United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 14, 2014 No. 8

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 14, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CHRIS STEWART to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

LEGALIZING MARIJUANA

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, no sooner had the United States recognized the failure of alcohol prohibition by repealing the 18th Amendment than the United States embarked upon another failed experiment in prohibition: marijuana. For three-quarters of a century, the United States has waged a futile attempt to prohibit marijuana based upon emotion and flawed science.

Since 1971, the Federal Government has classified marijuana as a schedule 1 prohibited substance, like heroin, more dangerous, according to the law, than cocaine or meth. It declared in statute, contrary to proven research, that marijuana has no therapeutic value.

Every day a million authorized users of medical marijuana reject that notion by using it by doctor's prescription to relieve symptoms like intense nausea due to chemotherapy, relief for veterans with PTSD, from chronic back pain, and neurological disorders like multiple sclerosis.

New York has now joined 21 other States and the District of Columbia authorizing medical marijuana. Colorado is now allowing adult use; and Washington State is soon to follow, after strong approval by both States' voters.

The revolution in medical marijuana policy has been led at the State level, usually as a result of popular vote. The facts are that marijuana does have therapeutic use.

It is also less destructive to human health than alcohol or tobacco. Not one death has ever been proven from a marijuana overdose; yet we continue to disrupt the lives of more than two-thirds of a million people arrested for possession each year.

We send billions of dollars to the hands of underworld and drug cartels. Many people know that it is easier for a 13-year-old girl to buy a joint than a six pack of beer.

No marijuana seller, except in Colorado, checks ID or has a license to lose. Even though White kids use marijuana more than teenagers of color, African Americans are almost four times more likely to be arrested and jailed.

Our Federal laws are frozen in time, but the American public has moved on. Majorities now say it should be legal, and even more say the Federal Government should not interfere with whatever State laws are in place.

It will be a while before Congress summons the courage to end the hypocrisy and irrationality of the futile Federal prohibition, but it should stop making things worse. For instance, it is insane to force hundreds of legal marijuana businesses to be all cash. We should end the grotesque punitive federal taxation for these legal small businesses.

It should explicitly allow State-approved medical marijuana. While we are at it, we should allow the cultivation of industrial hemp, which a dozen States have already approved. Hemp products are perfectly legal in the United States. Why shouldn't our farmers be able to grow the raw material like they used to?

Several dozen Members have cosponsored bipartisan legislation to help bring us out of these dark ages. These should be approved without delay. Sometime in this decade we will tax and regulate marijuana. Until we end the unfair discriminatory and costly Federal prohibition, we should at least end the most foolish and counterproductive policies.

HONORING THE LIFE OF FRANCES SARGENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Frances Rohrer Sargent, a courageous woman who selflessly helped defend our country during World War II. Being a member of the renowned Women Airforce Service Pilots or WASP, Frances pushed beyond the boundaries that limited opportunities at that time for women of her generation.

The Women Airforce Service Pilots were the first women to fly military aircraft, flying noncombat operations between the years 1942 and 1944.

These pioneers paved the way for women pilots to fly nearly every type of military aircraft from F/A–18 to the

Printed on recycled paper.

space shuttle today. My daughter-in-law, Lindsay, flew combat missions over Iraq and Afghanistan for the marines, but she would not have been able to do so without the women who came before her, Frances and all the other members of WASP.

Frances had a fulfilled life. She began flying at the age of 22 in Atlanta and would come to be one of only 1,704 women who were accepted to the prestigious Women Airforce Service Pilots, WASP, out of more than 25,000 women who had applied for the program.

Frances and other female pilots from our south Florida community, including Helen Wyatt Snapp, Ruth Schafer Fleisher, Shirley Kruse, and Bee Haydu, flew more than 60 million miles between '42 and '44.

As the author of the legislation awarding WASP the Congressional Gold Medal in the year 2009, I had the privilege to present the award to Frances Sargent for her patriotic service. The Congressional Gold Medal, as we know, is the highest civilian award in the United States; and it was presented to these women who were the first females to ever fly military aircraft. Their missions were mainly composed of safeguarding the U.S. coastal line so that male pilots could take on combat roles abroad.

Quite often Frances' life and that of her colleagues were on the line with constant attacks from enemy forces. The service of the WASPs to the U.S. military greatly contributed to the triumph and success of the U.S. and our allies in the defeat of the Axis powers during World War II.

Frances' deep passion for flying is what led her to pursue flight and become part of the prestigious WASPs. She never sought to break the barriers for women, but through her service she demonstrated her excellent skills that made her as well qualified a pilot as any of the male pilots in the military.

With her success, and that of her many other female pilots, more opportunities then became available for women in all fields.

After her retirement from WASP, Frances continued her love of flying by passing on her skills that she had gained. She became a professor at my alma mater, Miami-Dade College, where she took charge of developing the aviation program.

South Florida has been blessed to have had true heroines like Frances Rohrer Sargent, and we honor the service of her and her fellow south Florida WASP patriots: Helen Wyatt Snapp, Ruth Schafer Fleisher, Shirley Kruse, and Bee Haydu.

Aim high. Fly, fight, and win.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, 7 months ago, the Senate passed a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill, and for 7 months we have waited.

We have taken over 600 votes in the House of Representatives this Congress: finding the time to vote 46 times to overturn Obama administration; finding the time to pass nine bills that harm our environment; finding the time to twice pass bills that weaken our education system; finding the time to rename 40 post offices. But we haven't taken one vote, not a single vote, to advance immigration reform. We simply haven't found the time.

This despite the support of an overwhelming majority of Americans. This despite the support of interests as varied as labor unions and the Chamber of Commerce, high-tech companies, and faith leaders. This despite the CBO reporting that immigration reform will provide a much-needed jolt to the American economy.

With over half of the 113th Congress behind us, we have ignored one of the signature issues that the American people sent us here to solve. Sure, we have talked about immigration reform. We have even had our Gang of Eight on this side of the Capitol; but the old saying goes: talk is cheap.

Months of discussions by this Congress on one of the most important and complex issues in a generation have yielded only one point and one point only.

The only thing we have decided so far is that if we take on this issue, if we pass immigration reform, we will do it piece by piece. That is it. That is the only progress this body has made on this critical issue. We have made no substantive decisions about the fate of over 11 million people currently living their lives in legal limbo in this country—no substantive decision about whether their children, many of whom know no other country than this, will be sent thousands of miles away to live in a foreign country, separated from their families, denied the American Dream they fought so hard for, or even whether LGBT families will be torn apart.

