come onto the market, this bill ensures that any product defined as a tobacco product by the FDA is taxed at a level equivalent with cigarettes.

According to an estimate by the Joint Committee on Taxation, closing these loopholes will generate $3.6 billion over the next 10 years. But closing the loophole will not only generate much needed revenue and prevent manufacturers from gaming the system, it will protect children and teens from picking up this dangerous habit. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TAFT UNION HIGH SCHOOL

• Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting and commending Ryan Heber, Kim Fields and Mary Murphy, three educators who risked their lives to protect students in Taft, CA.

On Thursday, January 10—less than 4 weeks after the horrific massacre at Sandy Hook Elementary School—a student armed with a shotgun opened fire in a classroom at Taft Union High School and wounded two of his classmates. Today, one student remains hospitalized, recovering from his injuries.

This was a tragic attack, and it is terrifying to think that it could have been even worse had it not been for the brave, swift actions of Taft science teacher Ryan Heber and campus supervisors Kim Fields and Mary Murphy.

When the shooting started, Mr. Heber responded immediately. After ushering his other students out of harm's way, he began talking the shooter into ceasing his attack. Ms. Fields, who rushed to the classroom when she heard gunfire, joined Mr. Heber in persuading the attacker to put down his gun and surrender to police when they arrived on the scene. Meanwhile, Ms. Murphy stayed calm and made sure that students quickly and safely evacuated the classroom.

Like their teacher and supervisors, the students at Taft were also very brave. They stayed calm and followed school safety measures. I commend these young people and the first responders who swiftly responded to the call for help.

The students, faculty, and staff deserve our support in the days and years ahead, and they deserve our action to help curb gun violence and ensure safety at our schools in Taft and across the country.•

TRIBUTE TO AARON MANKIN

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, having served on the Rogers School Board, I understand how important the Wall of Distinction is to the school district and the community. This honor highlights the accomplishments of a wide array of people who have proven their commitment to upholding and sharing the values of Rogers.

I can't think of a better person who fits this description than Aaron Mankin.

I have known the Mankin family for much of my life. I grew up with Aaron's dad. Aaron grew up with my three daughters. Our families have a long history together.

Aaron's love for his country led him to join the Marine Corps in 2003, where he served as a combat correspondent. In 2005 he deployed to Iraq, risking his life to protect the interests of his country. I had the opportunity to visit with him during a trip to Iraq. Just a few weeks later, his life changed forever. He suffered intense burns and major lung damage when the armored vehicle he was riding in ran over a land mine in Northern Iraq. Aaron was sent to Brooke Army Medical Center in San Antonio and placed in the ICU. The damage to his lungs was so extensive that he was placed on a ventilator. He had third-degree burns on his arms and had to have his thumb and two-thirds of his index finger on his right hand amputated.

I have visited with Aaron on several occasions since his devastating injuries and heard him share his experiences. He is one of my heroes, and I am always moved personally regarding my own efforts after seeing how he has fought through his adversity.

Aaron has faced many challenges, but his contagious enthusiasm for life has opened many doors, and I am confident those opportunities will continue. Many programs have benefited Aaron along his path to recovery, and he has shown his appreciation by becoming a champion and spokesperson for UCLA's Operation Mend and the Intrepid Fallen Heroes Fund.

He has a long list of accomplishments and awards, including earning the Purple Heart and the Navy Achievement Medal with Combat Distinguishing Device for Valor. In addition, he was named as one of People Magazine's Heroes of the Year and a 2011 recipient of the Veterans Leadership Award presented by the Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America. The next year, Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta invited Aaron to discuss matters affecting wounded veterans.

He has taken his pain and suffering and turned it into a model of perseverance that is helping other soldiers and veterans heal from the pain of battle.

Aaron, we are proud of your visionary leadership and all of your accomplishments. You have always maintained an optimistic attitude and a determination that can be an example to us all. We are excited to see what your future holds, and we are proud to call you a son of Rogers, Arkansas. ●

REMEMBERING GORDON MANSFIELD

● Mr. KIRK. Mr. President, today I rise to honor the legacy of former VA Deputy Secretary Gordon Mansfield; a combat veteran, friend, and tireless advocate for our veterans. He passed away last week. Over the course of his distinguished career Gordon served his nation, its veterans, and those persevering through disabilities. He will be missed but his legacy remembered.

Like many in his generation, Gordon enlisted and served in Vietnam. During the Tet Offensive, while on his second combat tour, Gordon was wounded and sustained a spinal cord injury. He was awarded the Bronze Star, two Purple Hearts, the Combat Infantryman's Badge, and Presidential Unit Citation. While recovering from his injuries, Gordon earned his law degree, and upon moving back to Florida, began practicing law. He served as a counsel in a legal aid program devoted to assisting his fellow veterans.

From 1981 to 1989, Gordon served as the executive director of the Paralyzed Veterans of America, advocating for disabled veterans' interests on a national level. His work at PVA was instrumental in standing up the U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims as well as shaping landmark disabilities advocacy legislation. In 1989, Gordon joined the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and served as President George H.W. Bush's Assistant Secretary for Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity. There he served as a strong advocate for accessible housing.

In 2001, Gordon once again answered the call to help veterans, joining Secretary Anthony Principi as the Assistant Secretary for Congressional and Legislative Affairs at the Department of Veterans Affairs. In 2004, he became the Deputy Secretary and Chief Operating Officer, and served as Acting Secretary in 2007. During his time at the VA, Gordon oversaw the implementation of the post-9/11 GI bill and many other major transformation initiatives.

I worked closely with Gordon to establish the Captain James A. Lovell Federal Health Care Center in North Chicago, the Nation's first fully integrated Department of Defense-VA medical center. Only a few years before, a Washington consulting company recommended the closure of the North Chicago VA. Instead, the idea behind the Lovell FHCC was born.

Working with Gordon was a privilege, and through his dedication to this effort, we succeeded. Today, over 100,000 veterans, military servicemembers, and their families have access to state-of-the-art health care at the Lovell FHCC.

It is for this, and his many other accomplishments, that we thank and honor Gordon Mansfield for his service to this Nation.●

RHODE ISLAND'S MARINE ECONOMY

● Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to one of my State's great traditions and to a wonderful man. The Herreshoff Marine Museum, founded in 1971, preserves today the history of one our State's most important economic and design legacies, the Herreshoff boat building company of Bristol.

Early Rhode Island settlers took advantage of the State's location on the Narragansett Bay to foster one of Colonial America's most successful marine economies. Newport, RI, was the Colonies' fifth most prosperous commercial center, in part because of its port activity. Since that time, Rhode Islanders have sustained the State's maritime tradition, excelling in boatbuilding, fishing, shipping, port operation, energy exploration, and marine biology.

The marine trades continue to play a pivotal economic development role in our State today; as many other sectors in Rhode Island struggle to rebound from the recent recession, our marine industry is actually expanding. The Rhode Island Marine Trade Association reports that this industry supports over 6,600 Rhode Island jobs, paying almost $260 million in wages to Rhode Island workers—and almost 10 percent of private employers in the State are associated with the boating industry.

The Herreshoff family helped shape Rhode Island's maritime legacy. In 1878, John Brown Herreshoff and his brother Nathanael Greene Herreshoff more commonly known as ''Captain Nat''—joined forces to form the Herreshoff Manufacturing Company in Bristol, RI. Known for innovative design, superior skills, and efficient manufacturing, the Herreshoff Manufacturing Company quickly became a national leader in the boatbuilding industry. The brothers developed a lighter, faster version of the steam generator boiler, which allowed steamboats to operate at a much higher speed than previously possible.. Indeed, Herreshoff built the fastest boats on the water, both steam and sail. Between 1893 and 1920, five of Nathanael Greene Herreshoff's custom-designed racing sloops were chosen to sail in the prestigious America's Cup, and all five emerged as victors.

Notwithstanding these sea-going champions, the Herreshoffs' most acclaimed boat design is arguably the smaller S class. Nathanael Greene Herreshoff first designed the S boat in 1919, and the company built 95 boats before halting production in 1941. So well designed and built are they, that many S boats are still racing today.

It is no wonder the S boat has held up so well. The boat shows speed and agility under all conditions, and its engineering is considered one of the most groundbreaking undertakings in boatbuilding history. The S boat was particularly well suited for the coastal waters of Rhode Island: comfortable for easy day sailing; fast when racing hard. Its deep keel and hull shape made the boat steady in the strong ocean breeze that characterizes summer afternoons on Narragansett Bay, but on mild days its vast mainsail catches the lightest zephyr. The S boat boasted a keel with a high aspect ratio, and a high ballast-to-displacement ratio, allowing for a stiffer boat. Although these features were unusual for the 1900s, other boat designers quickly adopted them after the great success of the S boat became apparent. The S boat transom became a common sight for other sailors.

Ninety-five years after the first S boat splashed into Bristol Harbor at the Herreshoff boatyard, the fleet is active and growing, with boats being restored to join the class. This success and growth is much thanks to fleet commodore Fred Roy. Fred brought bouyant enthusiasm and cheerfulness to the Narragansett Bay Herreshoff S Class Association, and the association and all who love our bay and its special sailing traditions join in appreciation of Fred Roy. Fred has brought the spirit of the S boat, rail down and surging forward, to this part of our ongoing history and maritime culture, and I take this opportunity to thank and salute him, and celebrate this tradition of Narragansett Bay.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mrs. Neiman, 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 which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13396 ON FEBRUARY 7, 2006, WITH RESPECT TO THE SITUATION IN OR IN RELATION TO CÔTE D'IVOIRE—PM 1

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency, unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13396 of February 7, 2006, with respect to the situation in or in relation to Côte d'Ivoire is to continue in effect beyond February 7, 2013.

The situation in or in relation to Côte d'Ivoire, which has been addressed by the United Nations Security Council in Resolution 1572 of November 15, 2004, and subsequent resolutions, has resulted in the massacre of large numbers of civilians, widespread human rights abuses, significant political violence and unrest, and fatal attacks against international peacekeeping forces. Since the inauguration of President Alassane Ouattara in May 2011, the Government of Côte d'Ivoire has made progress in advancing democratic freedoms and economic development. While the Government of Côte d'Ivoire and its people continue to make progress towards peace and prosperity, the situation in or in relation to Côte d'Ivoire continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency and related measures blocking the property of certain persons contributing to the conflict in Côte d'Ivoire.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 4, 2013.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2013, the Secretary of the Senate, on February 1, 2013, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS) had signed the following enrolled bill:

H. R. 325. An act to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until May 19, 2013, and for other purposes.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2013, the enrolled bill was signed on February 4, 2013, during the adjournment of the Senate, by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 201. A bill to prohibit the sale, lease, transfer, retransfer, or delivery of F–16 aircraft, M1 tanks, or certain other defense articles or services to the Government of Egypt.

S. 204. A bill to preserve and protect the free choice of individual employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, or to refrain from such activities.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 209. A bill to require a full audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks by the Comptroller General of the United States, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–264. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, ''Certified Business Enterprise Expenditures of Public-Private Development Construction Projects for Fiscal Year 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–265. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–535, ''Allen Chapel A.M.E. Senior Residential Rental Project Property Tax Exemption Clarification Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–266. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–536, ''Hire Date Reporting Amendment Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–267. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–537, ''Fiscal Year 2013 Budget Support Technical Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–268. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–538, ''School-Based Enrichment Programs Temporary Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–269. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–539, ''Office of the Chief Financial Officer Audit Report Transparency Temporary Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–270. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–546, ''Health Benefits Plan Members Bill of Rights Amendment Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–271. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–547, ''Uniform Real Property Transfer on Death Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–272. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–548, ''General Obligation Bonds and Bond Anticipation Notes for Fiscal Years 2013–2018 Authorization Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–273. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–549, ''Medicaid Fraud Enforcement and Recovery Amendment Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–274. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–550, ''Judicial Adjudication of Parentage Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–275. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–551, ''District Department of Transportation Bicycle Sharing Fund Amendment Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–276. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–552, ''Public Vehicle-for-Hire Educational Services Temporary Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–277. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–553, ''Local Rent Supplement Program Voucher Temporary Amendment Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–278. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–554, ''NoMA Residential Development Tax Abatement Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–279. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–555, ''Closing of a Public Alley in Square N–515, S.O. 12–02073, Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–280. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–559, ''District of Columbia Flag Amendment Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–281. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report

on D.C. Act 19–560, ''Water Quality Assurance Amendment Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–282. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–561, ''District Department of Transportation Accessible Vehicles Fund Amendment Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–283. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–562, ''Energy Innovation and Savings Amendment Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–284. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–563, ''Alternative Service of Process Amendment Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–285. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–564, ''Good Samaritan Overdose Prevention Amendment Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–286. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–565, ''Department of Motor Vehicles Reciprocity Amendment Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–287. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–573, ''Parkside Parcel E and J Mixed-Income Apartments Tax Abatement Temporary Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–288. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–574, ''Streetscape Reconstruction Second Temporary Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–289. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–575, ''Phebbie Scott Way Designation Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–290. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–578, ''911 Purity Amendment Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–291. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–579, ''Senator Charles H. Percy Plaza Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–292. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–580, ''Albert 'Butch' Hopkins Way Designation Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–293. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–588, ''UDC Board Meeting Amendment Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

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. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 208. A bill to require the Federal Aviation Administration to prescribe regulations to reduce helicopter noise pollution in residential areas in Los Angeles County, California; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. VITTER, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BURR, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HELLER, Mr. LEE, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 209. A bill to require a full audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks by the Comptroller General of the United States, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 210. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to fraudulent representations about having received military declarations or medals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. LEE):

S. 211. A bill to amend certain definitions contained in the Provo River Project Transfer Act for purposes of clarifying certain property descriptions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. COCHRAN (for himself and Mr. WICKER):

S. 212. A bill to approve the transfer of Yellow Creek Port properties in Iuka, Mississippi; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. HELLER:

S. 213. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on telephone and other communication services; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota):

S. 214. A bill to prohibit brand name drug companies from compensating generic drug companies to delay the entry of a generic drug into the market; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. VITTER):

S. 215. A bill to ensure that the Federal Reserve conducts its policies to ensure long-term price stability and a low rate of inflation; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 216. A bill to prevent harassment at institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BEGICH, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 217. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require the Secretary of Education to collect information from coeducational elementary schools and secondary schools on such schools' athletic programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. COONS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. WARNER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. COBURN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. CORNYN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. COLLINS, and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 218. A bill to ensure that amounts credited to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund are used for harbor maintenance; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 219. A bill to establish the Susquehanna Gateway National Heritage Area in the State of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 220. A bill to create a Citrus Disease Research and Developing Trust Fund to support research on diseases impacting the citrus industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. AYOTTE:

S. 221. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to permit eligible fishermen to approve certain limited access privilege programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 222. A bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to clarify that uncertified States and Indian tribes have the authority to use certain payments for certain noncoal reclamation projects and acid mine remediation programs; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself and Mr. KIRK):

S. 223. A bill to amend section 217 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the visa waiver program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 224. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish a grant program to support the restoration of San Francisco Bay; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 225. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of alternatives for commemorating and interpreting the role of the Buffalo Soldiers in the early years of the National Parks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. BEGICH, Mrs. MCCASKILL, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 226. A bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to provide leave because of the death of a son or daughter; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. REED, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. PAUL):

S. 227. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain funds to improve security at United

States embassies and other diplomatic facilities worldwide, and for other purposes; considered and passed.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 228. A bill to establish the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 29

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 29, a bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for automatic continuing resolutions.

S. 43

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 43, a bill to require that any debt limit increase be balanced by equal spending cuts of the next decade.

S. 47

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 47, a bill to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994.

S. 56

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 56, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the credit for employers establishing workplace child care facilities, to increase the child care credit to encourage greater use of quality child care services, to provide incentives for students to earn child care-related degrees and to work in child care facilities, and to increase the exclusion for employer-provided dependent care assistance.

S. 82

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 82, a bill to provide that any executive action infringing on the Second Amendment has no force or effect, and to prohibit the use of funds for certain purposes.

S. 84

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) were added as cosponsors of S. 84, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

S. 109

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 109, a bill to preserve open competition and Federal Government neutrality towards the labor relations of Federal Government contractors on Federal and federally funded construction projects.

S. 113

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 113, a bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act and the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require certain creditors to obtain certifications from institutions of higher education, and for other purposes.

S. 114

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 114, a bill to amend title 11, United States Code, with respect to certain exceptions to discharge in bankruptcy.

S. 123

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 123, a bill to modernize voter registration, promote access to voting for individuals with disabilities, protect the ability of individuals to exercise the right to vote in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes.

S. 128

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 128, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve education and prevention related to campus sexual violence, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking.

S. 153

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 153, a bill to amend section 520J of the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants for mental health first aid training programs.

S. 157

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 157, a bill to provide for certain improvements to the Denali National Park and Preserve in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes.

S. 162

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 162, a bill to reauthorize and improve the Mentally Ill Offender Treatment and Crime Reduction Act of 2004.

S. 177

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) were added as cosponsors of S. 177, a bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 entirely.

S. 183

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) were added as cosponsors 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. 190

At the request of Mr. JOHANNS, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 190, a bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds for certain activities of the National Labor Relation Board and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

S. 192

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 192, a bill to enhance the energy security of United States allies, and for other purposes.

S. 200

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 200, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the interment in national cemeteries under the control of the National Cemetery Administration of individuals who served in combat support of the Armed Forces in the Kingdom of Laos between February 28, 1961, and May 15, 1975, and for other purposes.

S. 204

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 204, a bill to preserve and protect the free choice of individual employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, or to refrain from such activities.

S. 207

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) were added as cosponsors of S. 207, a bill to restrict the sale, lease, transfer, retransfer, or delivery of F–16 aircraft, M1 tanks, or certain other defense articles or services to the Government of Egypt.

S. RES. 24

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 24, a resolution commemorating the 10-year anniversary of the loss of the Space Shuttle Columbia.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 208. A bill to require the Federal Aviation Administration to prescribe regulations to reduce helicopter noise pollution in residential areas in Los Angeles County, California; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Los Angeles Residential Helicopter Noise Relief Act of 2013.

This legislation, which I introduce with Senator BOXER, would require the

Federal Aviation Administration to prescribe regulations for helicopter operations in the skies above Los Angeles in order to reduce helicopter noise pollution in residential areas.

In addition to addressing noise, the FAA's regulations would have to increase safety, minimize commercial aircraft delays, and exempt first responders and military aircraft from their limitations.

The bill also would direct the FAA to consult with local communities and local helicopter operators when developing the regulations.

This legislation is necessary because today the citizens of Los Angeles County suffer intrusive and disruptive low-flying helicopter traffic above their neighborhoods to an unprecedented degree.

The unique terrain of Los Angeles, with its many canyons and valleys, often concentrates the high decibel level noise from low-flying helicopters on many of the millions of homes in the county.

The noise interrupts daily life for Los Angeles County's residents, drowning out conversations and disrupting sleep cycles.

Despite multiple efforts from several community and homeowner organizations in Los Angeles County to address these disturbances over many years, helicopter traffic in Los Angeles County is not currently regulated by the Federal Aviation Administration or any other agency.

As one expert recently explained to The Los Angeles Times, a helicopter pilot is free to hover over a person's home for as many hours as he would like. The only limitation on helicopter hovering, in fact, appears to be fuel supply.

Last year, at my request the Senate Appropriations Committee directed the Federal Aviation Administration to begin developing solutions to this matter.

In response, the Federal Aviation Administration formed an internal working group in July 2012 to solicit input from local communities and stakeholders on helicopter noise and safety issues in Los Angeles County.

As part of that process, FAA Regional Administrator Bill Withycombe hosted several public meetings in the summer and fall of 2012 that have allowed stakeholders and citizens to express their concerns and propose solutions.

The Federal Aviation Administration will release a report in May 2013 evaluating a full set of voluntary and regulatory options to reduce helicopter noise and address safety issues in Los Angeles County.

The study is a necessary first step in order to determine how helicopters can be regulated in Los Angeles County in a manner that provides relief to residents from helicopter noise and increase safety.

But the study is only a first step. It must be followed by meaningful and effective regulations to limit the impacts of these helicopters. I introduce this legislation in order to ensure that the FAA will follow through on the regulatory options it plans to evaluate in its May 2013 report.

This legislation directs the FAA to act in the interest of the millions of Americans in Los Angeles County. I appreciate the steps the FAA has taken to date, but only regulations appear capable of addressing the quality of life impact caused by helicopters in Los Angeles.

Last August, thousands of people sat in the stands of the Hollywood Bowl for a night of Beethoven.

Nestled into the Hollywood Hills and with little sign of the Nation's second largest city that surrounds it, the Hollywood Bowl is a unique spot to take in a concert.

But just as violinist Renaud Capuçon stood for a solo, an unidentified helicopter flew overhead, drowning out the sound of his music.

It was an upsetting event for the audience, but it is far from unusual.

The people of Los Angeles have had too many wonderful outdoor concerts and other cultural events disrupted by helicopters that fly without restriction.

Choppers in L.A.'s sky have caused too many sleepless nights.

Paparazzi helicopters have too often flown dangerously low and close to homes in their constant pursuit of celebrity images.

The air space above Los Angeles is the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Aviation Administration, so to bring some sanity to the skies above L.A. requires Federal action, and Federal leadership.

This legislation directs the FAA to provide that leadership necessary to protect the public interest.

I encourage my colleagues to support it, and I look forward to working with my fellow members to enact this important legislation.

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. 208

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 ''Los Angeles Residential Helicopter Noise Relief Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Residents throughout Los Angeles County suffer intrusive and disruptive low-flying helicopter traffic above their neighborhoods. The unique terrain of canyons and valleys that surround residential neighborhoods in Los Angeles County often concentrate high decibel level noise from the low-flying helicopters in and around Los Angeles County residences. The concentrated noise interrupts daily life for many Los Angeles County residents by drowning out conversations and disrupting sleep cycles.

(2) Los Angeles County is home to a uniquely large concentration of scenic, historic, entertainment, and transportation venues, including sight-seeing, movie studios, movie star homes, outdoor entertainment facilities, Griffith Park, the Hollywood Sign, freeways, and many others, that generate extensive helicopter activity.

(3) Los Angeles County is home to the world's leading civil helicopter manufacturer that conducts extensive helicopter operational testing across the region.

(4) Despite multiple efforts from several community and homeowner organizations in Los Angeles County to address these disturbances, helicopter traffic in Los Angeles County is not currently regulated by the Federal Aviation Administration or any other agency.

(5) At the request of members of Congress, the Federal Aviation Administration formed an internal working group in July 2012 to solicit input from local communities and stakeholders on helicopter noise and safety issues in Los Angeles County.

(6) As part of that process, several public meetings were held in the fall and summer of 2012 that have allowed the Federal Aviation Administration and stakeholders to hear and better understand the concerns and complaints of affected residents.

(7) The Federal Aviation Administration is scheduled to release a report in May 2013 evaluating a full set of voluntary and regulatory options to reduce helicopter noise and address safety issues in Los Angeles County.

(8) The report is expected to explore how helicopters can be regulated in Los Angeles County in a manner that provides relief to residents from helicopter noise while also meeting the needs of relevant stakeholders, including first responders.

SEC. 3. REGULATIONS TO REDUCE HELICOPTER NOISE POLLUTION IN CERTAIN RESIDENTIAL AREAS.

(a) RULEMAKING.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall prescribe regulations for helicopter operations in Los Angeles County, California, that include requirements relating to the flight paths and altitudes associated with such operations to reduce helicopter noise pollution in residential areas, increase safety, and minimize scheduled commercial aircraft delays.

(b) EXEMPTIONS.—In prescribing regulations under subsection (a), the Administrator shall exempt helicopter operations related to emergency, law enforcement, or military activities from the requirements described in that subsection.

(c) CONSULTATIONS.—In prescribing regulations under subsection (a), the Administrator shall make reasonable efforts to consult with local communities and local helicopter operators in order to develop regulations that meet the needs of local communities, helicopter operators, and the Federal Aviation Administration.

By Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. VITTER):

S. 215. A bill to ensure that the Federal Reserve conducts its policies to ensure long-term price stability and a low rate of inflation; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I am here today to introduce the Federal Reserve Mandate Act of 2013 in an effort to begin returning our country to the right place in monetary policy. Senator VITTER is joining me in this effort.

The objective of our bill is simple. Our Central Bank, like other Central Banks around the world, should be focused on creating an environment of price stability. This should be the guiding principle of monetary policy decisions.

This is neither a radical nor a new idea. Most economists argue that the proper role of the Central Bank is to serve as a lender of last resort in a time of crisis, to supply payment distribution and clearing mechanisms, and to manage the money supply so that inflation stays in check. Managing unemployment is a completely separate task and not appropriate for the blunt tools of monetary policy. That is why almost every developed country's Central Bank has as its mandate the maintenance of price stability. In other words, we are an outlier.

This is not to say that a focus on price stability means the Fed is abandoning unemployment. In fact, just the opposite is true. Monetary policy can and should create an environment where jobs can grow and thrive by giving the economy certainty that prices will remain stable over the long term.

We have strayed a long way from traditional Central Bank actions. We have lost sight of the proper role of monetary policy in our economy. With roughly $3 trillion in assets—and I think the Presiding Officer knows that by the end of this year it is projected we will have $4 trillion in assets—sitting on the Fed's balance sheet, there is no question that the Fed is distorting financial markets with multiple rounds of quantitative easing. At a minimum, we have completely lost price signals from instruments such as treasuries and mortgage-backed securities. It is likely, however, we are doing more damage than just that. We may be creating asset bubbles elsewhere as money moves into investments that are risky.

We are also punishing savers. Purchasing assets to drive down rates forces pension funds and retirees to shift money into asset classes that may not be best for them. We are creating ''Fed addicts'' in our markets. Equity markets go through cycles where they become almost Fed obsessed. In these environments, good news is bad for equity markets because it means less QE buying. Meanwhile, bad economic news is good for markets because it means more easy money is on the way. Now we risk the perils of unwinding this policy.

Economists are beginning to discuss the likelihood that the Fed will take significant losses on assets it has purchased. We just had one of the Fed Governors in our office last week sharing with us that as we begin unwinding these balance sheets, it is very likely, as the Presiding Officer can imagine, as interest rates go up and the Fed begins to buy these securities, we are going to lose money on those assets. So it is likely the Fed is going to take significant losses on the assets it purchased. Since the Fed is buying these bonds at record low yields, they will likely sell them down the road at higher yields. I don't think there is anybody right now who disagrees with that probability.

The effect of this is a permanent increase in monetary supplies. This is an incredibly perverse situation we have now locked ourselves into.

The employment mandate at the Fed has not always existed. A lot of people believe it has. It was added with the passage of the Humphrey-Hawkins Act in 1978. Humphrey-Hawkins was passed in a moment of self-congratulations, like a lot of things around here are passed. Congress patted itself on the back for ''ending unemployment.'' Obviously, nothing could be further from the truth. The Fed cannot end unemployment by printing money.

The Central Bank should be tasked with maintaining price stability. We must return to this core principle. This is the reason we are offering this piece of legislation today.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 224. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish a grant program to support the restoration of San Francisco Bay; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise on behalf of myself and Senator BOXER to introduce legislation to further the restoration of the San Francisco Bay.

Over the last 150 years, the water quality and health of the San Francisco Bay Estuary have been diminished by pollution, invasive species, loss of wetland habitat and other factors. The degradation has not only impacted fish and wildlife, but has also reduced the estuary's ability to support important economic activities such as commercial and sport fishing, shipping, agriculture, recreation, and tourism.

Federal funding in recent years has begun the Bay's recovery process by investing in projects which improve water quality and restore critical habitat. These investments, $28 million between 2008 and 2012 by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency alone, were critical to spurring $22 million in matching funds and leveraging $81 million from other partners. But much work remains.

That is why I am pleased to introduce the San Francisco Bay Restoration Act with Senator BOXER, Chairwoman of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee. Companion legislation will also be introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives by Congresswoman JACKIE SPEIER.

This bill was first introduced in the 112th Congress. The Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works reported favorably on the bill and recommended its passage on January 26, 2012.

This bill recognizes the important restoration work that must be done to restore and protect the iconic San Francisco Bay by authorizing $5 million a year for restoration work between 2013 and 2017, and prioritizing funding for projects that will protect and restore vital estuarine habitat for migratory waterfowl, shorebirds, and wildlife; improve and restore water quality and rearing habitat for fish; and in turn reinvigorate recreation, tourism, and agricultural activities in and around the bay.

I urge my colleagues to join me in their support for this measure.

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

S. 224

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 ''San Francisco Bay Restoration Act''.

SEC. 2. SAN FRANCISCO BAY RESTORATION GRANT PROGRAM.

Title I of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 123. SAN FRANCISCO BAY RESTORATION GRANT PROGRAM.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) ANNUAL PRIORITY LIST.—The term 'annual priority list' means the annual priority list compiled under subsection (b).

''(2) COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.—The term 'comprehensive plan' means—

''(A) the comprehensive conservation and management plan approved under section 320 for the San Francisco Bay estuary; and

''(B) any amendments to that plan.

''(3) ESTUARY PARTNERSHIP.—The term 'Estuary Partnership' means the San Francisco Estuary Partnership, the entity that is designated as the management conference under section 320.

''(b) ANNUAL PRIORITY LIST.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—After providing public notice, the Administrator shall annually compile a priority list identifying and prioritizing the activities, projects, and studies intended to be funded with the amounts made available under subsection (c).

''(2) INCLUSIONS.—The annual priority list compiled under paragraph (1) shall include—

''(A) activities, projects, or studies, including restoration projects and habitat improvement for fish, waterfowl, and wildlife, that advance the goals and objectives of the approved comprehensive plan;

''(B) information on the activities, projects, programs, or studies specified under subparagraph (A), including a description of—

''(i) the identities of the financial assistance recipients; and

''(ii) the communities to be served; and

''(C) the criteria and methods established by the Administrator for selection of activities, projects, and studies.

''(3) CONSULTATION.—In developing the priority list under paragraph (1), the Administrator shall consult with and consider the recommendations of—

''(A) the Estuary Partnership;

''(B) the State of California and affected local governments in the San Francisco Bay estuary watershed; and

''(C) any other relevant stakeholder involved with the protection and restoration of the San Francisco Bay estuary that the Administrator determines to be appropriate.

''(c) GRANT PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to section 320, the Administrator may provide funding through cooperative agreements, grants, or other means to State and local agencies, special districts, and public or nonprofit agencies, institutions, and organizations, including the Estuary Partnership, for activities, studies, or projects identified on the annual priority list.

''(2) MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF GRANTS; NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—

''(A) MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF GRANTS.—Amounts provided to any individual or entity under this section for a fiscal year shall not exceed an amount equal to 75 percent of the total cost of any eligible activities that are to be carried out using those amounts.

''(B) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the total cost of any eligible activities that are carried out using amounts provided under this section shall be—

''(i) not less than 25 percent; and

''(ii) provided from non-Federal sources.

''(d) FUNDING.—

''(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator to carry out this section $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017.

''(2) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Of the amount made available to carry out this section for a fiscal year, the Administrator shall use not more than 5 percent to pay administrative expenses incurred in carrying out this section.

''(3) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER FUNDING.—Nothing in this section limits the eligibility of the Estuary Partnership to receive funding under section 320(g).

''(4) PROHIBITION.—No amounts made available under subsection (c) may be used for the administration of a management conference under section 320.''.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 225. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of alternatives for commemorating and interpreting the role of the Buffalo Soldiers in the early years of the National Parks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today on behalf of myself and Senator BOXER to introduce the Buffalo Soldiers in the National Parks Study Act. This legislation is an important step in preserving the legacy of the Army's first all-black infantry and cavalry units and their unique role in the creation of our National Park system.

The Buffalo Soldiers served bravely in campaigns both at home and abroad before being stationed at the military Presidio in San Francisco and being given charge of patrolling the National Park system. Although first tasked with taming the frontier, these troops also took on the responsibility of preserving that wilderness for future generations. Each summer, Buffalo Soldier regiments traveled roughly 320 miles from San Francisco to either Sequoia or Yosemite National Park, where they patrolled the parks for poachers and loggers, built trails, and escorted visitors. They were, in essence if not in name, the nation's first park rangers.

In a time of segregation and adversity, these soldiers served their country bravely and the National Parks they worked to establish are part of the legacy they leave behind. Unfortunately, this unique aspect of their history is neither widely recognized nor remembered. This legislation would address that by authorizing a study to determine the most appropriate way to memorialize the Buffalo Soldiers.

The study would evaluate the suitability and feasibility of establishing a national historic trail commemorating the route traveled by the Buffalo Soldiers from their post in the Presidio of San Francisco to Sequoia and Yosemite National Parks and to any other National Parks where they may have served.

The bill will identify properties associated with the Buffalo Soldiers that could be added to the National Register of Historic Places.

The bill will develop educational initiatives and a public awareness campaign about the contribution of African-American soldiers after the Civil War.

Although the experiences of the Buffalo Soldiers are an important piece of our national history, we are in danger of losing their legacy to the passage of time unless we take conscious steps to preserve the memory. This legislation works to ensure that the contributions of the Buffalo Soldiers will be remembered and shared by all.

Furthermore, as the centennial of the National Park Service in 2016 approaches, it is an especially appropriate time to conduct research and increase public awareness of the stewardship role the Buffalo Soldiers played in the early years of the National Parks.