The only progress we can point to at this time is instead of one large bill, we have decided on several small bills. If that is not definitive of a do-nothing Congress, I don't know what is.

But, okay, Mr. Speaker, you have convinced the President. If piecemeal is the only way we are going to pass immigration reform, then piecemeal it is. Here is the most important point. Where are the pieces? See, here is the thing: even if you are going to do something on a piecemeal basis, you still have got to do the first piece.

The second problem with a piecemeal approach is that you run the risk of cherry-picking, pushing through issues like increased border security, high-tech visas, while ignoring the harder decisions like providing a path to citizenship for the millions living in the shadows.

My friends on the other side of the aisle have introduced several immigration bills this Congress, with a few of them even passing out of committee; but not one bill has been offered that comes close to offering a pathway to citizenship.

While we may accept the piecemeal approach for the sake of getting something done, what we cannot accept—what we will not accept—is an approach that leaves a pathway to citizenship on the sidelines, because the pathway to citizenship remains the cornerstone of any serious immigration reform plan. The rest of the immigration reform structure is built around that piece. Without it, immigration reform will not stand. Without it, our system will remain broken.

The American people have called on us to fix our broken immigration system. At the very least, we owe it to them to give it a try. The window is still open; the opportunity is still there. We simply need to find the courage to complete the task.

REGULATIONS ON COAL-FIRED POWER PLANTS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Obama administration has repeatedly asserted their regulations on coal-fired power plants will not be a death blow to the industry. Unfortunately, the Environmental Protection Agency's most recently published rule for new coal-fired power plants tells us this claim could not be further from the truth.

The administration asserts this regulation on new coal-fired plants will make use of ''adequately demonstrated'' technologies. Well, according to the Washington Examiner's editorial board:

> Federal law has long barred the EPA from mandating industry use of technology that has not been ''adequately demonstrated'' as ready for commercial use. It is simply ludicrous for the EPA to claim in its proposed new rule that CCS technology has reached such a point.

Mr. Speaker, this administration is dead-set on eliminating coal from our fuel mix without a plan to make up for the energy that it provides or the jobs that it supports. It is an anti-energy agenda that is costing jobs, harming economic growth, and placing a greater burden on family budgets. The American people deserve better.

□ 1015

THE LIFE OF EDDIE A. BOGGS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to rise to honor a man who made a difference. I wish to pay tribute to the extraordinarily generous life of American patriot Eddie Boggs, an exceptional educator and music man

from Sylvania, Ohio, and Toledo. Eddie was a man held in particular affection by the thousands of people whose lives he touched so positively. Some said his being embodied the Midwestern caring spirit we each wish that we could emanate to those whose paths we cross.

Eddie was actually born in Soldier, Kentucky, and came north to attend the University of Toledo, where he received his master's degree and devoted his life to teaching and to his family. He was a musician and a composer, a great humanitarian, and an indefatigable social studies teacher who was recognized as Educator of the Year in 2005.

The Toledo Blade says of his life:

His smile, his sparkling blue eyes, his servant's heart and infectious love of life is the Eddie that we remember.

He was an educator on so many levels for nearly four decades, inspiring and caring about thousands and thousands of his students and fellow citizens.

Even after retiring from teaching, he did not really stop working. Eddie became a licensed tour guide. An engaged citizen, he made the extra effort year after year when he was a teacher and afterwards to bring hundreds and hundreds of students from Timberstone Junior High, for example, to visit the Capitol. It was always a grand and unforgettable occasion. Eddie would stand outside the east front here with his guitar, winding his way among hundreds and hundreds of students and begin singing, and his resonant and clear voice would filter across the Capitol lawn. It always seemed the sun was shining as the students gathered under the oak trees and the linden trees. These were unforgettable moments.

In Eddie's so-called retirement, he also furthered his love of music by performing nationally with the New Christy Minstrels. He composed songs of his own. He played over a thousand songs. His music never stopped. He was one of the best known entertainers in northeast Ohio and southeast Michigan. Eddie's wife, Chris, stated:

Eddie got 26 hours out of a 24-hour day. That is how Eddie was, a positive man.

In addition to teaching and performing, Eddie contributed mightily to the community through fundraising, and through the Christmas season he would organize a Christmas variety show that would raise more than $250,000 for area charities. This man was a real citizen.

Mr. Speaker, Eddie is a gift that keeps on giving for us who had the joy of knowing him and sharing in his life. Our thoughts and prayers are with his family: his wife, Chris; his daughters, Allison, Sara, and Grace; his grandchildren, Landon, Jackson, Kate, Grant, and Nola; his mother, Pearl; and mother-in-law, Pat; his brothers and sisters and extended family. Eddie's music will always play in our hearts. He lifted us to be a better and more caring people.

May God give his family comfort, and may Eddie's life inspire others to emulate his goodness.

[From Toledo Blade, Jan. 11, 2014]

EDDIE A. BOGGS, 1945–2014, MUSICIAN HAD POSITIVE VIEW ON LIFE

(By Mark Zaborney)

Eddie A. Boggs, 68, a longtime Sylvania educator and a musician who became one of the best known entertainers in northwest Ohio and southeast Michigan, died Thursday in Ebeid Hospice Residence, Sylvania.

Mr. Boggs learned in May, 2013, that he had non-Hodgkins' lymphoma, his wife, Chris, said. Through treatment and hospital stays, he performed when he could, most recently Dec. 7 in Fayette, Ohio. Since retiring in 2007 from education, he toured regularly as a member of the New Christy Minstrels, the folk-style group formed in the early 1960s. At the hospital for a biopsy and spinal tap, he asked whether he'd be able to make a Dec. 31 flight.

''That was his way of coping,'' his wife said. ''Eddie got 26 hours out of a 24-hour day. That's the way Eddie was, a positive man.''

Also in retirement, Mr. Boggs was a licensed guide, leading tours to Washington—often by school groups—and other destinations.

Most nights, weekends, and summers throughout the last 40 years, Mr. Boggs performed in public, singing the songs he wrote or the 1,000 he memorized, playing guitar or banjo or mandolin, and connecting with audiences.

''I always know there's somebody out there who can play greater or sing it better than me, but nobody who loves it more than me,'' he told The Blade in 2008. ''I guess the music is the vehicle, the means to an end to reach out to people.''

Mr. Boggs organized an annual Christmas season variety show, which raised more than $250,000 for area charities, and a family-friendly New Year's event in Sylvania for several years. He also established the Lake Erie West Hall of Fame for the performing arts.

He was master of ceremonies for Sylvania's annual fall festival.

''Everywhere he went, somebody knew him,'' his wife said.

In 2007, he was among local finalists in the Jefferson Awards for Public Service.

''He was a positive, outgoing individual,'' Sylvania Mayor Craig Stough said. ''He was positive in his outlook to everybody.''

Mr. Boggs became a social studies teacher at McCord Junior High School in 1973 and, later, a guidance counselor at Timberstone Junior High School. He was recognized as an ''educator of the year'' in 2005.

''He went that extra mile to make sure that new kid or teacher felt welcomed,'' his wife said.

He was born Aug. 10, 1945, in Soldier, Ky., to Elmer and Pearl Boggs. The family moved north, and he was a graduate of Mansfield High School. A counselor told him he wasn't smart enough for college. He went to work in the steel mill—but he took the night shift while attending the Mansfield branch of Ohio State University.

''That's why he went into education—he said he didn't want anybody to ever hear they weren't good enough to do something,'' his wife said.

After two years, he transferred to the main campus in Columbus and received a bachelor's degree. He also had two master's degrees from the University of Toledo.

Surviving are his wife, Chris Boggs, whom he married Sept. 20, 1991; daughters, Allison Boggs, Sara Roemer, and Grace Barton; mother, Pearl Boggs; sister, Ernestine Obney; brothers, Carl, Verlin, and Glenn Boggs, and five grandchildren.

Visitation will be from 2–8 p.m. Sunday in the Walker Funeral Home, Sylvania Township. Services will be at 11 a.m. Monday at Flanders Road Church of Christ, where he was a member.

The family suggests tributes to the Leukemia & Lymphoma Society.

RECOGNIZING SERGEANT INVESTIGATOR ADAM SOWDERS

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

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Adam Sowders, sergeant investigator with the Burleson County Sheriff's Department.

On December 19, 2013, Sergeant Sowders was killed in the line of duty. Sergeant Investigator Sowders passed away due to wounds he received while serving a search warrant with a team of deputies in Burleson County, Texas.

Adam graduated from Somerville High School in 2001, and like his father and his brothers, he became a volunteer firefighter at the Somerville Fire Department.

He began his career with the Burleson County Sheriff's Department as a patrol deputy in 2006 after serving as an officer with the Somerville Police Department.

Sergeant Investigator Sowders was loved and respected by his community, by his friends, and by his family. Our thoughts and prayers are with his family and his friends.

Today, we honor and remember Adam for putting himself in harm's way for the good of his neighbors, his family, his friends, and his community. We thank him for his service and his sacrifice for public safety. He devoted his life to public safety and to being a first responder, and he will be forever remembered as an outstanding individual who lived to selflessly serve his community.

Adam was a model public servant, however; and, more importantly, he was a servant leader who modeled the words of Jesus in John 15:13, which states:

> Greater love hath no man than this, that he lay down his life for his friends.

His death marks the 17th first responder lost in the line of duty in the 17th Congressional District of Texas since the time I was sworn in in January 2011.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close by reminding all Americans to continue praying for our country and for our American men and women who serve in our military and for our first responders. Their selfless service protects our lives, our freedoms, and our liberties from both internal and external dangers.

God bless our first responders and our troops, and God bless America.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to show my support for the reinstatement of emergency unemployment insurance for thousands of residents in the Inland Empire and millions of other Americans across the Nation. These Americans rely on these benefits so they can put food on their table, so they can pay for heat, and so they can continue their search for work.

Now, my friends on the other side of the aisle will have you believe that these millions of Americans are just too lazy to find work and that they are only interested in handouts. My Republican colleagues believe in making the long-term unemployed more desperate and that this desperation will be the necessary motivation for them to find work. Well, when has an unpaid gas bill ever created a job? When has forcing someone to go to sleep hungry ever created a job?

Let me remind my colleagues that the Great Recession was the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression and that there are still three people competing for every job opening. While our recovery is gaining momentum, it has been the wealthiest that have benefited the most, leaving far too many Americans behind.

Let's extend these emergency benefits for the long-term unemployed. Let's create jobs, not desperation.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 22 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

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

On this day we ask Your blessing on the men and women, citizens all, whose votes have populated this people's House. Each Member of this House has been given the sacred duty of representing them.

We ask Your blessing as well on the Members of this House, whose responsibility lies also beyond the local interests of constituents while honoring them. Give each Member the wisdom to represent both local and national interests, a responsibility calling for the wisdom of Solomon. Grant them, if You will, a double portion of such wisdom.

Bless us this day and every day, and may all that is done within the people's House this day 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.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KENNEDY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

NEW YORK SSDI FRAUD

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this past summer, we learned of the largest disability fraud in the history of Social Security taking place in Puerto Rico.

Now, less than 6 months later, we hear of an even more shocking scandal in New York, where 106 people have been arrested, including former policemen, FBI employees, and firemen. Worse, about half of the defendants falsely claimed that their ''disability'' was caused as a result of the 9/11 terrorist attacks, even though many had never even worked at Ground Zero.

These individuals are stealing from a program that serves those who can no longer work due to a disability. This is unacceptable.

The American people are outraged and fast losing confidence in Social Security, and rightfully so.

That is why this Thursday I will be holding a hearing to ensure Social Security makes fighting fraud and protecting hardworking taxpayer dollars its number one priority. The time for excuses is over.

EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION EXTENSION ACT

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as we begin today's activities, 1.3 million individuals face a harsher reality because Congress failed to extend unemployment insurance benefits. That includes 2 million children and 20,000 veterans who face a more uncertain future because Congress failed to do the right thing.

The moms who attended my Chicagoland job fair don't want an unemployment check more than a job. They do want a Congress that recognizes that any one of us could use a little help when an economic crisis hits and leaves us vulnerable.

The families I represent aren't looking for handouts. They are my friends and neighbors and paid into the unemployment insurance system with the promise that, if times got tough, they would still be able to provide for their families using the benefits they paid for as a bridge over troubled waters.

I am a cosponsor of H.R. 3824, the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act, because I stand by my friends in tough times. I urge my colleagues in the House and Senate to do the same by passing a bipartisan unemployment insurance extension now.

MODERNIZING BANK TRANSFERS

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

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to question why banks and their customers are still burdened by rules designed in an era that, when most bank transactions ended, a free lollipop was given to the customer.