I urge my colleagues to join me in their support for this measure.

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. 225

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 ''Buffalo Soldiers in the National Parks Study Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) In the late 19th century and early 20th century, African-American troops who came to be known as the Buffalo Soldiers served in many critical roles in the western United States, including protecting some of the first National Parks.

(2) Based at the Presidio in San Francisco, Buffalo Soldiers were assigned to Sequoia and Yosemite National Parks where they patrolled the backcountry, built trails, stopped poaching, and otherwise served in the roles later assumed by National Park rangers.

(3) The public would benefit from having opportunities to learn more about the Buffalo Soldiers in the National Parks and their contributions to the management of National Parks and the legacy of African-Americans in the post-Civil War era.

(4) As the centennial of the National Park Service in 2016 approaches, it is an especially appropriate time to conduct research and increase public awareness of the stewardship role the Buffalo Soldiers played in the early years of the National Parks.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to authorize a study to determine the most effective ways to increase understanding and public awareness of the critical role that the Buffalo Soldiers played in the early years of the National Parks.

SEC. 3. STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct a study of alternatives for commemorating and interpreting the role of the Buffalo Soldiers in the early years of the National Parks.

(b) CONTENTS OF STUDY.—The study shall include—

(1) a historical assessment, based on extensive research, of the Buffalo Soldiers who served in National Parks in the years prior to the establishment of the National Park Service;

(2) an evaluation of the suitability and feasibility of establishing a national historic trail commemorating the route traveled by the Buffalo Soldiers from their post in the Presidio of San Francisco to Sequoia and Yosemite National Parks and to any other National Parks where they may have served;

(3) the identification of properties that could meet criteria for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or criteria for designation as National Historic Landmarks;

(4) an evaluation of appropriate ways to enhance historical research, education, interpretation, and public awareness of the story of the Buffalo Soldiers' stewardship role in the National Parks, including ways to link the story to the development of National Parks and the story of African-American military service following the Civil War; and

(5) any other matters that the Secretary of the Interior deems appropriate for this study.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after funds are made available for the study, the Secretary of the Interior shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report containing the study's findings and recommendations.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 228. A bill to establish the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise on behalf of myself and Senator BOXER to introduce legislation to establish a National Heritage Area in the California Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. This legislation will create the first Heritage Area in California.

This bill was first introduced in January 2011 during the 112th Congress and received a hearing in the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources Subcommittee on National Parks. Since then, the Delta Protection Commission has completed a feasibility study, as required, and endorsed the legislation. Additionally, the National Park Service has confirmed that the study is consistent with the agency's interim National Heritage Area Feasibility Study Guidelines.

I was pleased to have had the opportunity to work with Senator BOXER,

Representative JOHN GARAMENDI, and the County Supervisors from the five Delta Counties to develop this legislation and look forward to continuing to partner with them as well as local, State and Federal agencies to care for and improve the Delta.

This bill will establish the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta as a National Heritage Area.

The Delta Protection Commission, created by California law and responsible to the citizens of the Delta and California, will manage the Heritage Area. It will ensure an open and public process, working with all levels of Federal, State, and local government, tribes, local stakeholders, and private property owners as it develops and implements the management plan for the Heritage Area. The goal is to conserve and protect the Delta, its communities, its resources, and its history.

It is also important to understand what this legislation will not do.

It will not affect water rights.

It will not affect water contracts.

It will not affect private property.

Nothing in this bill gives any governmental agency any more regulatory power than it already has, nor does it take away regulatory from agencies that have it.

In short, this bill does not affect water rights or water contracts, nor does it impose any additional responsibilities on local government or residents. Instead, it authorizes Federal assistance to a local process already required by State law that will elevate the Delta, providing a means to conserve and protect its valued communities, resources, and history.

The Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta is the largest estuary on the West Coast. It is the most extensive inland delta in the world, and a unique national treasure.

Today, it is a labyrinth of sloughs, wetlands, and deepwater channels that connect the waters of the high Sierra mountain streams to the Pacific Ocean through the San Francisco Bay. Its approximately 60 islands are protected by 1,100 miles of levees, and are home to 3,500,000 residents, including 2,500 family farmers. The Delta and its farmers produce some of the highest quality specialty crops in the United States.

The Delta offers recreational opportunities to the two million Californians who visit the Delta each year for boating, fishing, hunting, visiting historic sites, and viewing wildlife. It provides habitat for more than 750 species of plants and wildlife. These include sand hill cranes that migrate to the Delta wetland from places as far away as Siberia. The Delta also provides habitat for 55 species of fish, including Chinook salmon—some as large as 60 pounds—that return each year to travel through the Delta to spawn in the tributaries.

These same waterways also channel fresh water to the Federal and State-owned pumps in the South Delta that provide water to 23 million Californians and three million acres of irrigated agricultural land elsewhere in the State.

Before the Delta was reclaimed for farmland in the 19th Century, the Delta flooded regularly with snow melt each spring, and provided the rich environment that, by 1492, supported the largest settlement of Native Americans in North America.

The Delta was the gateway to the gold fields in 1849, after which Chinese workers built hundreds of miles of levees throughout the waterways of the Delta to make its rich peat soils available for farming and to control flooding.

Japanese, Italians, German, Portuguese, Dutch, Greeks, South Asians and other immigrants began the farming legacy, and developed technologies specifically adapted to the unique environment, including the Caterpillar Tractor, which later contributed to agriculture and transportation internationally.

Delta communities created a river culture befitting their dependence on water transport, a culture which has attracted the attention of authors from Mark Twain and Jack London to Joan Didion.

The Delta is in crisis due to many factors, including invasive species, urban and agricultural run-off, wastewater discharges, channelization, dredging, water export operations, and other stressors.

Many of the islands of the Delta are between 10 and 20 feet below sea level, and the levee system is presently inadequate to provide reliable flood protection for historic communities, significant habitats, agricultural enterprises, water resources, transportation and other infrastructure.

Existing levees have not been engineered to withstand earthquakes. Should levees fail for any reason, a rush of seawater into the interior of the Delta could damage the already fragile ecosystem, contaminate drinking water for many Californians, flood agricultural land, inundate towns, and damage roads, power lines, and water project infrastructure.

The State of California has been working for decades on a resolution to the water supply and ecosystem crisis in the State, and has a long history of partnerships with Federal agencies, working together to resolve challenges to the Delta's historic communities, ecosystem and the water it supplies so many Californians.

The Delta Protection Commission, established under State law, has been tasked by the California State Legislature with providing a forum for Delta residents to engage in decisions regarding actions to recognize and enhance the unique cultural, recreational, agricultural resources, infrastructure and legacy communities of the Delta and to serve as the facilitating agency for the implementation of a National Heritage Area in the Delta.

This legislation will complement the broadly supported State Water Legislation of 2009, which called for a Heritage designation for the Delta.

This legislation authorizes the creation of the Delta Heritage Area and Federal assistance to the Delta Protection Commission in implementing the Area. This legislation is just a small part of the commitment the Federal Government must make to the Delta. I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues at every level of government to restore and sustain the ecosystem in the Delta, to provide for reliable water supply in the State of California, to recover the native species of the Delta, protect communities in the Delta from flood risk, ensure economic sustainability in the Delta, improve water quality in the Delta, and sustain the unique cultural, historical, recreational, agricultural and economic values of the Delta.

The National Heritage Area designation for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta will help local governments develop and implement a plan for a sustainable future by providing Federal recognition, technical assistance and small amounts of funding to a community-based process already underway.

Through the Delta Heritage Area, local communities and citizens will partner with Federal, State and local governments to collaboratively work to promote conservation, community revitalization, and economic development projects.

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. 228

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 ''Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area Establishment Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) HERITAGE AREA.—The term ''Heritage Area'' means the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Heritage Area established by section 3(a).

(2) HERITAGE AREA MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The term ''Heritage Area management plan'' means the plan developed and adopted by the management entity under this Act.

(3) MANAGEMENT ENTITY.—The term ''management entity'' means the management entity for the Heritage Area designated by section 3(d).

(4) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the State of California.

SEC. 3. SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA HERITAGE AREA.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the ''Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Heritage Area'' in the State.

(b) BOUNDARIES.—The boundaries of the Heritage Area shall be in the counties of Contra Costa, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Solano, and Yolo in the State of California, as generally depicted on the map entitled ''Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area Proposed Boundary'', numbered T27/105,030, and dated September 2010.

(c) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map described in subsection (b) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service and the Delta Protection Commission.

(d) MANAGEMENT ENTITY.—The management entity for the Heritage Area shall be the Delta Protection Commission established by section 29735 of the California Public Resources Code.

(e) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) AUTHORITIES.—For purposes of carrying out the Heritage Area management plan, the Secretary, acting through the management entity, may use amounts made available under this Act to—

(A) make grants to the State or a political subdivision of the State, nonprofit organizations, and other persons;

(B) enter into cooperative agreements with, or provide technical assistance to, the State or a political subdivision of the State, nonprofit organizations, and other interested parties;

(C) hire and compensate staff, which shall include individuals with expertise in natural, cultural, and historical resources protection, and heritage programming;

(D) obtain money or services from any source including any that are provided under any other Federal law or program;

(E) contract for goods or services; and

(F) undertake to be a catalyst for any other activity that furthers the Heritage Area and is consistent with the approved Heritage Area management plan.

(2) DUTIES.—The management entity shall—

(A) in accordance with subsection (f), prepare and submit a Heritage Area management plan to the Secretary;

(B) assist units of local government, regional planning organizations, and nonprofit organizations in carrying out the approved Heritage Area management plan by—

(i) carrying out programs and projects that recognize, protect, and enhance important resource values in the Heritage Area;

(ii) establishing and maintaining interpretive exhibits and programs in the Heritage Area;

(iii) developing recreational and educational opportunities in the Heritage Area;

(iv) increasing public awareness of, and appreciation for, natural, historical, scenic, and cultural resources of the Heritage Area;

(v) protecting and restoring historic sites and buildings in the Heritage Area that are consistent with Heritage Area themes;

(vi) ensuring that clear, consistent, and appropriate signs identifying points of public access, and sites of interest are posted throughout the Heritage Area; and

(vii) promoting a wide range of partnerships among governments, organizations, and individuals to further the Heritage Area;

(C) consider the interests of diverse units of government, businesses, organizations, and individuals in the Heritage Area in the preparation and implementation of the Heritage Area management plan;

(D) conduct meetings open to the public at least semiannually regarding the development and implementation of the Heritage Area management plan;

(E) for any year that Federal funds have been received under this Act—

(i) submit an annual report to the Secretary that describes the activities, expenses, and income of the management entity (including grants to any other entities during the year that the report is made);

(ii) make available to the Secretary for audit all records relating to the expenditure of the funds and any matching funds;

(iii) require, with respect to all agreements authorizing expenditure of Federal funds by other organizations, that the organizations receiving the funds make available to the Secretary for audit all records concerning the expenditure of the funds; and

(F) encourage by appropriate means economic viability that is consistent with the Heritage Area.

(3) PROHIBITION ON THE ACQUISITION OF REAL PROPERTY.—The management entity shall not use Federal funds made available under this Act to acquire real property or any interest in real property.

(4) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT.—The Federal share of the cost of any activity carried out using any assistance made available under this Act shall be 50 percent.

(f) HERITAGE AREA MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the management entity shall submit to the Secretary for approval a proposed Heritage Area management plan.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The Heritage Area management plan shall—

(A) incorporate an integrated and cooperative approach to agricultural resources and activities, flood protection facilities, and other public infrastructure;

(B) emphasizes the importance of the resources described in subparagraph (A);

(C) take into consideration State and local plans;

(D) include—

(i) an inventory of—

(I) the resources located in the core area described in subsection (b); and

(II) any other property in the core area that—

(aa) is related to the themes of the Heritage Area; and

(bb) should be preserved, restored, managed, or maintained because of the significance of the property;

(ii) comprehensive policies, strategies and recommendations for conservation, funding, management, and development of the Heritage Area;

(iii) a description of actions that governments, private organizations, and individuals have agreed to take to protect the natural, historical and cultural resources of the Heritage Area;

(iv) a program of implementation for the Heritage Area management plan by the management entity that includes a description of—

(I) actions to facilitate ongoing collaboration among partners to promote plans for resource protection, restoration, and construction; and

(II) specific commitments for implementation that have been made by the management entity or any government, organization, or individual for the first 5 years of operation;

(v) the identification of sources of funding for carrying out the Heritage Area management plan;

(vi) analysis and recommendations for means by which local, State, and Federal programs, including the role of the National Park Service in the Heritage Area, may best be coordinated to carry out this Act; and

(vii) an interpretive plan for the Heritage Area; and

(E) recommend policies and strategies for resource management that consider and detail the application of appropriate land and water management techniques, including the development of intergovernmental and interagency cooperative agreements to protect the natural, historical, cultural, educational, scenic, and recreational resources of the Heritage Area.

(3) RESTRICTIONS.—The Heritage Area management plan submitted under this subsection shall—

(A) ensure participation by appropriate Federal, State, tribal, and local agencies, including the Delta Stewardship Council, special districts, natural and historical resource protection and agricultural organizations, educational institutions, businesses, recreational organizations, community residents, and private property owners; and

(B) not be approved until the Secretary has received certification from the Delta Protection Commission that the Delta Stewardship Council has reviewed the Heritage Area management plan for consistency with the plan adopted by the Delta Stewardship Council pursuant to State law.

(4) DEADLINE.—If a proposed Heritage Area management plan is not submitted to the Secretary by the date that is 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the management entity shall be ineligible to receive additional funding under this Act until the date that the Secretary receives and approves the Heritage Area management plan.

(5) APPROVAL OR DISAPPROVAL OF HERITAGE AREA MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of receipt of the Heritage Area management plan under paragraph (1), the Secretary, in consultation with the State, shall approve or disapprove the Heritage Area management plan.

(B) CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL.—In determining whether to approve the Heritage Area management plan, the Secretary shall consider whether—

(i) the management entity is representative of the diverse interests of the Heritage Area, including governments, natural and historic resource protection organizations, educational institutions, businesses, and recreational organizations;

(ii) the management entity has afforded adequate opportunity, including public hearings, for public and governmental involvement in the preparation of the Heritage Area management plan; and

(iii) the resource protection and interpretation strategies contained in the Heritage Area management plan, if implemented, would adequately protect the natural, historical, and cultural resources of the Heritage Area.

(C) ACTION FOLLOWING DISAPPROVAL.—If the Secretary disapproves the Heritage Area management plan under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall—

(i) advise the management entity in writing of the reasons for the disapproval;

(ii) make recommendations for revisions to the Heritage Area management plan; and

(iii) not later than 180 days after the receipt of any proposed revision of the Heritage Area management plan from the management entity, approve or disapprove the proposed revision.

(D) AMENDMENTS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall approve or disapprove each amendment to the Heritage Area management plan that the Secretary determines make a substantial change to the Heritage Area management plan.

(ii) USE OF FUNDS.—The management entity shall not use Federal funds authorized by this Act to carry out any amendments to the Heritage Area management plan until the Secretary has approved the amendments.

(g) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this Act affects the authority of a Federal agency to provide technical or financial assistance under any other law.

(2) CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION.—The head of any Federal agency planning to conduct activities that may have an impact on the Heritage Area is encouraged to consult and coordinate the activities with the Secretary and the management entity to the maximum extent practicable.

(3) OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Nothing in this Act—

(A) modifies, alters, or amends any law or regulation authorizing a Federal agency to manage Federal land under the jurisdiction of the Federal agency;

(B) limits the discretion of a Federal land manager to implement an approved land use plan within the boundaries of the Heritage Area; or

(C) modifies, alters, or amends any authorized use of Federal land under the jurisdiction of a Federal agency.

(h) PRIVATE PROPERTY AND REGULATORY PROTECTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), nothing in this Act—

(A) abridges the rights of any property owner (whether public or private), including the right to refrain from participating in any plan, project, program, or activity conducted within the Heritage Area;

(B) requires any property owner to permit public access (including access by Federal, State, or local agencies) to the property of the property owner, or to modify public access or use of property of the property owner under any other Federal, State, or local law;

(C) alters any duly adopted land use regulation, approved land use plan, or other regulatory authority of any Federal, State or local agency, or conveys any land use or other regulatory authority to the management entity;

(D) authorizes or implies the reservation or appropriation of water or water rights;

(E) diminishes the authority of the State to manage fish and wildlife, including the regulation of fishing and hunting within the Heritage Area; or

(F) creates any liability, or affects any liability under any other law, of any private property owner with respect to any person injured on the private property.

(2) OPT OUT.—An owner of private property within the Heritage Area may opt out of participating in any plan, project, program, or activity carried out within the Heritage Area under this Act, if the property owner provides written notice to the management entity.