Regulation D, which was implemented in the 1980s, restricts customers to just six transfers between their accounts for 1 month. These rules made a lot of sense in an era when most bank transactions were done manually; but today, through modern technology, this is truly obsolete.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore ask support for H.R. 3240, the Regulation D Study Act. This bill will direct the GAO, the Government Accountability Office, to study Regulation D and recommend appropriate changes to modernize the regulation. H.R. 3240 has strong bipartisan support. I am grateful for Congresswoman MALONEY's being the lead Democrat sponsor for the bill.

Credit unions tell us that modern customers today hit the six-transfer limit just in a matter of moments as they work online. We need to change this, Mr. Speaker, so that individuals can manage their money on a daily basis. Updating this regulation is important to benefit consumers and bank institutions.

MORTGAGE FORGIVENESS TAX EXCLUSION

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, on December 31, the tax exclusion for mortgage forgiveness expired. What does that mean? It means if someone sells their house for less than they owe, they have to pay tax on the difference.

The failure of the House Republican leadership to extend this forgiveness provision, which has been on the books since 2009, means that underwater properties all across the country—6 million of them—now basically face paying taxes in terms of trying to do the right thing and get these properties to move.

In Connecticut today, there are 772 pending short sale closings that, again, the owners are going to be taxed because of the failure of the Republican leadership to move.

Mr. CAMP said the other day that there is nothing to worry about; we have all year to deal with this. Well, the housing market can't wait. We need to move. H.R. 2994 will extend that mortgage forgiveness tax relief. It is time for this Chamber to take this measure up and vote on it.

Ask a realtor; ask a home builder; ask a mortgage broker. They all know. This market needs to get the overhang of distressed properties cleared out if we are going to have a healthy housing market and a strong recovery.

This Chamber needs to act. The Republican leadership needs to listen to people who are in the front trenches of the economy.

OBAMACARE IS HURTING SOUTH CAROLINIANS

(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, besides sticker shock, American families are beginning to realize that they were misled and that ObamaCare is not as great as advertised. Sheryl from Columbia says:

> I realize the ACA is controversial, but it was billed as something better than what the insurance companies were offering to private parties. What we actually purchased is very inferior to the high deductible policy I currently have when out of network.

Edward from Chapin has made several attempts to enroll his family in the government health care insurance program since the beginning of October. Unfortunately, due to the faulty government-run Web site and the complicated nature of the law, he tried for 2 months to successfully enroll his 17-year-old daughter in a government health plan.

The government's role is to protect our fellow citizens, not make tasks such as enrolling in health care more expensive or difficult. ObamaCare must be repealed and replaced to create jobs and put health care decisions back in the hands of the American people.

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

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE EXTENSION

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

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask that today we extend the crucial and critical unemployment insurance lifeline to the 1.3 million jobless Americans who have already lost coverage. In California alone, 214,000 people have already lost their unemployment coverage, including almost 19,000 people in San Diego County and 3,500 people in Imperial County.

With unemployment unacceptably high, now is not the time to take money out of the pockets of those who are struggling to find work. Unemployed Americans are actively looking for work but, unfortunately, are unable to find jobs in our economy.

We must continue to provide unemployment benefits to jobless Americans so they can purchase crucial life needs like food and shelter. So let us heed the better angels of our nature and immediately restore unemployment benefits to out-of-work Americans.

FIRST LEGISLATIVE ACT: REPEALING OBAMACARE

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, last week I was sworn in as the newest Member of this body. As my very first legislative act, I have announced my cosponsorship of the American Health Care Reform Act, a bill that will repeal the destructive ObamaCare law and replace it with conservative, market-based solutions.

ObamaCare is hurting families across south Alabama, causing dropped coverage, skyrocketing premiums, and adding to the debt when we just can't afford it. It is becoming painfully obvious for families and small businesses in this country that this law is not working, and that it simply cannot be fixed.

We have a responsibility in this body to do what is right for the American people, and it is urgent and obvious we must act now to end this unworkable law.

To my colleagues on the other side: I respect you and stand ready to work with you to replace this law with solutions that will actually lower costs and provide quality care for all of the people in America.

THE VETERANS' RECORDS RECONSTRUCTION ACT

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3397, the Veterans' Records Reconstruction Act.

In 1973, a fire at the National Personnel Records Center in Overland, Missouri, destroyed as many as 18,000 military records. While efforts were made to reconstruct these records, many records were left incomplete, which makes it difficult to determine veterans' eligibility for service recognition.

This legislation would create guidelines and allow alternative methods of authenticity verifying veterans' records using unofficial sources, thus creating a pathway toward getting due benefits and recognitions for veterans whose files were destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, while this legislation does not completely solve the problem of missing records, it is a way for our Nation to thank veterans for their service by helping them to best have a chance to receive the recognition that they are due.

I want to thank my colleague, Congresswoman LOIS CAPPS, for her leadership in introducing the legislation. I urge its swift passage.

SECOND WAVE OF OBAMACARE CANCELATIONS' EFFECT ON SMALL BUSINESS

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

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, due to ObamaCare, potentially millions of small business employees will be affected by a surge of health care plan cancelations. The hundreds of thousands of individual cancelation notices we saw last year were just the beginning, and there will be more before the next open enrollment period.

Mr. Speaker, small business owners are forced to buy more expensive comprehensive coverage, so they must find ways to offset the costs. They will have to cut employees' and workers' hours. And employees they can afford to keep will have restricted choices when selecting doctors and filling prescriptions; so they might not be able to keep the doctor they like, and if they can, it likely will be more expensive.

Mr. Speaker, small businesses create jobs and grow our economy. Around 40 million people have health insurance through their small business employer, and for them, the next wave of ObamaCare cancelations could be catastrophic.

□ 1215

CLEAN ENERGY FUTURE

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that power generation produces the vast majority of carbon pollution that is causing climate change. In order to mitigate the impacts of climate change, we have no choice but to find cleaner, more sustainable energy sources. The good news is we have been making progress. For example, thanks to both Federal and private investments, my district on California's central coast is now home to two of the largest operating solar farms in the world, and more are on the way.

I had the pleasure of visiting these facilities last week, and they are truly a sight to behold. Together, the California Valley Solar Ranch and the Topaz Solar Farms are already generating 550 megawatts of electricity and powering hundreds of thousands of California homes. The clean energy generated from these two projects alone is equivalent to removing 135,000 cars from our roads. Not to mention that these projects have also created hundreds of local construction jobs.

There is no silver bullet to stopping climate change, but renewable energy is certainly a big step in the right direction. I urge my colleagues to join in in helping to stop climate change. Let's invest in a clean energy future.

RIGHT TO LIFE

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

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, this week the congressional conversation is on spending, the national debt, and rightfully so. The budget work in the past 3 years has only made a dent in the looming debt crisis in our future, but America's story is about more than budget and spending. America is about its people, their opportunity and hope and dream for a better future for all of our children.

A few months ago, the March of Dimes released its scorecard for premature birth rates in Oklahoma. We lowered our preterm birth rate for the third year in a row in Oklahoma. That is good. Every child is a gift of God, and they should have a chance to live to his or her fullest potential. We all know that a baby in the womb is not tissue; that is a child. A child that should have the same opportunity, the same chance for hope, the same dreams for a better future. That dream begins with the opportunity for life.

How can we as a Nation work so hard to prevent premature births so each child can reach their full potential and then be callous to the reality that some children will never have the chance to even be born? That is why Americans will stand on the National Mall for the March for Life January 22. We are Americans. We believe in the inherent right to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness. That right extends to all people, regardless of their size.

EXTEND EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, here we go again, another week, another bill, another missed opportunity to extend emergency unemployment benefits for 1.4 million Americans.

Today, the House will be voting on the 2014 omnibus spending bill, but one key part is missing: an extension of emergency unemployment benefits. To add insult to injury, on Friday, this body will adjourn for another week of recess without addressing this issue, leaving 1.4 million Americans without this critical lifeline, a number that grows every day. It is terrible for these families and for our economy.

Just yesterday, I spoke with a constituent, Margaret, a mother of four who is suffering with Parkinson's disease whose benefits were cut. She has worked her whole life. This is the first time she has ever had to ask for help. She is among more than 4,900 Rhode Island families and 1.4 million Americans who are struggling to find work and need this insurance to help them survive.

We should not adjourn before resolving this issue, and I urge my colleagues to press the Speaker to bring a bill to the floor to extend emergency unemployment insurance today.

CONGRATULATING DRESS FOR SUCCESS MIAMI

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, Dress for Success is celebrating 20 years of service to Miami-Dade County residents who have benefited through its training and clothing programs. This noble organization promotes self-sufficiency to low-income women by providing professional attire, while equipping them with the tools and resources to help them thrive in work and in life.

Over 35,000 women in Miami have already succeeded and transitioned from unemployment to economic independence. We have seen that when women have the possibility to earn an income, find stability, and invest back into their communities, they successfully break the dreadful cycle of poverty.

The Dress for Success celebration will also honor the first woman to serve as president of any State senate in the United States, Florida Senator Gwen Margolis. I have had the pleasure of knowing Gwen for over 30 years and can testify on her commitment to public service, to our community, and to her many capacities as a member of the Miami-Dade County Commission, the Florida House of Representatives, and the Florida Senate.

I thank Florida Senator Gwen Margolis and Dress for Success Miami for what they do on behalf of low-income women of south Florida.

ECONOMY PRIORITY NUMBER ONE

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to advocate for the 1.3 million Americans and their families who have been hit hardest by this recession. Affording the most basic necessities—food, transportation, rent, and health care—just got even harder. Their needs are not extravagant. The benefits of unemployment insurance are not a blank check. They are a modest lifeline for families who are in need of desperate help over the holidays and in a cold winter.

Since Congress has failed to act, over 60,000 residents of Massachusetts have lost access to these benefits. If we fail to do so, 140,000 more residents of our State are in jeopardy. At a time when the State's overall jobless rate is around 7 percent, and rises to 12 or 13 percent in some of our most challenged communities, to not extend these benefits today is wrong.

My colleagues that are blocking this bill will tell you they are concerned with the number of people accessing these benefits. Well, you know what? So am I, and cutting those benefits off today is wrong.

The funding that we seek today is an essential lifeline for these individuals at a time when we need to be expanding workforce development programs, workforce training programs, community colleges, vocational schools, and STEM education. We have to support our small businesses, an economic engine for so many American communities. I am in support of transportation upgrades, investments in infrastructure, and affordable housing.

While there is a whole lot we should be working on right now, getting our economy going again and getting people back up should be priority number one.

FLEXIBILITY TO PROMOTE REEMPLOYMENT ACT

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

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge support for the Flexibility to Promote Reemployment Act. Under the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012, States were granted unprecedented flexibility in the use of unemployment insurance funds to help unemployed individuals

collect paychecks instead of benefit checks.

Unfortunately for States, the DOL issued restrictive, burdensome, and costly application requirements. To date, one State has completed the application process, only to have the application swiftly denied. The Flexibility to Promote Reemployment Act increases flexibility in the use of State UI funds by enabling the DOL to revisit current application guidance and allow States to operate demonstration projects that test alternative means of helping the unemployed return to work.

At a time when our unemployment rate remains unacceptably high, we need to be doing everything we can to advance solutions that will promote job creation. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this commonsense legislation.

EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on December 28, 3 days after Christmas, this Federal Government allowed 1.3 million American families to be cut off of long-term unemployment insurance. It comes at a time when we are in the dead of winter, at a time when construction employment is dormant, when agriculture is not hiring. It comes at a time when the national unemployment rate is close on 7 percent, when the national long-term unemployment rate is 2.6 percent, which is twice what it ever was when we ever cut off long-term unemployment before, going back to 1959. It comes at a time when jobs growth is its weakest in 3 years, and it comes at a time when we know it is going to cost 240,000 jobs for our economy. This is money, Mr. Speaker, that goes right back into the economy because people are living hand to mouth on these checks and they need to spend it right away.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I urge you to bring up the modest 90-day extension for unemployment insurance before we break for recess.

GROW ECONOMY, NOT FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, the new year is an opportunity for Congress to get back to work for the American people, and that means supporting good-paying jobs and a growing economy.

Over the coming weeks, we are going to hear debating of proposals that would put more people on unemployment support for longer periods of time. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, that is the wrong direction for our country.

What the American people want and need are greater job opportunities, not bigger government programs. Let's grow the economy, not the Federal Government. Mr. Speaker, we live in the land of opportunity, the greatest Nation on Earth, a place for everyone. No matter what their economic or racial or socioeconomic background, everyone has a chance to live the American Dream.