(i) EVALUATION; REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years before the date on which authority for Federal funding terminates for the Heritage Area, the Secretary shall—

(A) conduct an evaluation of the accomplishments of the Heritage Area; and

(B) prepare a report in accordance with paragraph (3).

(2) EVALUATION.—An evaluation conducted under paragraph (1)(A) shall—

(A) assess the progress of the management entity with respect to—

(i) accomplishing the purposes of this Act for the Heritage Area; and

(ii) achieving the goals and objectives of the approved Heritage Area management plan;

(B) analyze the Federal, State, local, and private investments in the Heritage Area to determine the leverage and impact of the investments; and

(C) review the management structure, partnership relationships, and funding of the Heritage Area for purposes of identifying the critical components for sustainability of the Heritage Area.

(3) REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Based on the evaluation conducted under paragraph (1)(A), the Secretary shall prepare a report that includes recommendations for the future role of the National Park Service, if any, with respect to the Heritage Area.

(B) REQUIRED ANALYSIS.—If the report prepared under subparagraph (A) recommends that Federal funding for the Heritage Area be reauthorized, the report shall include an analysis of—

(i) ways in which Federal funding for the Heritage Area may be reduced or eliminated; and

(ii) the appropriate time period necessary to achieve the recommended reduction or elimination.

(C) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—On completion of the report, the Secretary shall submit the report to—

(i) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(ii) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(j) EFFECT OF DESIGNATION.—Nothing in this Act—

(1) precludes the management entity from using Federal funds made available under other laws for the purposes for which those funds were authorized; or

(2) affects any water rights or contracts.

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act $10,000,000, of which not more than $1,000,000 may be made available for any fiscal year.

(b) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT.—The Federal share of the total cost of any activity under this Act shall be determined by the Secretary, but shall be not more than 50 percent.

(c) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the total cost of any activity under this Act may be in the form of in-kind contributions of goods or services.

SEC. 5. TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If a proposed Heritage Area management plan has not been submitted to the Secretary by the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Heritage Area designation shall be rescinded.

(b) FUNDING AUTHORITY.—The authority of the Secretary to provide assistance under this Act terminates on the date that is 15 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet in open session on Thursday, February 7, 2013, at 10:00 a.m. in room 216 of the Hart Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled ''No Child Left Behind: Early Lessons from State Flexibility Waivers.''

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact Leanne Hotek of the committee staff on (202) 228–6685.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The hearing will be held on Tuesday, February 12, 2013, at 10:00 a.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of this hearing is to explore opportunities and challenges associated with America's natural gas resources.

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

For further information, please contact Todd Wooten at (202) 224–4971 or Lauren Goldschmidt at (202) 224–5488.

EMBASSY SECURITY FUNDS TRANSFER ACT OF 2013

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 227, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 227) to authorize the transfer of certain funds to improve security at United States embassies and other diplomatic facilities worldwide, and for other purposes.

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

S. 227

Mr. LEAHY. Today I am pleased the Senate will pass the bipartisan Embassy Security Funds Transfer Act of 2013. This commonsense legislation will enact a provision similar to one passed overwhelmingly by the Senate last December as part of the Sandy Supplemental but that was stripped out by House Republicans.

This bill simply provides authority to the State Department to transfer up to $1.1 billion in overseas contingency operations funds appropriated in Fiscal Year 2012 for operations in Iraq, which are no longer needed due to reduced State operations there, to be used for increased security at U.S. embassies and other overseas posts identified in the Department's security review after the terrorist attack in Benghazi.

Making such resources available for these purposes is one of the recommendations of the Accountability Review Board chaired by Ambassador Pickering and Admiral Mullen. The bill permits the transfer of funds between the diplomatic and consular programs and embassy security construction and maintenance accounts. Such transfers would otherwise be precluded due to percentage limitations.

To be clear, this legislation appropriates no additional funds. It costs the taxpayers no additional money. It has no scoring impact. It merely allows for the transfer of existing, appropriated funds for this critical purpose. There is nothing controversial about this bill.

We all want to do what we can to prevent another tragedy like what occurred in Benghazi. The State Department has done a review, and these funds will be used to expedite construction of Marine security guard posts at overseas facilities and for the construction of other secure embassies. While it is impossible to guarantee the safety of our diplomats and aid workers, many

of whom risk their lives daily in dangerous places, we should protect them as best we can so they can carry out their duties as safely as possible.

As I mentioned, the Senate approved a similar provision last December, overwhelmingly, by voice vote. I thank Chairwoman MIKULSKI, Senator GRAHAM, and the other cosponsors for supporting this bill and for helping to expedite its consideration. I am confident that the chairwoman and ranking member of the House State and Foreign Operations Subcommittee share our view that this is an appropriate use of these funds. I hope the House will act quickly to send this bill to the President.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of this important legislation, I am pleased the Senate will pass this bill and once again provide for stronger security at our diplomatic facilities.

Numerous reports have documented the security failures that resulted in the tragic deaths of four Americans at the consulate in Benghazi. Both the Administrative Review Board and the report of the Senate Homeland Security Committee found that inexcusable failures of judgment led State Department decisionmakers to ignore the rising threat levels in Benghazi and the repeated requests for enhanced security at the site. Marine Security Guards were not on site to protect our consulate in one of the most dangerous and unstable regions in the world. The failures of management that led to these decisions are reprehensible; the lapses in judgment indefensible. It is beyond my comprehension why the individuals whose poor decisionmaking directly resulted in the deaths of four Americans remain employed by the State Department, and compensated by the U.S. taxpayers.

One of the most troubling aspects of the Benghazi attack is the complete disregard that State Department leadership gave to the repeated requests for enhanced security from Ambassador Christopher Stevens. Should funding have been an issue, the State Department always has the option available to come to Congress for approval to transfer funds within accounts. In fact, this is what S. 227 accomplishes—it provides the State Department transfer authority to prioritize diplomatic security in our embassies around the world. It is a sad, but necessary postscript to this tragic event—and a step that, if taken earlier by the State Department, may have saved the lives lost in Benghazi.

It is my hope that the Senate takes into consideration my repeated calls for increased Marine security at our embassies in high threat areas of the world. In the two budgets I have authored during my Senate tenure, I not only called for increased funding for military protection, but also for reducing the presence of embassies in the most dangerous areas of the globe. The safety of our men and women in diplomatic service must be prioritized. This means placing more emphasis on involvement in security by the Defense Department, but it also means assessing whether our diplomacy in the most dangerous areas of the world is better done from afar.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read three times 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 (S. 227) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 228

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 ''Embassy Security Funds Transfer Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. TRANSFER OF CERTAIN FUNDS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF SECURITY AT UNITED STATES EMBASSIES AND OTHER DIPLOMATIC FACILITIES WORLDWIDE.

(a) TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—Funds appropriated by title VIII of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act of 2012 (division I of Public Law 112–74; 125 Stat. 1265) under the headings ''DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR PROGRAMS'' and ''EMBASSY SECURITY, CONSTRUCTION, AND MAINTENANCE'' may be transferred between such headings.

(b) AVAILABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any funds transferred to a heading under subsection (a) shall be merged with funds in the heading to which transferred, and shall, except as provided in paragraph (2), be available subject to the same terms and conditions as the funds with which merged.

(2) DURATION OF AVAILABILITY.—Any funds transferred under subsection (a) shall be available for the same period for which such funds were originally appropriated.

(c) NOTIFICATION PROCEDURES.—Any transfer of funds under subsection (a) shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 209

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I understand that there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title for the first time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 209) to require a full audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Reserve banks by the Comptroller General of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I now ask for a second reading, but in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the majority leader, pursuant to Public Law 112–240, appoints the following as members of the Commission on Long-Term Care: Dr. Javaid Anwar of Nevada, Laphonza Butler of California, and Judith Feder of Virginia.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2013

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, February 7, 2013; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of S. 47, the Violence Against Women Act, with the time until noon equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, at noon on Thursday, Senator-designate Cowan will be sworn in.

We hope to reach an agreement to complete action on the Violence Against Women Act on Thursday.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2013 AT 9:30 A.M.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:41 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, February 7, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

ERIC K. FANNING, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE, VICE ERIN C. CONATON, RESIGNED.

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, VICE DANIEL PEARSON, TERM EXPIRED.

HARRY S TRUMAN SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION

MICHAEL WAYNE HAIL, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE HARRY S TRUMAN SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 10, 2017, VICE SHARON TUCKER, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

JANET LORRAINE LABRECK, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE COMMISSIONER OF THE REHABILITATION SERVICES ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, VICE LYNNAE M. RUTTLEDGE, RESIGNED.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING AND CELEBRATING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF SIG SANCHEZ

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 2013

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge and honor Sig Sanchez.

Sig was born to Spanish immigrant parents, as the second of eleven children. His mother worked in a cigarette factory in San Francisco and his father was an agricultural laborer. In 1942, Sig moved to Gilroy because of his involvement in agriculture. For 20 years, Sig owned a melon-packing operation with two of his brothers and a 600-acre farm to the south of Los Banos.

Sig entered public service over 55 years ago when one of his tractors broke down. He went to repair his tractor and the owner of the shop was on the Gilroy City Council. The councilmember proceeded to encourage Sig to join him on the council. Sig served for five years as a councilman and another five years as the mayor. He then served 16 years on the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors. As a county supervisor, Sig advocated for the merger of the Santa Clara County Flood Control and Water District with the Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation District to better address floor management and water importation. In all his years of public service, he tried to never leave his office without returning every phone call.

In 1980, Sig was appointed as an at-large director to the water district board. He was a key player in the 1987 merger of the Gavilan Water District in South County with the Santa Clara Valley Water District, which allowed for full integration of all the county's reservoirs and groundwater facilities. Sig was a charter board member in the 1992 development of the San Luis and Delta-Mendota Water Authority, a joint organization of 32 water and irrigation agencies that contract with the US Bureau of Reclamation for water from the Central Valley Project. He was also instrumental in water importation into Santa Clara County with the county Board of Supervisors, South Bay Aqueduct, water district board, and the San Felipe project. As the longest serving member of the water district's board of directors, Sig guided the agency on pressing water quality problems, steered the valley through both floods in the 1980s, and helped it survive the 1987–1992 drought.

Sig has served as a board member of HOPE Rehabilitation, Wheeler Hospital Foundation, and the Gilroy Elks Club. As a passionate advocate for water and flood control issues, he has been an active member of national, state, and local water resource organizations, including the Agricultural Water Advisory Committee, Central valley Project Authority, Pajaro River Watershed Flood Prevention Authority, San Luis & Delta Mendota Water Authority Board and Finance Committee, Uvas/Llagas Flood Control and Watershed Advisory Committee, Santa Clara Valley Water Commission, Santa Clara Valley Water District Board Ad Hoc Audit Committee, and the South County Regional Wastewater Authority.

In recognition of his service and contributions, Sig was inducted into the Gilroy Hall of Fame in 1991. A building in San Martin is named after Sig. He also has a 10-mile portion of state Highway Route 101, the Sig Sanchez Freeway, named in honor of his 12-year effort to lobby various government agencies to build the highway.

Sig is being honored as the Gilroy Chamber of Commerce's 2013 Man of the Year on February 9. I join in honoring his decades of contribution and service to the betterment of our society. The community is very fortunate to have benefited from his dedication, commitment, and advocacy. He has left his mark in the community and I know he will continue to play a positive role in the years to come.

GREAT LAKES EXPLORATION GROUP

HON. DAN BENISHEK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 2013

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Great Lakes Exploration Group on the occasion of the work they do to discover and preserve the maritime history of the State of Michigan and the Great Lakes. The group has not only worked to identify and save historic artifacts, but do so in a way that preserves the cultural heritage of the Great Lakes.

In particular, I wish to commend the Great Lakes Exploration Group on discovering the possible location of *Le Griffon*, a ship that went missing in 1697. If *Le Griffon* is found, not only will a centuries-long mystery be solved, but, more importantly, the Great Lakes Group will add to the historical treasure trove of our Nation's earliest days of settlement.

Through community-based, non-invasive underwater archaeology and research that leaves the bottomlands intact, the Great Lakes Exploration Group was formed to be a worldwide leader in identifying, protecting, and preserving rare pieces of North American history found in Michigan's waters.

I wish the Great Lakes Exploration Group all the best in locating and preserving the wreck of *Le Griffon* and learning what secrets it may hold.

IN CELEBRATION OF THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF BAKER AND O'BRIEN, INC.

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 2013

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Baker and O'Brien, Inc. as they celebrate twenty years of outstanding business.

Founded in 1993, Baker and O'Brien, Inc. started with merely six employees. With their commitment and vision, the company has since flourished to three offices and forty dedicated staffers that have served over 700 different clients. They uphold themselves to the highest standards of professionalism and integrity, which is reflected in the quality of their services and outstanding reputation. I commend Baker and O'Brien, Inc. for holding steadfast to their guiding principles of service, commitment, integrity, and confidentiality in their approach to business. Their success story exemplifies the American Dream; that in this land of great opportunity, hard work and dedication can turn a dream into reality.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my esteemed colleagues to join me in expressing our heartiest congratulations to Baker and O'Brien, Inc. as they celebrate twenty years of success.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF FORMER MAYOR VICENTE IGNACIO AGUON

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 2013

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of Vicente Ignacio Aguon, the former Mayor of the village of Chalan Pago-Ordot, Guam. Vicente was born on July 6, 1939, to the late Jose Manglona Aguon and Emperatriz Cruz Ignacio Aguon. He married Pacita Baza Aguon and had seven children. Vicente passed away on January 21, 2013, at the age of 73.

Vicente attended Chalan Pago Elementary and graduated from George Washington Senior High School. He then went on to graduate from the National Technical School in Inglewood, California and the Harcourt Learning Direct in Hotel Management. Additionally Vicente studied Electrical Engineering at Guam Community College and he completed seminars from Chicago Technical College in Building Construction.

Vicente was a dedicated public servant. From 1965–1985 he worked for the Guam Department of Public Works as an Electrical and Refrigeration Technician, Construction Inspector, Construction Inspector supervisor, construction Project Manager, and Acting Engineer. In 1986, he moved to the Guam Legislature and was a Legislative Consultant for the

18th and 19th Guam Legislature under the Rules Committee. He also served as the manager of the Tumon Village Complex from 1991–1995.

In 2000, Vicente was elected Mayor of Chalan Pago-Ordot. He paid particular attention to the wellbeing of the people of Chalan Pago-Ordot by voicing their concerns. When Vicente was not serving the people of Chalan Pago-Ordot he volunteered his free time as a Parish Council Member of Our Lady of Peace and Safe Journey Catholic Church. He also volunteered as Assistant State Commissioner for Guam Babe Ruth Baseball, and he was a Municipal Planning Council Member at the Chalan Pago-Ordot Community.

Vicente will be missed by all who knew and loved him. I extend my condolences to his wife Pacita Baza Aguon, his family and loved ones, including his children, Peter, Frances, Vicente, Raymond, Anthony, Josephine, and Beatrice.

HONORING THE LIFE OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL JACK REED, USAF

HON. DAVID SCOTT

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 2013

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I stand before you today to honor Lt. Col. Jack G. Reed, USAF (Ret.), who passed away at the age of 82 in December of 2012 in Granbury, TX. Lieutenant Colonel Reed was an honorable man who dedicated his life to his country.

Lieutenant Colonel Jack Reed was born near Rio Vista, Texas, on August 25, 1930. After attending Texas Tech, Mr. Reed joined the United States Air Force in January 1951 as an enlisted Soldier during the Korean War. In 1953, his abilities soon won him entrance to the Aviation Cadet program and a commission as a Second Lieutenant.

In 1954, Lieutenant Colonel Reed was selected for assignment to the B–47 program, and transferred to Mather AFB, Sacramento, CA. From 1954 to 1960, Mr. Reed was assigned to the 22nd Bombardment Wing, March AFB, and Riverside, CA. From 1960 to 1965, Mr. Reed was assigned to B–58s with the 63rd Bomb Squadron, 43rd Bombardment Wing, Carswell AFB, and Fort Worth, TX, where he participated in military preparedness for action against Cuba during the missile crisis of 1962.

Lieutenant Colonel Reed performed exceedingly above all that was asked of him as an Airman. In August 1965, Lieutenant Colonel Reed was one of two Air Force officers selected for assignment to the CIA/USAF programs OXCART/TAGBOARD/SENIOR BOWL at Groom Lake, NV, and later Beale AFB, CA.

Lieutenant Colonel Reed was a well rounded individual who consistently went above and beyond for his country. In 1971, Lieutenant Colonel Reed began working for the Pentagon where he worked on leading edge technology for air and space-based reconnaissance assets, including the U–2R. Mr. Reed promoted the development of many of the first unmanned aircraft flown by the United States military.

Lieutenant Colonel Reed's developmental work in the Air Force, Boeing and at Sperry/Unisys on unmanned air vehicles and remotely piloted aircraft led to the use of these systems today by various military departments and government agencies.

Though committed to service, Jack was not consumed by work. Despite numerous and lengthy absences from home to serve his country, Mr. Reed loved and mentored his children, participated in their activities, was a deacon in church congregations, and found time to travel and enjoy the outdoors, particularly the challenge of fishing. Everybody was drawn to Mr. Reed's charisma, because he genuinely enjoyed helping children, family, and even strangers; learn more about the wonders of this world, how it worked and what made things grow.

I commend Lieutenant Colonel Reed's contributions and his record of service to our Nation, his community and his family. I ask my colleagues to join me in extending heartfelt condolences to his wife of more than 59 years, Norma, his sons Jack W. Reed and Stephen E. Reed and their families.

CONGRATULATING BOB BENNETT

HON. BRUCE L. BRALEY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 2013

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Bob Bennett for being inducted into the Dubuque Area Labor Hall of Fame. Bob has dedicated his life to improving the relationship between labor and management through his service as a Commissioner of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service (FMCS).

Bob spent the early part of his career working at the Clinton Corn Processing Company where he joined the American Federation of Grain Millers union. He was appointed as a FMCS Commissioner in 1973. As Commissioner, Bob mediated over one thousand contracts in the private, public and healthcare sectors. Many of these cases were in the Dubuque area. Bob was also instrumental in providing a start up grant to establish a Labor Management Council in Dubuque.

Bob has the honor of being the namesake for an award given at an annual dinner. The Bob Bennett Good Faith Award is given to a representative from labor or management who lives up to the definition of "good faith". I congratulate Bob on his induction into the Dubuque Area Labor Hall of Fame and wish him all of the best in his future endeavors.

HONORING THE LIFE OF TRACY A. SUGARMAN

HON. JAMES A. HIMES

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 2013

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, January 20, we lost a cherished and dearly loved member of our community. Tracy Sugarman lit up the town of Westport, Connecticut, for 60 years with his ceaseless generosity, well-known sense of humor, and passion for social justice.

Mr. Sugarman served as a naval officer in World War II, leading troops up Normandy during the historic D-Day assault. His courage and fortitude in battle are emblematic of the heroism of the "Greatest Generation."

As an acclaimed illustrator and chronicler of the Civil Rights Movement, Mr. Sugarman bore witness to the many struggles faced by African Americans living in the Deep South. Mr. Sugarman's drawings helped bring to national attention the horrors of 1960's Mississippi, where black Americans faced threats of violence and death for registering to vote or attending a desegregated school.

Mr. Sugarman's sketches of major news events appeared in hundreds of magazines, books, and other media across the country. He brought his skilled and emotional work to the Saturday Evening Post, Forbes Magazine, Louis Armstrong record covers, and hundreds of children's books.

Mr. Sugarman's artwork is, by all counts, his greatest legacy: his drawings of the Civil Rights Movement are permanent archives in Mississippi and New York City. His painting, "The Heroes of Nine-Eleven," is on permanent display in Washington, DC. His painting of the Space Shuttle Columbia is part of NASA's archives at Cape Kennedy. And his collection of art from World War II is in use by the Library of Congress' Veterans History Project.

Mr. Sugarman also wrote a number of books, many relating to his experiences in the South. "Stranger at the Gate—A Summer in Mississippi" details the Freedom Summer of 1964, during which more than 1,000 volunteers flooded rural Mississippi to register voters; "We Had Sneakers, They Had Guns: the Kids Who Fought for Civil Rights in Mississippi" recounts the civil rights work of white college students, many of whom were arrested and beaten.

Whether it was in writing or on canvas, Mr. Sugarman brought to his work artful introspection, keen awareness, and brutal honesty. His strong dedication to his fellow man—and particularly to his community here in Connecticut—will be sorely missed.

IN HONOR OF MR. GORDON PROUT

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 2013

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life of Mr. Gordon Prout. Mr. Prout, a resident of Tinton Falls, New Jersey, passed away on December 17, 2012 after decades of public service as a civil engineer for the New Jersey Department of Transportation.

Prior to his 34 years of public service, Mr. Prout served his country honorably in the U.S. Army Air Corps during World War II. He was a navigator on a B–17 Flying Fortress for nine missions over Europe before being shot down and captured. Consequently, he spent 16 months as a prisoner in Stalag Luft I in Germany. Mr. Prout successfully returned home on the Queen Mary after being liberated by the Soviets in May, 1945.

Mr. Prout is survived by his devoted wife of 67 years, Anne Bruno Prout; a daughter and son-in-law, Judith and Mickey McCabe of Monmouth Beach and Bayonne; a son and daughter-in-law, Donald and Deborah Prout of VA; four grandchildren, Allison McCabe Matto

and her husband Joseph, Michael McCabe and his wife Tina, Derek Prout and his wife Jessica, and Bryan Prout and his fiancée Tayler Lyttle; and five great-grandchildren, Madelyn, Luke, Grace, Aiden and Abigail.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that my colleagues will join me in honoring Mr. Prout for his lifetime of public service to the State of New Jersey, and his dedicated service to our country.

REMEMBERING JUDGE JAMES H. TAYLOR

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 2013

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remember my friend, the late Judge James H. Taylor, who passed away on October 31 at his home in Upper Marlboro, Maryland. A prosecutor, judge, and family man, Jim was also a trailblazer as the first African-American to serve on the circuit court in Prince George's County.

Raised in Howard County, Maryland, Jim was one of ten children in a family that emphasized hard work and education. As a young man, he attended Carver Vocational-Technical High School in Baltimore to learn bricklaying, and he worked as a postal employee, a railroad oilman, and a cook to help support his widowed mother and his siblings.

After serving the nation in the Army Air Corps in 1945–1946, Jim matriculated at Howard University, where he graduated in 1950. In 1953, he was the first African-American law school graduate at American University.

In practicing law as one of the first African-Americans admitted to the bar in Prince George's County in 1956, Jim was described as a bold prosecutor who took risks and achieved results. Named Maryland's first African-American assistant state's attorney in 1963, Jim rose through the ranks of our state's legal establishment, breaking barriers along the way. In 1969, he was appointed to the bench by Governor Marvin Mandel and served for eighteen years before retiring from Maryland's Seventh Judicial Circuit in 1987.

Much of his casework dealt with family and child custody issues, and Jim drew on the experiences of his youth to help ensure that rulings of the court served the best interests of children and their future success.

An advocate for education in the study and practice of the law, Jim was a trustee of Prince George's Community College, which named a scholarship in his honor for paralegal students in 1992.

Above all else, Jim was a gentle giant who was able to accomplish great things in service to his fellow citizens without seeking attention for himself. He was a master of working behind the scenes to help others climb mountains and overcome hardships.

Jim, who was age 86, is survived by his wife of forty-four years, Jan Johnson Taylor; three children, and one stepdaughter; seven grandchildren; and three great-grandchildren. He also leaves behind his first wife, Lillian Miles Taylor, and a brother, Captain Milton Taylor (Ret.) of the Maryland State Police.

I join in remembering the life of Judge James H. Taylor and in celebrating his groundbreaking achievements as he helped advance the cause of justice in Maryland. He will be dearly missed by me and many others across my home state—but surely never forgotten.

THE HIGH SCHOOL DATA TRANSPARENCY ACT

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 2013

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today to introduce the High School Data Transparency Act. Since the enactment of Title IX in 1972, the number of women competing in college sports has soared by more than 600 percent while the number of high school girls competing in sports increased by over 1,000 percent. Yet, despite our incredible progress over the years, we still have more work to do.

Young women in high school currently receive 1.3 million fewer opportunities to play sports than young men, and this gap is increasing. The problem stems from a lack of transparency and accountability in our high schools. Federal law requires colleges and universities to report basic information about the funding of athletic programs for men and women and the participation of men and women throughout these sports. Due in part to this public information, American women have unrivaled opportunity at the collegiate level.

Unfortunately, the basic actions required of our universities are not required of our high schools. As a result, we are seeing fewer and fewer high schools realize full equality for male and female athletes, and more young women being denied the opportunity to realize their full potential both on and off the field.

I've met with many Olympic gold medalists who have told me that Title IX—and the accompanying athletic scholarships it made possible—was the reason they were able to attend college and pursue their dreams. These Olympians have emphasized that the benefits of sports participation are not limited to their achievements on the field. Indeed, statistics have shown that young women thrive when they participate in sports and are less likely to get pregnant, drop out of school, do drugs, smoke, or develop mental illness. Increasing young students' physical activity can also help combat childhood obesity, which is at an all-time high.

To address the lack of reporting at the high school level, the High School Data Transparency Act would require that high schools report basic data on the number of female and male students in their athletic programs and the expenditures made for their sports teams. This would be an easy change for our high schools to make. Several states, including Kentucky, Georgia, and New Mexico, have already implemented similar reporting requirements at the state level, and high school athletics directors from those states tell us that it usually takes just 2–6 hours of one person's time to complete each year.

The extraordinary accomplishments we've achieved together over the past four decades of Title IX are a cause for celebration, but we must look forward and continue our steady march of progress.

I urge my colleagues to build on our advancement and help ensure that young women in high school have equal opportunities to play sports by supporting the High School Data Transparency Act.

Thank you.

INTRODUCING THE DONATE FOR DISASTER RELIEF ACT

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 2013

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Donate for Disaster Relief Act.

Forty-seven major disasters were declared last year. The year before that, we had 99 major disasters. Three major disasters have already been declared in 2013. On top of that, there were a number of smaller incidents that don't rank on the scale. A tornado that destroys a single house might not be a ''super storm,'' but for the family that lost its home, that tornado certainly is a major disaster.

Things are not going to get better. There are going to be more major disasters. We are going to have to pay for the response and repair. We need to start thinking about what we can do ahead of time to be prepared for when they strike. We don't have to wait for the worst to happen before we actually do something. This bill will help us get ready beforehand. Why wait?

The Donate for Disaster Relief Act creates a completely voluntary check-off on income tax returns that lets taxpayers elect to donate to a disaster relief trust. This bill is an opportunity for us to share our selflessness and generosity before an emergency situation.

The harsh reality of disasters is that while we may not be able to predict when, we certainly can be prepared. The altruism of the American people is on display in their willingness to pitch in and help those in their greatest time of need. This bill creates an easy way for concerned Americans to anticipate the need for disaster relief, wherever and whenever it may be necessary.

CONGRATULATING WALT PREGLER

HON. BRUCE L. BRALEY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 2013

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Walt Pregler for being inducted into the Dubuque Area Labor Hall of Fame. Walt has been active in both the labor community and local politics in Dubuque since the 1950s.

Walt worked as a Tool Room Machinist at John Deere from 1955 to 1992. After starting at John Deere, Walt became a member of the United Auto Workers (UAW) Local 94. His involvement in the UAW eventually got him involved in Dubuque city politics. In 1965, Walt was elected to the Dubuque City Council where he served for nine years. During his tenure on the City Council, Walt was elected by his colleagues to serve as Mayor in 1966 and 1969. While on the Council, Walt was able to get federal funding to build a floodwall in Dubuque. Walt had a large list of other accomplishments while on the Council including

expansion of the Dubuque airport and expansion of the water treatment facilities at Eagle Point.

Throughout his life, Walt has continued to serve Dubuque's labor community. He was a delegate to the Dubuque Federation of Labor and chaired the UAW Local 94 Cope Committee. Walt currently serves as the President of the UAW Local 94 Retiree Chapter. I congratulate Walt on his induction into the Dubuque Area Labor Hall of Fame and wish him all of the best in his future endeavors.

IN RECOGNITION OF DELTA SIGMA THETA SORORITY, INC.'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 2013

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc. as it celebrates its 100th anniversary. Since its inception at Howard University in January 1913, Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc. has striven to serve the community. For 100 years, its leaders and members have continued the legacy and goals of its founders. They are committed to public service, education and social action locally, nationally and worldwide.

Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc. has a rich history to celebrate. Its second chapter was established in 1914 at Wilberforce University and it was incorporated as a national organization in 1930. In 1950, its first foreign chapter was established in Port-au-Prince, Haiti. Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc. celebrated its Golden Anniversary Year in 1963 with President Kennedy and Vice President Johnson and four years later met with President Johnson to discuss community issues and concerns. Over the years, Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc. has continued to grow, and in 2010, welcomed over 16,000 members from across the globe to its 50th National Convention.

Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc. works toward the advancement of civil rights, women's rights and equality and provides support and education to the community and world. Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc. has been responsible for the establishment of numerous schools in the United States and abroad. It has held conferences and summits for women, blacks, single parents and young men. In 1992, Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc. was the first African American organization to become affiliated with Habitat for Humanity.

Mr. Speaker, once again, please join me in congratulating Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc. on its 100th Anniversary and recognizing the Monmouth County Alumnae Chapter for the work they do to progress the mission of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF FORMER UMATAC MAYOR DEAN SANCHEZ

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 2013

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of Dean D. Sanchez, former Mayor of the village of Umatac, Guam. Dean was born on June 21, 1961, and was one of the seven children of a former village Chief Commissioner, Vincente Q. Sanchez, and his wife Priscilla Q. Sanchez. Dean married Jennifer Aguon Sanchez and have two sons, Alexander Dean and Chance Theo. Dean passed away on January 14, 2013, at the age of 51.

Before Dean was appointed Mayor of Umatac by former Governor Joseph F. Ada in 1991 he served as the Administrative Assistant to late former Mayor T. Topasna. Dean served as Mayor of Umatac until January 1993, after which he returned to his position as Administrative Assistant for former Mayor Daniel Q. Sanchez. In 2008, Dean ran for the position of Mayor and was elected by the residents of Umatac.

As Mayor of Umatac, Dean dedicated his life to serving the residents of his village. He paid particular attention to the wellbeing of the people of Umatac by voicing their concerns, such as the closing of F.Q. Sanchez Elementary and increasing cultural awareness in his participation in hosting Discovery Day festivities in Umatac. In addition to his elected role as Mayor of Umatac, Dean wore many hats and served the entire community of Guam as a member of the Commission on Self Determination; the Guam Product 19 Seal Task Force; the Department of Agriculture Aquatic & Wildlife 20 Resources—Fisheries; Civilian/Military Task Force; Association of Mariana Islands Mayors (AMIM), Vice Mayors, and Elected 22 Municipal Council Members.

Dean will be missed by all who knew and loved him. I extend my condolences to wife Jennifer, his family and loved ones, including his children, Alexander and Chance.

RECOGNIZING BRIAN BOATRIGHT, RECIPIENT OF THE BOY SCOUT HONOR MEDAL

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 2013

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to commend the heroic actions of a young member of our Central Florida community. In recognition of his swift and decisive action in a moment of life or death, Brian Boatright has been awarded the Boy Scout's Honor Medal.

On the fifth day of a tough hike up Big Red, a rugged New Mexico mountain, one of Brian's troop leaders suffered an apparent heart attack and collapsed. Stranded without cell phone reception 11,000 feet up the mountain, Brian and his fellow scouts acted on the skills and knowledge learned during scouting.

While others in the group searched for cell reception and applied CPR, Brian led several of his fellow Scouts as they navigated four miles to the nearest staffed camp. From the camp, a helicopter was called to the site and the leader was evacuated to a hospital where he underwent successful heart bypass surgery. For his actions on Big Red that day, Brian was awarded the Boy Scout's Honor Medal, one of the highest honors awarded by the Boy Scouts.

The Honor Medal is bestowed on scouts who demonstrate unusual heroism and skill or resourcefulness in saving or attempting to save life at considerable risk to self. In the 90-year history of the Boy Scouts, only 2,302 other scouts have been awarded the Honor Medal. Brian is a sophomore at Bishop Moore High School and a member of Troop 6 in Orlando.

I commend Brian for his quick thinking and decisive actions under great pressure. His deeds are a credit to the Boy Scouts and he is well deserving of this recognition.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 2009, the day I took office, the national debt was $10,627,961,295,930.67.

Today, it is $16,433,791,850,294.04. We've added $5,805,830,554,363.37 to our debt in 4 years. This is $5.8 trillion in debt our Nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a Balanced Budget Amendment. We must stop this unconscionable accumulation of debt.

IN HONOR OF THE UNI-CAPITOL WASHINGTON INTERNSHIP PROGRAM

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 2013

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Uni-Capitol Washington Internship Program. Since its inception 14 years ago, the program has placed some of Australia's best and most passionate university students with House and Senate offices for two-month full-time internships annually. These internships have enabled me and my staff, who have participated since the program's inception, to share in our common values and ideals while at the same time learning more about the culture and people of Australia.