The policies of bailouts, borrowing, and Big Government only serve to threaten those opportunities. Rather than focus on expanding government programs, let's expand opportunity. Let's empower the American people to grow and build and create. Let's focus on bills that create more opportunities for employment, and let's come together to help honest, hardworking Americans realize the great American Dream.

RAISE MINIMUM WAGE

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal minimum wage has remained the same for 4 years and has failed to keep up with the cost of living. According to the recently released Shriver Report, nearly two-thirds of minimum wage workers are women, and 42 million American women either live in poverty or are right on the brink of it. This is wrong. No one who works hard at a full-time job to provide for their children and family should be living in poverty.

Today, with one in five children in America still living in poverty, we must act and pass the Fair Minimum Wage Act, which would increase the Federal minimum wage to $10.10 an hour for American workers over the next 3 years. This modest increase would raise the wages of approximately 30 million Americans and bring over 4.5 million people above the poverty line. Increasing the minimum wage to $10.10 an hour will not only put more money into the pockets of those in need, but it will infuse an additional $51 billion into our economy.

Mr. Speaker, this will not be a job killer; it actually will help to create 140,000 new jobs. Our success as a Nation hinges on the success of women. When women succeed, America succeeds.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE EXTENSION

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, because of the House Republican leadership's inaction, 3 days after Christmas, 127,000 New Yorkers were cut off from their jobless benefits. Every week in 2014, another 5,100 working families in New York lose unemployment compensation. These families are struggling to make ends meet and put food on the table.

This inaction not only harms dislocated workers who stop receiving a check in the mail, but it also slows economic growth. When families have to further cut spending, there is a ripple effect. As families spend less on necessities like food and clothing, local businesses take a hit. Indeed, it has been estimated that failing to pass an unemployment insurance extension will cost our economy 310,000 new jobs.

Mr. Speaker, this could end today. Let's do what is right for working families and for the American economy. Let's reinstate unemployment insurance, and let's do so now.

WAR ON POVERTY

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remind my colleagues that the war on poverty, begun 50 years ago by President Johnson, is still relevant today. As we debate the great issues, we must not forget that nearly 50 million Americans in 2012 were below the poverty level, and that includes 13 million children. Most startling, Mr. Speaker, 16 million of those live below half of the poverty line. Were it not for the safety net that some want to dismantle, 41 million more would live in poverty.

It is undeniable that the poverty rate has decreased, but the fact remains that the face of poverty continues to be low-income Whites and racial minorities and females and children. The omnibus bill will continue to dismantle nondefense discretionary spending to a level that will reverse the gains made over the past 50 years.

I plead with my colleagues to be vigilant in our fight to end poverty in America. Our oath requires us to provide for the common defense, but it also requires that we provide for the common good and enable every American to achieve the American Dream.

□ 1230

WAR ON POVERTY

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago, President Johnson declared an unconditional war on poverty in America and established landmark programs—such as Head Start, Medicare, and Job Corps—that were designed to give all Americans the opportunity to succeed.

These programs have had a substantial impact, cutting poverty by one-third since 1967. Despite the progress, however, we still have a lot to do.

Today, 100 million Americans live in or near the brink of poverty, including 42 million women and 28 million children. In Nevada, nearly 18 percent of women and 24 percent of children live in poverty, a situation made even

worse by the gender wage gap and the lack of paid leave and affordable care. It is hard to lean in when you are barely hanging on.

What is more, cuts to SNAP and unemployment insurance have placed even greater hardships on those already struggling to get by. Denying this vital lifeline is morally indefensible and economically shortsighted.

To win the war on poverty, we must strengthen, not gut, the programs that protect and empower millions of people every day, giving everyone in this great country an opportunity to succeed.

DANIEL K. INOUYE ARROW ANTI-MISSILE DEFENSE FACILITY

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, just today, for the first time, Israel named a military facility after a non-Israeli. Named after Daniel K. Inouye is an Arrow anti-missile defense facility.

As we know, the U.S. and Israel have successfully developed the Arrow anti-missile system through joint cooperation. A steadfast symbol of cooperation is perhaps the most appropriate way to remember him, as our Senator played an integral role in transforming the relationship between our two countries, and I am pleased that our allies around the world continue to honor him and carry on his legacy.

When former colleagues recall Senator Inouye, they insist that, without him, there would be no U.S. aid to Israel as we know it today. The Senator's interest in Israel stemmed from learning of the fate of the Jews in Europe after his own military experience in Italy in the 442nd, a legendary unit of Japanese Americans, which earned him the highest military honor, the Congressional Medal of Honor.

This honor is another example of how Senator Inouye's influence and hard work have deeply impacted not only Hawaii, but also our Nation and the world. This time, he was recognized some 8,664-plus-or-minus miles from his beloved Hawaii.

UNEMPLOYMENT EXTENSION

(Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to reinstate a critical lifeline for the unemployed.

Since the expiration of the unemployment insurance benefits in December, 1.3 million people nationwide have been affected, one in six of whom live in California.

This extension of unemployment benefits is especially needed for the residents of San Bernardino County, where the unemployment rate is 9.1—well above the national average.

Unemployment benefits keep individuals actively looking for work, they prevent families with a reduced income from becoming homeless, and infuse the economy with much-needed dollars.

My constituents have contacted my office on a daily basis. I hear them. They need this vital lifeline back.

I ask that the Speaker work with the Senate and take up this extension.

UNEMPLOYMENT EXTENSION

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

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is completely insensitive, unjust, and flat out wrong that Congress would deny the now more than 1.4 million Americans unemployment insurance, including over 18,000 Nevadans.

Mr. Speaker, this is the week that checks stop coming in the mail. For those who maybe never have been unemployed or don't know what it is like to struggle, for many Americans this is the week that the pain takes hold.

The hypocrisy from across the aisle is staggering. I don't quote the former President often, but on December 14, 2002, in his weekly radio address, then-President George W. Bush scolded Congress because ''no final bill was sent to me extending unemployment benefits for about 750,000 Americans whose benefits will expire on December 28.''

He went on to say:

> These Americans rely on their unemployment benefits to pay for their mortgage or rent, food, and other critical bills. They need our assistance in these difficult times, and we cannot let them down.

The unemployment rate in December 2002, it was just 6 percent. Congress then extended those unemployment benefits, Mr. Speaker, by a vote of 416–4. If it was an emergency then, it is an emergency now.

It is time to do the right thing and extend unemployment insurance for the 1.4 million Americans.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). 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.

SMALL BUSINESS MERGERS, ACQUISITIONS, SALES, AND BROKERAGE SIMPLIFICATION ACT OF 2013

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2274) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide for a notice-filing registration procedure for brokers performing services in connection with the transfer of ownership of smaller privately held companies and to provide for regulation appropriate to the limited scope of the activities of such brokers, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2274

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 ''Small Business Mergers, Acquisitions, Sales, and Brokerage Simplification Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. REGISTRATION EXEMPTION FOR MERGER AND ACQUISITION BROKERS.

Section 15(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(13) REGISTRATION EXEMPTION FOR MERGER AND ACQUISITION BROKERS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an M&A broker shall be exempt from registration under this section.

''(B) EXCLUDED ACTIVITIES.—An M&A broker is not exempt from registration under this paragraph if such broker does any of the following:

''(i) Directly or indirectly, in connection with the transfer of ownership of an eligible privately held company, receives, holds, transmits, or has custody of the funds or securities to be exchanged by the parties to the transaction.

''(ii) Engages on behalf of an issuer in a public offering of any class of securities that is registered, or is required to be registered, with the Commission under section 12 or with respect to which the issuer files, or is required to file, periodic information, documents, and reports under subsection (d).

''(C) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to limit any other authority of the Commission to exempt any person, or any class of persons, from any provision of this title, or from any provision of any rule or regulation thereunder.

''(D) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

''(i) CONTROL.—The term 'control' means the power, directly or indirectly, to direct the management or policies of a company, whether through ownership of securities, by contract, or otherwise. There is a presumption of control for any person who—

''(I) is a director, general partner, member or manager of a limited liability company, or officer exercising executive responsibility (or has similar status or functions);

''(II) has the right to vote 20 percent or more of a class of voting securities or the power to sell or direct the sale of 20 percent or more of a class of voting securities; or

''(III) in the case of a partnership or limited liability company, has the right to receive upon dissolution, or has contributed, 20 percent or more of the capital.

''(ii) ELIGIBLE PRIVATELY HELD COMPANY.—The term 'eligible privately held company' means a company that meets both of the following conditions:

''(I) The company does not have any class of securities registered, or required to be registered, with the Commission under section 12 or with respect to which the company files, or is required to file, periodic information, documents, and reports under subsection (d).

''(II) In the fiscal year ending immediately before the fiscal year in which the services of the M&A broker are initially engaged with respect to the securities transaction, the company meets either or both of the following conditions (determined in accordance with the historical financial accounting records of the company):

''(aa) The earnings of the company before interest, taxes, depreciation, and amortization are less than $25,000,000.

''(bb) The gross revenues of the company are less than $250,000,000.

''(iii) M&A BROKER.—The term 'M&A broker' means a broker, and any person associated with a broker, engaged in the business of effecting securities transactions solely in connection with the transfer of ownership of an eligible privately held company, regardless of whether the broker acts on behalf of a seller or buyer, through the purchase, sale, exchange, issuance, repurchase, or redemption of, or a business combination involving, securities or assets of the eligible privately held company, if the broker reasonably believes that—

''(I) upon consummation of the transaction, any person acquiring securities or assets of the eligible privately held company, acting alone or in concert, will control and, directly or indirectly, will be active in the management of the eligible privately held company or the business conducted with the assets of the eligible privately held company; and

''(II) if any person is offered securities in exchange for securities or assets of the eligible privately held company, such person will, prior to becoming legally bound to consummate the transaction, receive or have reasonable access to the most recent year-end balance sheet, income statement, statement of changes in financial position, and statement of owner's equity of the issuer of the securities offered in exchange, and, if the financial statements of the issuer are audited, the related report of the independent auditor, a balance sheet dated not more than 120 days before the date of the offer, and information pertaining to the management, business, results of operations for the period covered by the foregoing financial statements, and material loss contingencies of the issuer.

''(E) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—On the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of the Small Business Mergers, Acquisitions, Sales, and Brokerage Simplification Act of 2013, and every 5 years thereafter, each dollar amount in subparagraph (D)(ii)(II) shall be adjusted by—

''(I) dividing the annual value of the Employment Cost Index For Wages and Salaries, Private Industry Workers (or any successor index), as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, for the calendar year preceding the calendar year in which the adjustment is being made by the annual value of such index (or successor) for the calendar year ending December 31, 2012; and

''(II) multiplying such dollar amount by the quotient obtained under subclause (I).

''(ii) ROUNDING.—Each dollar amount determined under clause (i) shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $100,000.''.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and any amendment made by this Act shall take effect on the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to submit extraneous materials for the RECORD on H.R. 2274, as amended, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, at this point, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of this good piece of legislation, H.R. 2274. It is the Small Business Mergers, Acquisitions, Sales, and Brokerage Simplification Act. It is introduced by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), who will be speaking momentarily.

Mr. Speaker, during the period of overly burdensome Big Government—of ObamaCare and of Dodd-Frank and thousands and thousands more regulations costing Americans literally trillions of dollars—it is really no surprise that the economic growth and job creation in this country remain sluggish.

America's small businesses are the primary engine of job creation, for they are the ones who are disproportionately affected by simply a deluge of new rules and regulations coming out of Washington daily. In fact, according to a recent survey, small businesses continue to identify government regulation and red tape as the single most important problem facing them.

While our colleagues in the Senate appear unwilling these days to pass any legislation to help create jobs, well, we have H.R. 2274 in the House that we take up, and it is done in a bipartisan manner. It is a commonsense piece of legislation that will remove some of these unnecessary regulations and obstacles to small business development, growth, and job creation.

What it would do is exempt brokers who perform services in connection with the transfer of ownership of small, privately held companies—that are also known as M&A brokers—from the SEC's costly one-size-fits-all registration requirements that we have right now.

While terms that we sometimes hear in the press and elsewhere—mergers, acquisitions, brokers—may give you the image of big Wall Streets and what have you, make no mistake about it, this bill is about helping Main Street.

M&A brokers play a very, very important role helping small businesses and small business owners successfully navigate their way through and transfer their company, or sell their company, to new owners, new enterprises, instead of simply closing up their shop and going out of business.

Yet under the current SEC one-size-fits-all registration regime, M&A brokers face a myriad of costly regulations. Unfortunately, M&A brokers have to pass these costs on to, well, other small businesses and, of course, eventually the public.

It is no wonder this legislation has now received widespread and bipartisan support. In fact, this bill was unanimously approved by the committee 57–0. Let me get that straight: 57–0.