This year, I am delighted to welcome Elizabeth Flora into my Washington, DC office. I am thrilled to have the opportunity to participate in this valuable exchange program, meeting Australian students that have a passion for American politics. Since its commencement, the program has seen more than 130 young Australians walk the halls of Congress in various capacities and it is with the utmost pride that I recognize the importance of the Uni-Capitol Washington Internship Program in the United States House of Representatives.

Elizabeth joined my office on January 2, 2013 from the University of Canberra where she is pursuing her B.A. in Communications and Media. During her time in my office, Elizabeth has proven herself to be a caring, humorous, intelligent and dedicated intern and I am honored to host her. In addition to serving my constituents with professionalism and respect, she has attended hearings and briefings, drafted legislative correspondence and has assisted my staffers with a variety of important research projects.

In addition to working in offices throughout Congress, all Uni-Capitol Washington interns are given the opportunity to explore our brand of democracy through panel discussions with political correspondents, Members of Congress and representatives from various government offices as well as professionals at non-government agencies.

Founded and directed by former House and Senate staffer, Eric Federing, the program fosters cultural and educational exchanges between the United States and Australia. Mr. Federing deserves distinguished praise for his efforts and dedication in coordinating this program, and the support and opportunities he provides to all participants is truly incredible.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot fully express how critical this program is to strengthening ties with America's allies and offering inspiration for the students of today that may become the leaders of tomorrow. Participating in this program has been a remarkable experience that has inspired Elizabeth for her future endeavors and gave my office the sincere pleasure of having an Australian working among us. I extend my sincere appreciation to Mr. Federing for developing and organizing this program, to my fellow Members of Congress and their dedicated staff for hosting, to Elizabeth for grasping this opportunity with an open heart and a curious mind and to all participants for engaging in public service. I ask my colleagues to join with me in recognizing the contributions of the Uni-Capitol Washington Internship Program and, again, thanking Elizabeth Flora for her admirable participation and diligent work.

CLAIRTON BEARS PIAA CLASS A STATE CHAMPIONS

HON. MICHAEL F. DOYLE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 2013

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Clairton Bears on another perfect high school football season and their fourth consecutive PIAA Class A state championship victory.

The Bears now have 63 straight wins after their victory in Hershey, PA, giving them the longest winning streak in all of high school, collegiate, and professional football. It is also the longest such streak in Pennsylvania history.

Both the players and the coaches put in years of hard work that led to this sustained success on the field, and in their success they have brought hope to the town and the region.

Tom Nola has now served as the team's head coach for 11 years, and he is assisted by coaches Tim Bukowski, Jim Dumm, Eric Fusco, Marc Gambino, Wayne Wade, Jr., and Remondo Williams, Sr.

The team was led by sixteen seniors—Tyus Booker, Santeaun Sims, Bryon Clifford, Terrish Webb, Titus Howard, Nick Boswell, Vinny Moody, Robert Boatwright, Armani Ford, Tyler Boyd, Sedrick Nash, Devonte Harvey, Damond Flowers, Jordan Gressem, Kyuss Jeter, and Garret Santoline.

In addition, the team included a number of underclassmen—JoJuan Bray, Ryan Williams, Tyreike Hammonds, Khalil Berry, Aaron Matthews, Vance Allen, Esaias Hammons, Brandon Murphy, James Hines, Deven Fritz, Demar Bell, Jjuan Jackson, Brian Brown, Raymone Clifford, Josh Wilson, Dryan Davenport, Vance Gibson, Israel Melvin, Will Hampton, Jhsia Miles, Devondre Brown, Jayll Hall, Carlito Spence, and Allen Norris.

The Clairton Bears continue to make Pittsburgh proud through the high standard of athletic excellence they have brought to the gridiron. Clairton has a rich history of perseverance and hard work, and the Bears continue to build on that legacy. I give them my hearty congratulations, and I wish them all the best as they look to dive deeper into the record books next season.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF BLACK JANUARY

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 2013

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in remembrance of the over 130 innocent men, women, and children who were killed by the Red Army in the days following its invasion of Azerbaijan 23 years ago.

On January 20, 1990, the Soviet Union, in a brutal attempt to end the growing independence movement in Azerbaijan, sent in 26,000 troops under the pretext of restoring public order, while actually aiming to forcefully end peaceful demonstrations for independence.

The invasion and subsequent massacre, which resulted in over 130 killed, 611 injured, and 841 arrests, is remembered as ''Black January'' in the Republic of Azerbaijan today and has left an indelible mark on that nation's memory.

It was the overt oppression of innocent people by the Soviet government that further inspired the Azerbaijani people to regain its independence after 70 years of foreign rule.

Less than two years later, on October 18, 1991, Azerbaijan gained its independence from the Soviet Union and was soon recognized by the international community.

Today, the United States and Azerbaijan enjoy a close and important relationship, built on trust, understanding, and mutual support. It is important on this day that America remembers the trials and tribulations our friends in Azerbaijan have had to endure for the cause of freedom and continue to support their vital role as a beacon of democracy and prosperity in the Caspian Region.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to please join me in remembering the tragic events of Black January and honor those who gave their lives in order to give birth to their country.

HONORING ANDERSON HOUSE FOR ITS PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. LEONARD LANCE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 2013

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Anderson House for two decades of public service. Anderson House has been a resource for women in need in Hunterdon County. It has a record of accomplishment for which the organization should be very proud. It has have selflessly played a role in lives of countless women and I thank Anderson House for its public service.

Anderson House offers the best in comprehensive care that treats all aspects of the disease of addiction. It offers physical, psychological, emotional and spiritual treatment to provide the top care to those who need it most. The outstanding staff and volunteers help those suffering from addiction obtain the tools necessary to become drug-free, to rejoin their awaiting families and to reenter the community.

I thank all members of the Anderson House family for their fine work. They have made a difference in the lives of many women and those who receive their excellent care will forever remember the fine service and dedication of Anderson House.

I also wish to praise the following honorees for their fine work: Janet Schrnidling, Marfy Goodspeed, Dr. Boris Ivovich, and the late Kay Applegate.

I again thank these public servants.

IN RECOGNITION OF ST. JAMES' CHURCH AND BEATRIZ OESTERHELD

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 2013

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate St. James' Church and Beatriz Oesterheld as they are honored by the Long Branch Concordance at their ''Success Starts at Home'' fundraiser. The work St. James' Church and Beatriz Oesterheld do for their community is truly deserving of this recognition.

Celebrating its 100th anniversary at its current location, which also now houses the Long Branch Concordance Family Success Center, St. James' Church has continued to grow and provide spiritual guidance to the community of Long Branch. St. James' Church was founded in the mid-1850s in response to the need for Episcopal worship services for summer visitors and residents. Since that time, St. James' Church has expanded to include an educational room, choir room, meeting room and many other facilities for the congregation and community at large. The church also houses St. Brigid's Pantry and Kitchen, which provides food and other items to those in need and has been especially helpful to residents in the aftermath of Superstorm Sandy. St. James' Church provides faith, fellowship and solace to its parish and the community.

As Executive Director of the Community Affairs and Resource Center, Beatriz Oesterheld works to ensure all those in need receive assistance. The Community Affairs and Resource Center provides services to Monmouth County residents despite of their language and ethnic background. Ms. Oesterheld is also an outreach coordinator at the Monmouth Family Health Center and an advocate for lead screening and treatment for children. Ms. Oesterheld's work helps advance the well-being of the community.

The Long Branch Concordance is a resource center that provides services, information and support to the community. It works

with other organizations to reach and assist the residents of Long Branch. Its ''Success Starts at Home'' fundraiser honors its community partners for the work they do to strengthen the community.

Mr. Speaker, once again, please join me in congratulating St. James' Church and Beatriz Oesterheld for their contributions to the community and thank the Long Branch Concordance for hosting tonight's ''Success Starts at Home'' event.

CONGRATULATING FRANCIS GIUNTA

HON. BRUCE L. BRALEY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 2013

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Francis Giunta for being inducted into the Dubuque Area Labor Hall of Fame. Francis has been an active member of the Communication Workers of America (CWA) for over 40 years.

Francis has been an active member of the Dubuque labor community. In 1975, he was elected Chief Union Steward for his CWA local. In 1977, Francis was elected President of his CWA local which is a position he continues to hold today. Francis has served many different roles in the Dubuque labor community. He served as President of the Dubuque Federation of Labor in the 1980s and has sat on various labor boards such as the United Labor Participation Committee and the Dubuque Area Labor Management Council.

Francis has also seen a lot of change throughout his career. When Francis began his career in telecommunications, many Americans were using ''party lines'' which were shared telephone lines used by multiple households. When he retired, he worked in a digital subscriber age dealing with DSL and Broadband lines. I congratulate Francis on his induction into the Dubuque Area Labor Hall of Fame and wish him all of the best in his future endeavors.

HONORING MR. DANNIEL J. PETRO, RECIPIENT OF THE FIRST INAUGURAL DANNIEL J. PETRO—''THE BRIGHT FUTURE OF WEST ORANGE'' AWARD

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 2013

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity to recognize a close friend of mine and a highly accomplished leader in the electrical contracting field. Mr. Danniel J. Petro is a co-founder and Chief Executive Officer of Bright Future Electric, LLC, and he is a devoted servant to the Central Florida community.

Dan began his electrician career as an Apprentice Electrician for Indiana University in the early 1960's. In 1965, after completing his training and passing his journeyman qualifications test, Dan became supervisor of his father's company, Petro Electric.

Relocating to Florida in 1970, Dan began working for Orange County Schools as an Area Lead Electrician until 1973 when he acquired his Florida Master Electrician License and joined the Local 606 while working with Fishbach & Moore. Continuing his education, Dan earned his Florida Teaching Certificate in 1975 and started an electrician program for Westside Vo-Tech. After several years of teaching others, Dan took his talent and founded Amber Electric in 1979.

Amber Electric became known for its quality and reliable service, and under his leadership, grew into a multi-million dollar company which was sold in 1998 to Integrated Electrical Services, IES, based out of Houston, Texas. In the Amber Electric and IES merger, Dan joined IES as one of their Founding Partners and as the Regional Operating Officer for the State of Florida.

After 17 years of partnership, Dan resigned from his post as President of Eastern Operations for IES in 2005. In 2006, Dan, Roger Scroggins and Allen McMain founded Bright Future Electric, LLC, with offices located in Florida and Alabama.

Throughout his long career, Dan has established an impressive and storied history of involvement in the Central Florida community. He has served many boards and committees, including the Florida State Department of Education Advisory Committee and the West Orange Chamber of Commerce, where he formally served as Chairman and currently serves as a trustee. Due to his leadership in the community, he has also received many awards and recognitions for his efforts including the Florida Association of Electrical Contractors, FAEC, Lifetime Achievement Award and on several occasions the FAEC Man of the Year Award.

Dan has been a constant source of support for our community. He has promoted an array of community associations including, the Florida Department of Community Affairs, West Orange Boys and Girls Club, Friends of Lake Apopka, Oakland Nature Preserve, Health Alliance Family Care Center, the Winter Garden Heritage Foundation, and Winter Garden Rotary Club. His generous spirit is an example of the life-changing impact a dedicated leader can have on individual lives and a community.

On February 7, 2013, the West Orange Chamber of Commerce will be honoring Mr. Petro with the first inaugural Danniel J. Petro—''The Bright Future of West Orange'' Award at the Annual Big Orange Awards Reception in West Orange County. Through his investment in the community, he has created opportunities and served others in our community in a way that keeps our futures bright. There is no doubt that this prestigious award deserves to bear Dan's name.

On behalf of the citizens of Central Florida, I am honored to recognize Dan for the devotion with which he serves our community. His commitment to excellence, leadership and service is to be admired, and his example inspires others to follow in his footsteps.

DR. PETER R. BETZER HONORED FOR HIS VISIONARY LEADERSHIP

HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 2013

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join the leaders of the science and education community of the Tampa Bay area who are honoring Dr. Peter R. Betzer of St. Petersburg, Florida this Saturday with the 2013 ARCS STEM Visionary Catalyst Award for his life-long work to inspire generations of students to pursue the study of science, technology, engineering and math, STEM.

There is no more appropriate award with which to honor Peter than one that pays tribute to his vision because he has brought vision and strong leadership to every area in which he has been involved over the more than 40 years he has lived and worked in our community.

Peter found his way to St. Petersburg in 1971 after receiving his Ph.D. from the University of Rhode Island. He taught chemical oceanography at the University of South Florida's Department of Marine Science. By 1982 he became Chairman of the Department and in 2000 he was named Dean of the newly established College of Marine Science. I still remember my first meetings with Peter as the Department and College grew. We agreed at the time that we would do all we could to make the University of South Florida in St. Petersburg a world-class center for the study of marine science. With Peter's vision and his passion we have done just that.

Under Peter's guidance, the College became an important partner of the United States Navy in developing systems to protect our nation's ports and waterways as well as those of our allies. The technology and systems developed there have proven extremely useful to our nation's homeland and environmental security agencies. These include an underwater mass spectrometer and an underwater mapping system that have created tremendous commercial opportunities and were critical to monitoring the impact of oil from the 2010 Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill.

The development of these systems only enhanced the growth of the University's reputation as a world-class center for the study of marine science, and strengthened Peter's efforts to bring other agencies and businesses to St. Petersburg: this to create a true marine science hub in the southeast U.S. Together, the community developed an innovative plan to bring the United States Geological Survey to campus and established an office of NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service in downtown St. Petersburg. Along with the city, we developed a public/private partnership to bring the world-renowned SRI International to the port and to bring nearby a new division of Draper Labs. Peter was at the center as the architect of all these developments. With each one, the opportunities to study the sciences grew along with the interests of local, national and international students.

It is Dr. Peter Betzer's ability to provide the vision and act as the catalyst that the ARCS Foundation, which stands for Achievement Rewards for College Scientists, will be honoring at a dinner to raise funds to support Tampa Bay area students pursuing the study of science, technology, engineering and math.

As a leader in Marine Science education at the University of South Florida, Peter recognized early-on the importance of promoting the broad spectrum of STEM to USF's students. Back in the early 1990's, a bright marine science student named Mike Morris started with an idea born of studying ocean chemical processes and created a company worth tens of millions of dollars in a few short years—

Ocean Optics. Peter is quick to recognize that the success took a team led by Mike Morris, but it would not have happened if not for Peter's leadership, mentorship and behind-the-scenes support.

In the world of business, Ocean Optics was just the beginning. Other companies, like Claro Scientific, came to St. Petersburg because of Peter's efforts. And, Peter's behind-the-scenes support for the ''STEM-business'' connection was ultimately a deciding element in both SRI International's and Draper Lab's decisions to locate in St. Petersburg. Those organizations brought dozens of high-paying knowledge jobs to the region and thus helped to establish an emerging regional technology cluster.

While Peter has always understood the importance of developing new businesses, for him an emphasis on education has been his highest priority. While leading the world-class ocean research programs at the College of Marine Science, Peter spearheaded the creation of the Oceanography Camp for Girls to inspire them to consider career opportunities in the sciences, with nearly 1000 ''teenaged scientists'' attending the camp so far. He also established a marine science-based remote learning program which televises informative middle-school marine science lessons across the country reaching tens of thousands more.

When Peter retired from academic life, he decided to push the throttle further forward. Leading the St. Petersburg Downtown Partnership as its President and CEO, Peter continued to perform miracles. From providing vision for the downtown waterfront, to making international connections with world-class groups such as Cousteau Divers to securing businesses like LumaStream for St. Petersburg, his many accomplishments seem to have no end. Most noteworthy is Peter's passionate championing of the SunBay Digital Math program for Pinellas County middle schools. The SunBay math program, through a collaborative partnership of SRI International and the University of South Florida St. Petersburg, has positively impacted more than 2500 students by enhancing their understanding of the principles of algebra—a crucial element in the future success of anyone in a STEM-related career.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when this Congress and our nation are doing all we can to encourage our youth to consider careers in math and science, let there be no doubt of Dr. Peter Betzer's life-long passion in this regard. For Peter, it has been a multiplier effect as the students he has inspired throughout his career have in turn passed along Peter's passion to their students and coworkers to bring more interest and more focus to STEM education and careers. There is clearly no one more deserving of the ARCS STEM Visionary Catalyst Award than Dr. Peter Betzer and I am proud to say to him thank you for a job well done.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF CAROL HAFNER

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 2013

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Carol Hafner for her service, as she prepares to retire from her position as Fresno County's Agricultural Commissioner/Sealer of Weights and Measures. Carol will be leaving the Fresno County Department of Agriculture after more than 34 years of service.

Born into a farming family, Carol has a deep understanding of agriculture—the lifeblood of California's San Joaquin Valley. She earned a Bachelor's degree in Biological Sciences, with an emphasis in botany from California State University, San Jose. In 1979, she was offered a job as an agricultural biologist/inspector at the Fresno County Department of Agriculture and immediately formed an attachment with the community. After 10 years as an agricultural biologist/inspector she was hired as a deputy and served in that position for 19 years. Carol then worked as assistant commissioner for nine months before becoming the Agricultural Commissioner. She held that position for over four years.

Carol has made many outstanding contributions during her time at the Fresno County Department of Agriculture. The methyl iodide application and the European grapevine moth (EGVM) quarantine was a challenge that Carol encountered. Even though it created an obstacle for the department, she ended the chaos and fixed the problem in a short period of time. Also, while other departments in the County were facing tough budget challenges, Carol found the money to fill four positions in her department. In addition, Carol developed great relations between the Fresno County Department of Agriculture and growers in the surrounding area.

The Agricultural Commissioner plays a vital role in Fresno's multi-billion dollar agriculture industry. Carol's hard work and dedication to our Valley made her perfect for the position, and she served the County of Fresno proudly.

Carol plans to stay active in the agricultural community when she retires. She will serve on the Specialty Crop Block Grant Review Committee, and she will resume her involvement in California Women for Agriculture (CWA). In addition, Carol and her husband, Tye will both be retiring, so they can spend much needed time with their sons and prize winning miniature schnauzers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the service of Ms. Carol Hafner. The work she has done for Valley agriculture will have a lasting impact on Fresno County and the entire State of California.

THE EVAN AMENDMENT BY HOLLY SCHEUREN

HON. MARK POCAN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 2013

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit the following by Holly Scheuren:

It was 4 years ago and it still feels like it was yesterday.

Our daughter Maia was 2 years old and we were halfway through our second pregnancy, I could feel our baby moving. I had my ''20 week ultrasound'' when I was actually 21 weeks pregnant. We were so excited.

At the ultrasound, the technician told us that we're having a baby boy! I thought ''A boy? I know nothing about raising a boy!''

The technician joked with us that he must have his legs tucked up under him. Then she just got really quiet, finished the ultrasound and led us into the waiting room. We called our moms to tell them that we are having a BOY! They were equally excited.

Minutes later, we were called back. The nurse practitioner was VERY serious. I asked if there was something wrong. And she said ''Well, yes. Your baby's limbs are measuring in the 5th percentile and you need to have another ultrasound with another doctor.'' My mind was blank . . . what do you mean, his limbs are in the 5th percentile? Is that dwarfism?'' I asked. She said the physician would answer my questions. She said don't go on-line looking for answers, but of course that's what I did.

I could not be seen for 3 days. In those 3 days I researched what is meant when a fetus has short limbs . . . it must be some form of dwarfism. I read how it may be associated with Down's syndrome. I was preparing to have a baby with Down's syndrome or dwarfism. I started researching support groups in Madison. I started thinking about how we would eventually have to remodel our kitchen to accommodate a person with dwarfism. I was crying and wondering what kind of life my boy would have. Would it be better to have Dwarfism or Down's syndrome? . . .

When I called my Dad and told him that the baby probably has dwarfism. In his best job to comfort me, he said ''well, them are nice people, too.'' (that actually made me laugh). I knew that both my family and I were ready for this.

We had no idea.

The 3 days until my ultrasound were torture. The day of, I was dizzy with anticipation. I tried to crack jokes but soon, the room was filled only with clicks on the computer. At one point, they turned the screen to show me my baby! They got a shot of my baby giving the ''I love you'' in sign language! He was telling me he loves me. They printed a picture of my baby. He looked peaceful. He looked normal.

After a long wait, the genetic counselor came in and wrote 2 long words on a piece of paper and turned it towards us and slowly read out loud ''Thanatoporic dysplasia''. ''What's that??? I interrupted.

She said it is a rare form of dwarfism. ''Oh, so our baby will be a dwarf.'' The air was so thick. Pointing at the first word she said ''thanatophoric'' means ''imminent death''. WHAT?? What do you mean??? My head was screaming, even though the room was completely silent.

She explained our baby's long bones were short. His skull is strawberry shaped. His jaw is deformed. His brain has a lot of fluid in it. If he was born, he would not be able to breathe because his lungs could not expand in his tiny rib cage. I pleaded ''maybe his bone growth will catch up with the rest of his body!! Maybe he will just be very small!'' She said that the baby would not survive much past birth.

I felt like I couldn't breathe. The doctor came back into the room. I showed her the ultrasound picture ''But he looks normal and peaceful!''

They then told us that we have two options. We can choose to terminate the pregnancy, or carry the baby to term, and the delivery staff would be ready with ventilators and pain management until the baby died. My regular doctor happened to be on call that day; she came into the room and hugged me. She said she also looked at the ultrasound, and the baby was not going to live.

We were devastated. What would we do?? Part of me wanted to give birth to him, just so I could hold him. But I knew that the image of seeing him suffer would haunt me for the rest of my life.

We decided we would end the pregnancy.

When the genetic counselor returned I told her we decided to terminate, and wanted it done at a hospital. She said that the hospital refers all abortion procedures to the Planned Parenthood's health center where abortions are still available. I did NOT want to go to a clinic and walk through protesters on one of the worst days of my life.

The genetic counselor confirmed no hospital would perform this abortion, and she would schedule an appointment for me at Planned Parenthood.

We went to Olin park and just sat in the car, crying. Calling our parents, calling my boss. All this time, I could feel the baby alive moving inside of me. My son. Alive and inside of me.

Our counselor called with more bad news. To comply with Wisconsin's 24 hour waiting period law, I would be too far along to have the procedure at Planned Parenthood. She said there is a clinic in Chicago who could see me in a few days. If they assessed that the baby was too big, then I would have to go to Kansas.

She said the abortion in Chicago is a 3 day process, so I would need to get a hotel. Over this time they would slowly dilate my cervix with bamboo reeds and would do the procedure Friday morning and it would cost $1500 cash.

Now I am calling my Dad to ask for money. Word of this spread fast at work and someone took up a collection that raised $200. My Dad gave us $1000 and we came up with the rest. Our moms bought the hotel room and came with us, along with our 2 year old daughter Maia.

The clinic was in an unfamiliar neighborhood and there were tons of protesters with signs about killing babies. I expected this, but I didn't expect them to SHOUT at me. JESUS!! They have NO CLUE why I am having an abortion. They don't know what I am going through. I wanted to scream SHUT UP!!

The clinic staff were friendly but the 70's decor waiting room had no privacy. I was crying, my mom was holding me, and people were staring at me. I wanted to explain to everyone that my baby was going to die.

My name was called and the nurse did an ultrasound, I finally went to a room that looked like an operating room, put my feet up in the stirrups and had reeds inserted into my cervix. OUCH!! It felt like the worst period cramps ever!

Friday morning, lying on my hotel bed, my partner and our moms all laid their hands on my belly. We said prayers. We said goodbye. Goodbye baby boy. Goodbye Evan.

On Friday there were even more protesters. They must know that this is ''abortion day''. They yelled that a girl just died here last week.

Inside, the staff was friendly and warm, but I felt like we were cattle, being moved from one room to the next, just wearing a thin gown. No privacy, no loved ones.

Finally, I went into the surgery room, was put under anesthesia and I woke up to a nurse calling my name. ''Holly . . . wake up. Holly.'' I opened my eyes. I was in a room with maybe 20 other women all lined up in beds. I felt like I was dreaming. I remember looking at the floor and it seemed far, far away. I felt so dizzy. I knew something was wrong the minute I threw up the ginger ale that I just drank.

The nurses wanted to bring me back to the recovery room. On the way there, I felt so dizzy, I fell on the floor with one of them. I peed all over!! The anesthesiologist came and asked me some questions, gave me a shot to help me wake up. I started having horrible rib pain and I couldn't stay awake. I could hear the nurse ask me questions, but I felt like I was dreaming.

The doctor said there was nothing unusual about my procedure and would check back with me. I felt so alone. My ribs were killing me. The nurse told me they would allow me to either bring back my mom or my partner. I chose my mom.

My mom stared into my face. She held my hand. She told the nurse that something was very wrong. Then the clinic director came and sat with us. And while they talked, I kept passing out.

My mom suggested to the doctor and anesthesiologist it might be pulmonary embolism. The doctor said when he was done he would call an ambulance and go with us to Northwestern Hospital. If they called an emergency ambulance, they would take us to the nearest hospital, which was Catholic and he wanted me to go to Northwestern.

All the women were recovered and going home. Except me. Around 5 pm, the ambulance came. The EMT lifted me onto the bed. I screamed in pain. WHAT WAS HAPPENING TO ME?

The ride to Northwestern seemed to take forever.

The emergency room doctor said he needed to wait for an emergency OB/GYN, who then did a trans-vaginal ultrasound and told me I would need a cat scan right away. They put a catheter in me and my urine was brown. My Mom panicked and thought my organs were shutting down. (my Mom watched WAY too many ER shows at the time. . .)

The emergency doctor came back and said my uterus had been perforated during the abortion and I was bleeding internally. He said they may have to take my uterus.

I heard my Mom on the phone to my dad, crying about what was happening. The doctor told me that they had to wait for a special team of OB/GYN doctors and specialized nurses. I waited just staring into darkness. Hearing the fear in my Mom's voice, I just kept thinking about my daughter Maia. Then in walks in the anesthesiologist. . .

The next thing I remember, I was in a bed, looking at big Chicago buildings and it looked like dawn. There was a man looking at me. I asked him if I lost my uterus. He said ''yes.'' I remember pleading: ''Why didn't they just sew it back up??'' I was stunned and crying.

My partner had to take the moms and Maia back to Madison. My mom came in to hug and kiss me, and then they left. I've never felt so alone.

The doctor who did the surgery came in. He held my hand. He told me that I am a very lucky person, that I lost 2 liters of blood and nearly died.

I was in the hospital for 4 days, including Mother's Day. My Mother's Day was spent looking out at a rainy, cold Chicago, again thinking about Maia, who was in Madison with her Grandma. I had no baby boy, no uterus, and I nearly lost my life. Maia almost lost her Mother.

Flash forward a month. The bills start rolling in . . . surgery room $17,000 . . . Anesthesiologist $11,000 . . . Facility charges $75,000. AND . . . my insurance denied EVERYTHING because expenses were related to a non-covered service. My insurance company only covered abortions if the mother's life was in danger. Not if the baby's life was in danger.

It seemed like I was sobbing 20 hours a day. I didn't want to talk to anyone except my mom.

I started going through the appeals process which kept getting denied. I was supposed to appeal, in front of the appeals board, made up of people I work for! I was filled with anxiety and dread THEN, my insurance case worker called and said someone at my company went up the chain to the top to plead my case. The person at the top decided that our insurance company would cover all my expenses at 100% AND that a new policy would be implemented for all members to cover abortion care for fatal fetal anomalies!!!! I call this the Evan Amendment!!

Hallelujah.

A great way to get through my grief was to bury myself into the world of adoption as I wanted a second child.

A year and a half later, my mom and I flew to Ethiopia to bring home our beautiful daughter Amara Selamawit.

No family should have to go through what I went through. Hospitals should be performing later-term abortions. I can't help but wonder how the outcome would have been different had I been able to have my abortion done at a safe, modern hospital.

No one should have to suffer while trying to do what's right for their children.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE BIRTHDAY OF JANICE JENNINGS

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 2013

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask for the House's attention today to recognize Jan Jennings who is celebrating her 60th birthday on Thursday, February 7th, 2013.

Mrs. Jennings was born on February 7th, 1953 in Anniston, Alabama to Johnny and Ruby Reaves. She is one of seven children. She graduated from Saks High School and went on to attend Gadsden State University, where she got her degree in Nursing. She later received her Business degree from Jacksonville State University in 1989.

In 1983, Jan married Jeff Jennings, also a native of Anniston, Alabama. Later, in 1987, they welcomed their only child, Jessica. In 2010, they adopted their beloved labradoodle, Tully.

For almost 20 years, Jan practiced as a nurse at Regional Medical Center in Anniston, Riverview Medical Center in Gadsden, and Montclair Baptist Hospital in Birmingham. Jan then left to pursue her dreams of traveling the world when she joined the medical sales industry. Jan is still in the industry today, working as a Trainer for EndoGastric Solutions.

After over 40 years of living in Anniston, Alabama, Jan and her family relocated to High Point, North Carolina, where they live today. Although she lives in North Carolina, Jan remains a dedicated fan of the University of Alabama Crimson Tide.

Mr. Speaker, we join her family and friends in celebrating Jan's birthday and wishing her many more.

RECOGNIZING MS. OLLIE LEE MCMILLAN MASON

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 2013

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the life and achievements of Ms. Ollie Lee McMillan Mason. Ms. Mason lived her life with determination and with a commitment to serving others. As the first black nurse on the staff of

Parkland Memorial Hospital in 1937, Ms. Mason was a trailblazer for others who would follow in her path.

A Dallas, Texas, native, Ms. Mason moved to Washington, DC, to study at the Freedmen's Hospital School of Nursing. After graduating in 1929, she served as chief nurse at the McMillan Sanitarium in Dallas, an institute founded by her father, Dr. W. R. McMillan. Ms. Mason later studied obstetrics for a year at Bellevue Hospital Center in New York City. During her time in New York, she married Duane B. Mason.

When Ms. Mason and her husband returned to Dallas, Ms. Mason began working at Parkland Memorial Hospital in the obstetrics department. She became a public health nurse for Dallas in 1941. Ms. Mason continued her nursing education at Michael Reese Hospital in Chicago, and earned her bachelor's degree in nursing at Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland. Ms. Mason always used her education to serve her community in Dallas, whether teaching others to care for premature infants or working for the school district.

Never shying away from a challenge, Ms. Mason joined the Peace Corps in 1972 and served in Mauritius. After working overseas, Ms. Mason came back to Dallas and worked for Tremont Health Care Center until her retirement at the age of 84.

Ms. Mason died last week at the age of 107 in Irving, Texas. Her lifelong dedication to helping others and her love for nursing changed our Dallas community for the better. Ms. Mason is survived by her daughters, Sandra Ruth Dixon and Anne Young, eight grandchildren and two great-grandchildren.

HONORING THE LIFE OF LAURA LASALVIA

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 2013

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of Laura LaSalvia, who lived a long and fulfilling life of 95 years. Laura joined her late husband, Tony LaSalvia, on January 5, 2013.

Laura and Tony raised three children together: Antonia, Nicola, and Steven. Laura spent most of her time at home with her children while Tony ran the family business, the Los Banos Abattoir. After Tony's passing, Steven took over the business with Laura's help. She was well-known to both the producers and the customers, keeping a tight watch on the business affairs to ensure they were fulfilled as Tony would have wanted.

Laura was a trailblazer for women in the meat industry. It can be a tough business for women, but her dedication and hard work helped her to accomplish many successes. She passed these strong traits along to her children, grandchildren, great grandchildren, and to all those associated with the family business. Laura's presence at the Los Banos Abattoir will be greatly missed.

Laura was extremely active in her community. She served on school boards and participated in school-related activities for her children and grandchildren. She was also very involved at Saint Joseph's Church in Los Banos. Religion and faith were strong components of her life. In 1957, Laura was a charter parent of Our Lady of Fatima School, and she served as president various times. She was also a member of Altar Society and the Italian Catholic Federation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to the life of Laura LaSalvia. She will undoubtedly be missed by all for her wise and loving counsel. We thank Laura today for her outstanding contributions to the Central Valley and the State of California.

IN SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE RELEASE OF COMMEMORATIVE ROSA PARKS STAMP

HON. JOYCE BEATTY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 2013

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, today is the 100th birthday of Rosa Parks, the mother of the modern Civil Rights Movement.

In celebration of this year's Black History Month, it is with great honor that I wholeheartedly lend my voice in support of the release of a commemorative stamp, created by the United States Postal Service, to pay respects to her legacy and contributions to this country to ensure the equal treatment of all citizens.

Her civil disobedience in refusing to give up her seat on that bus in Montgomery, Alabama sparked a movement that continues today to push the possibilities of our society into new realms.

As a member of the Ohio General Assembly, where I also served as House Minority Leader, I was proud to have led the efforts that resulted in the 2005 passage of House Bill 421 of the 130th General Assembly to mark December 1st as Rosa Parks Day—the first state to do so in the Nation.

That day in 1955, she started something larger than herself.

Her action sparked the peaceful Montgomery Bus Boycott that lasted 381 days and successfully desegregated the public transportation system across the country. Her fight didn't end there: she continued to champion civil rights all across the country until her passing on October 24, 2005. And with this stamp, we further add to the recognition of her selflessness and pioneering spirit that she deserves.

The unveiling of the stamp will take place in Detroit, Rosa Parks' final place of rest. Detroit is also the location of the Rosa and Raymond Parks Institute for Self Development, an organization she help found in 1987 to inspire young people—just as her actions inspired many across our nation in Alabama years before.

Now that we are at the start of this year's Black History Month, a year that celebrates the 150th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation and the 50th anniversary Martin Luther King Jr.'s March on Washington, I cannot think of a better 100th birthday memorial to help further etch Rosa Parks' name into the fabric of our nation's history than with this stamp.

''SOMETHING INSIDE'' BY MADDIE GREENE

HON. MARK POCAN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 2013

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit the following by Maddie Greene:

SOMETHING INSIDE

(By Maddie Greene)

PLANNED PARENTHOOD OF WISCONSIN PRESENTS OUR LIVES—OUR STORIES—OUR CELEBRATION: THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF ROE V. WADE

On a sunny, slightly chilly weekend in May of 2000 I was preparing for final exams. Despite the stress of impending tests, it was a beautiful spring.

I woke up early Saturday morning with severe stomach pain. This was a type of pain with which I was entirely unfamiliar. It came in waves, dull but intense. It would recede for a time then return so strong I could barely stand. Pressing my fingers against my lower belly, I determined that the lowest right-hand region was swollen, hot, and hard to the touch. So did I jump out of bed and call the hospital? Oh, heavens, no. Now, a blister—that's a tragedy worth swooning over. A swollen stomach? Eh, I'll ignore that.

That evening, I went to study with a friend. We made jokes about appendix trouble. I laughed—then rushed home and read up on appendicitis. My symptoms weren't quite right. With so much else to worry about, my attitude was this: ''It will get worse, or it will get better. I'll adjust to either option as needed.''

It got better. I went on about my week as usual. However, by happy chance, I had a routine annual gynecologist appointment scheduled for that Thursday at Planned Parenthood. That appointment was going to change my life.

Thursday morning, May 11, 2000, I took a final exam. A few hours later I was at my appointment at the old Mifflin Street Planned Parenthood a few blocks from my dorm. I mentioned the pain of the previous weekend, expecting little to come of it.

The R.N. conducting my examination was named Elizabeth. She was lovely. One element of my routine checkup involved Elizabeth pressing her fingertips into my lower belly. A few painful presses into the exam, her lips tightened. Then she smiled and said in a bright, cheerful voice, ''Well, you're pregnant.'' I'm pretty sure I gave a witty and decimating retort, probably something like ''No, I'm not.'' She gauged me at about three months pregnant based on the firm swelling. Mind you, the math didn't work out. I couldn't be pregnant. But when a nurse thinks you're having a baby, you entertain the notion. I took a pregnancy test.

Sitting in that exam room awaiting the results of my test constituted the longest five minutes of my life up to that point. When Elizabeth came back she was frowning again. ''Well, you're not pregnant,'' she informed me, and I punched the air triumphantly. She let me have my little celebration but she didn't smile with me. Instead, she said pointedly ''But if you're not pregnant, then I don't know what that thing is inside you.''

This disturbed me greatly.

Elizabeth sent me home to relax. ''Take the day off work,'' she said. ''Think about your next step.'' She promised to be in touch. I went back to my dorm and called my parents in tears. ''Mom? Dad? I'm not pregnant! . . . But something's wrong.'' They came to Madison and took me out to lunch.

When I got back there was a message on the answering machine from Elizabeth asking what I'd decided. Well, I hadn't decided anything yet. That evening she called again and finally revealed the depth of her concern. She said, ''Maddie, I didn't want to scare you too badly earlier. You needed time to cope. But I want to stress to you the: importance of contacting someone NOW. Please find a doctor and have that checked out.''

So I did. And it was cancer. Just after my final exams I started treatment for a volleyball-sized malignant tumor that used to be my right ovary.

As a college student I was covered under my family's health insurance. But I was at school far from home—and I wanted some agency over my health and my life. For a busy student struggling through full-time coursework and a part-time job, Planned Parenthood was the best option for monitoring my reproductive health privately and affordably.

Without Elizabeth, without the convenience and affordability of that Planned Parenthood on Mifflin St, maybe I'd be dead. Who knows? I know that they wouldn't have caught my cancer until I could no longer avoid the symptoms. Maybe until that fast-growing malignancy had done what it was trying to do.

Planned Parenthood didn't just do what I asked, they did what I needed. They identified that I was very sick and they gently, kindly, but insistently urged me toward seeking specialized care.

Today I'm healthy, cancer-free, and grateful that Planned Parenthood was available to me and that its kind, smart R.N. Elizabeth caught my cancer.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, February 5, 2013 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's record.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

FEBRUARY 7

10 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the Department of Defense's response to the attack on United States facilities in Benghazi, Libya, and the findings of its internal review following the attack; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC–217 following the open session.

SD–G50

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine No Child Left Behind, focusing on early lessons from state flexibility waivers.

SH–216

Committee on the Judiciary

Business meeting to consider the nominations of Robert E. Bacharach, of Oklahoma, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit, William J. Kayatta, Jr., of Maine, to be United States Circuit Judge for the First Circuit, Richard Gary Taranto, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit, Caitlin Joan Halligan, of New York, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit, Patty Shwartz, of New Jersey, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, Pamela Ki Mai Chen, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York, Katherine Polk Failla, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, Andrew Patrick Gordon, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nevada, Ketanji Brown Jackson, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia, Raymond P. Moore, to be United States District Judge for the District of Colorado, Troy L. Nunley, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of California, Beverly Reid O'Connell, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California, Analisa Torres, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, Derrick Kahala Watson, to be United States District Judge for the District of Hawaii, and Mark A. Barnett, of Virginia, and Claire R. Kelly, of New York, both to be a Judge of the United States Court of International Trade.

SD–226

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold an oversight hearing to examine implementation of Corps of Engineers water resources policies.

SD–406

2:30 p.m.

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of John Owen Brennan, of Virginia, to be Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

SH–216

FEBRUARY 12

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine opportunities and challenges associated with America's natural gas resources.

SD–366

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights and Human Rights

To hold hearings to examine proposals to reduce gun violence, focusing on protecting our communities while respecting the Second Amendment.

SD–226

CORRECTION

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

See Résumé of Congressional Activity.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S449–S477

Measures Introduced: Twenty-one bills were introduced, as follows: S. 208–228. **Pages S469–70**

Measures Passed:

Security at U.S. Embassies and Diplomatic Facilities: Senate passed S. 227, to authorize the transfer of certain funds to improve security at United States embassies and other diplomatic facilities worldwide. **Pages S476–77**

Measures Considered:

Violence Against Women Act—Agreement: Senate began consideration of S. 47, to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, after agreeing to the motion to proceed. **Page S463**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 85 yeas to 8 nays (Vote No. 12), Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Pages S461–63**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 9:30 a.m., on Thursday, February 7, 2012, Senate resume consideration the bill with the time until noon equally divided and controlled between the two Leaders, or their designees. **Page S477**

Appointments:

Commission on Long-Term Care: The Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to Public Law 112–240, appointed the following as members of the Commission on Long-Term Care: Dr. Javaid Anwar of Nevada, Laphonza Butler of California, Judith Feder of Virginia. **Page S477**

Message from the President: Senate received the following message from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13396 on February 7, 2006, with respect to the situation in or in relation to Côte d'Ivoire; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–1) **Page S468**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Eric K. Fanning, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force.

F. Scott Kieff, of Illinois, to be a Member of the United States International Trade Commission for the term expiring June 16, 2020.

Michael Wayne Hail, of Kentucky, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Harry S Truman Scholarship Foundation for a term expiring December 10, 2017.

Janet Lorraine LaBreck, of Massachusetts, to be Commissioner of the Rehabilitation Services Administration, Department of Education. **Page S477**

Messages from the House: **Page S468**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Pages S449, S468**

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S468, S477**

Executive Communications: **Pages S468–69**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page S470**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S470–76**

Additional Statements: **Pages S466–67**

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: **Page S476**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—12) **Page S463**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 2 p.m. and adjourned at 6:41 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, February 7, 2013. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S477.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 41 public bills, H.R. 452–491; and 4 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 11; and H. Res. 341–342, were introduced. **Pages H341–42**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H344**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 297, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize support for graduate medical education programs in children's hospitals (H. Rept. 113–3);

H.R. 225, 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 (H. Rept. 113–4);

H.R. 235, to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants to States to streamline State requirements and procedures for veterans with military emergency medical training to become civilian emergency medical technicians (H. Rept. 113–5);

H.R. 267, to improve hydropower, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 113–6);

H.R. 316, to reinstate and transfer certain hydroelectric licenses and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of certain hydroelectric projects (H. Rept. 113–7); and

H. Res. 48, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 444) to require that, if the President's fiscal year 2014 budget does not achieve balance in a fiscal year covered by such budget, the President shall submit a supplemental unified budget by April 1, 2013, which identifies a fiscal year in which balance is achieved, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 113–8). **Pages H340–41**

Committee Resignation: Read a letter from Representative Wasserman Schultz, wherein she resigned from the Committee on the Budget, effective immediately. **Page H319**

Recess: The House recessed at 2:17 p.m. and reconvened at 5:05 p.m. **Page H319**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Children's Hospital GME Support Reauthorization Act of 2013: H.R. 297, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize support for graduate medical education programs in children's hospitals, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 352 yeas to 50 nays, Roll No. 32 and **Pages H319–22, H325–26**

National Pediatric Research Network Act of 2013: H.R. 225, 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, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 375 yeas to 27 nays, Roll No. 31. **Pages H322–25, H326–27**

Recess: The House recessed at 5:36 p.m. and reconvened at 6:30 p.m. **Page H325**

Privileged Resolution: The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 11, providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President. **Page H325**

Presidential Message: Read a message from the President wherein he notified Congress that the national emergency declared with respect to the situation in or in relation to Côte d'Ivoire is to continue in effect beyond February 7, 2013—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 113–8). **Page H325**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H325–26 and H326–27. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 2 p.m. and adjourned at 9:09 p.m.

Committee Meeting

REQUIRE A PLAN ACT

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 444, the "Require a PLAN ACT". The Committee granted, by a record vote of 9 to 3, a structured rule for H.R. 444. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by

the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget or their respective designees. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the bill shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill. The rule makes in order only those amendments printed in the Rules Committee report. 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. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Representatives Price (GA), Schwartz, Scalise, Fleming, Gibson, and Messer.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 2013

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of February 5 through February 8, 2013

Senate Chamber

Senate will not be in session on Tuesday, February 5, 2013 and Wednesday, February 6, 2013.

On *Thursday,* at approximately 9:30 a.m., Senate will resume consideration of S. 47, Violence Against Women Act. At 12 noon, Senator-designate Cowan, of Massachusetts, will be sworn in.

During the balance of the week, Senate may consider any cleared legislative and executive business.

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Armed Services: February 7, to hold hearings to examine the Department of Defense's response to the attack on United States facilities in Benghazi, Libya, and the findings of its internal review following the attack; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC–217 following the open session, 10 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: February 7, to hold an oversight hearing to examine implementation of Corps of Engineers water resources policies, 10:30 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: February 7, to hold hearings to examine No Child Left Behind, focusing on early lessons from state flexibility waivers, 10 a.m., SH–216.

Committee on the Judiciary: February 7, business meeting to consider the nominations of Robert E. Bacharach, of Oklahoma, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit, William J. Kayatta, Jr., of Maine, to be United States Circuit Judge for the First Circuit, Richard Gary Taranto, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit, Caitlin Joan Halligan, of New York, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit, Patty Shwartz, of New Jersey, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, Pamela Ki Mai Chen, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York, Katherine Polk Failla, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, Andrew Patrick Gordon, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nevada, Ketanji Brown Jackson, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia, Raymond P. Moore, to be United States District Judge for the District of Colorado, Troy L. Nunley, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of California, Beverly Reid O'Connell, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California, Analisa Torres, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, Derrick Kahala Watson, to be United States District Judge for the District of Hawaii, and Mark A. Barnett, of Virginia, and Claire R. Kelly, of New York, both to be a Judge of the United States Court of International Trade, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: February 7, to hold hearings to examine the nomination of John Owen Brennan, of Virginia, to be Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, 2:30 p.m., SH–216.

House Committees

Committee on Education and the Workforce, February 5, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Challenges and Opportunities Facing America's Schools and Workplaces'', 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, February 5, Subcommittee on Energy and Power, hearing entitled ''American Energy Security and Innovation: An Assessment of North America's Energy Resources'', 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

February 5, Subcommittee on Communications and Technology; Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade; and the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, joint hearing entitled ''Fighting for Internet Freedom: Dubai and Beyond''; and consideration of legislation to affirm that it is the policy of the United States to promote a global Internet free from government control, 10:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

February 5, Full Committee, business meeting to adopt the Committee's Oversight Plan for the 113th Congress, 4 p.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Ethics, February 5, Full Committee, business meeting to consider organizational matters relating to the start of the 113th Congress, 4 p.m., 2261 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, February 6, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Examining the Proper Role of the Federal Housing Administration in our Mortgage Insurance Market'', 9 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, February 5, Subcommittee on Middle East and North Africa, hearing entitled ''The Fatah-Hamas Reconciliation: Threatening Peace Prospects'', 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on House Administration, February 5, Full Committee, organizational meeting for the 113th Congress, 2:15 p.m., 1310 Longworth.

Committee on the Judiciary, February 5, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''America's Immigration System: Opportunities for Legal Immigration and Enforcement of Laws against Illegal Immigration'', 10:15 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, February 5, Full Committee, business meeting and a hearing entitled ''Government Spending: How Can We Best Address the Billions of Dollars Wasted Every Year?'', 1 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, February 6, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''American Competitiveness: The Role of Research and Development'', 9:30 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, February 5, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled ''Analyzing VA's Actions to Prevent Legionnaire's Disease in Pittsburgh, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

February 5, Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs, hearing entitled ''The 100% Temporary Disability Rating: An Examination of Its Effective Use'', 2 p.m., 334 Cannon.

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 January 31, 2013

	Senate	*House*	*Total*
Days in session	10	10	..
Time in session	58 hrs., 41′	32 hrs., 43′	..
Congressional Record:			
Pages of proceedings	448	301	..
Extensions of Remarks	..	75	..
Public bills enacted into law	..	2	2
Private bills enacted into law	..	..	..
Bills in conference	..	..	..
Measures passed, total	21	24	45
Senate bills	..	..	..
House bills	3	5	..
Senate joint resolutions	..	..	..
House joint resolutions	..	..	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	3	3	..
House concurrent resolutions	..	1	..
Simple resolutions	15	15	..
Measures reported, total	..	*2	2
Senate bills	..	..	..
House bills	..	..	..
Senate joint resolutions	..	..	..
House joint resolutions	..	..	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	..	..	..
House concurrent resolutions	..	..	..
Simple resolutions	..	2	..
Special reports	..	..	..
Conference reports	..	..	..
Measures pending on calendar	7	..	..
Measures introduced, total	232	522	754
Bills	197	442	..
Joint resolutions	6	23	..
Concurrent resolutions	4	10	..
Simple resolutions	25	47	..
Quorum calls	1	1	..
Yea-and-nay votes	11	16	..
Recorded votes	..	13	..
Bills vetoed	..	..	..
Vetoes overridden	..	..	..

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

January 3 through January 31, 2013

Civilian Nominations, totaling 62, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	1
Unconfirmed	61
Air Force Nominations, totaling 307, disposed of as follows:	
Unconfirmed	307
Army Nominations, totaling 627, disposed of as follows:	
Unconfirmed	627
Navy Nominations, totaling 34, disposed of as follows:	
Unconfirmed	34
Marine Corps Nominations, totaling 682, disposed of as follows:	
Unconfirmed	682

Summary

Total Nominations carried over from the First Session	0
Total Nominations Received this Session	1,712
Total Confirmed	1
Total Unconfirmed	1,711
Total Withdrawn	0
Total Returned to the White House	0

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, February 7

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will resume consideration of S. 47, Violence Against Women Act. At 12 noon, Senator-designate Cowan, of Massachusetts, will be sworn in.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Tuesday, February 5

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Begin consideration of H.R. 444—Require a PLAN Act (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Beatty, Joyce, Ohio, E91
Beniskey, Dan, Mich., E83
Bordallo, Madeleine Z., Guam, E83, E86
Braley, Bruce L., Iowa, E84, E85, E88
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E86
Costa, Jim, Calif., E89, E91
Doyle, Michael F., Pa., E87
Farr, Sam, Calif., E86
Green, Gene, Tex., E87
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E85
Himes, James A., Conn., E84
Hoyer, Steny H., Md., E85
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E90
Lance, Leonard, N.J., E87
Lofgren, Zoe, Calif., E83
Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E84, E86, E87
Pocan, Mark, Wisc., E89, E91
Rogers, Mike, Ala., E90
Scott, David, Ga., E84
Sessions, Pete, Tex., E83
Slaughter, Louise McIntosh, N.Y., E85
Webster, Daniel, Fla., E86, E88
Young, C.W. Bill, Fla., E88

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.