I would like to thank the sponsor, Mr. HUIZENGA, for all his hard work on this legislation and bringing it to the floor at a time like this when America's small businesses are struggling through a mire of regulation and red tape. This type of bipartisan pro-small business, pro-jobs legislation is exactly the type of thing we need.

I urge my colleagues on both sides to pass it, as we did in the committee, in a bipartisan manner.

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today, I rise in support of H.R. 2274, the Small Business Mergers, Acquisitions, Sales, and Brokerage Simplification Act of 2013.

H.R. 2274 provides a much-needed exemption and clarification for current M&A brokers who perform services in connection with the transfer and ownership of small- and medium-sized businesses in privately negotiated transactions.

Small- and medium-sized businesses play a critical role in our economy. They provide jobs, they spur innovation, and they strengthen our overall economy. In fact, over the past decade and a half, America's small businesses and entrepreneurs have created 65 percent of all new jobs in this country.

As businesses grow, many small- and medium-sized businesses reach a point where they want to and need to expand their businesses. They turn to mergers and acquisition professionals to facilitate such sales.

Currently, M&A brokers who facilitate the private sale of small- and medium-sized privately owned companies must register with the SEC. SEC registration as a broker also requires membership in FINRA—the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority.

The burdens and costs of initial broker-dealer registration and ongoing compliance with both SEC and FINRA requirements are substantial. These costs adversely impact and unnecessarily increase the costs that business owners incur to sell, buy, or grow their small- and medium-sized businesses.

H.R. 2274 is a legislative acknowledgement that one size does not, indeed, fit all when it comes to transactions. Prior to my election, I was a securities lawyer with over a decade of experience working in capital markets for a Wall Street law firm. I had the opportunity to work on a variety of transactions.

Not all mergers and acquisitions are alike, and so not all require the same type of registration and requirements. Some transactions are privately negotiated transmissions of relatively small dollar amounts with sophisticated investors, not for public sale. By streamlining and simplifying the regulatory structures of these small- and medium-sized businesses, we allow them to safely, efficiently, and effectively sell their companies while preserving growth and protecting jobs in these companies.

This bill, H.R. 2274, allows smaller privately held companies to save time and money on the services rendered during the transfer of ownership allowing for smooth sale and transfer. To qualify for the exemption, the transaction would have to involve a business with less than $250 million in gross revenues and/or pre-tax earnings of less than $25 million with no securities, and the buyer of the business is someone who will actively manage and control the business, either directly or indirectly.

I fully support this bipartisan legislation and its efforts to simplify the regulatory structure in the sale and transfer of ownership of small- and medium-sized businesses in privately negotiated transactions.

This reform was welcomed by regulators and passed, as the chairman of the subcommittee so accurately noted, by a vote of 57–0, unanimously, with full bipartisan support. The ABA Private Placement Broker-Dealer Task Force recommended this change in its 2005 report, which is available on the SEC Web site. Similar recommendations to simplify broker-dealer registration for M&A brokers were made in the final report by the advisory committee to the SEC on small business companies in 2006.

I think appropriately scaling Federal registration of M&A brokers is a good thing. It is something that I would not only support, but encourage my colleagues to support as well.

H.R. 2274 would amend the Exchange Act by adding a new subsection, section 15, which would govern broker-dealer registration. The amendment would cut regulatory costs incurred by sellers and buyers of small-and mid-sized privately held companies in privately negotiated transactions.

Federal law would continue to provide important investor protections through the SEC registration and SEC regulation of the capital, custody, margin, recordkeeping, bonding, and operational reporting requirements applicable to M&A brokers, and existing State security laws will continue to apply.

□ 1245

I think that this is sensible legislation that should be supported by both sides of the aisle. I am indeed honored to stand with my colleagues in support of H.R. 2274.

Mr. GARRETT. I thank the gentlelady for working with us on this, as she says, sensible piece of legislation.

And with that, I yield such time as the gentleman may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), the sponsor of the legislation before the House at this time.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage passage of H.R. 2274, the Small Business Mergers, Acquisitions, Sales, and Brokerage Simplification Act. Maybe we need to work on the titles getting a little simpler, too. It is very complex. It is a very complex set of laws and rules that have been put in place.

I do want to say thank you to my subcommittee chairman, Mr. GARRETT, and Ranking Member Sewell for their work on this, as well as Chairman HENSARLING and Ranking Member WATERS, as we have explored this and dove headfirst, really, into this issue.

It has been estimated, Mr. Speaker, that there are approximately 10 trillion—that's ''trillion'' with a ''t''—privately-owned, small family-owned type of businesses that will be sold or potentially closed in the coming years as baby boomers retire.

Now, we want to see one of those things happen. We want people to see the fruits of their hard work over the years, and we want to see them be able to sell those companies. We don't want to see them close them unnecessarily, because we know the impact that happens to small communities, much like has happened in some of my hometown communities, when we have seen that happen.

Mergers and acquisitions are also known as M&A. Brokers play a critical role in facilitating the transfer of ownership of these smaller privately held companies. Currently, all M&A brokers are subject to costly, burdensome requirements which adversely impact and unnecessarily increase the cost that business owners incur when they buy or sell their businesses. Often we have heard anecdotally and statistically that they have to make a decision sometimes. They can't move ahead and can't really afford to sell that small—literally, sometimes—corner store, mom-and-pop-type operation, and so they end of closing it because they can't afford to go through the sale.

In fact, the issue has been highlighted by the SEC's Forum on Small Business Capital Formation, which, for the last 7 years—that is over the last two administrations, this current administration and the last administration—has repeatedly recommended that the SEC modernize and streamline the regulation of M&A brokers. But, unfortunately, the SEC has never acted on these recommendations.

Well, we think the time is up. We believe that 7 years is long enough. It is time that this body and hopefully our colleagues in the Senate, as well, will take this bill and finally put some closure to this issue. That is why I, along with Representatives BRIAN HIGGINS and BILL POSEY, introduced H.R. 2274. This bipartisan bill would create a simplified system for brokers performing services in connection with the transfer of ownership of smaller privately held companies.

By simplifying the regulation and reducing the cost of these business brokerage services, these smaller privately owned companies would be able to safely, efficiently, and effectively transfer their company, preserving jobs currently in existence, while also allowing for continued economic growth and job creation to take place at these companies.

There is no risk to the public; there is no threat to the safety and soundness of our economic system; but it is very, very important to those communities that have those kinds of businesses in them and where they are located.

In October 2013, a piece in The Hill newspaper, Michael Nall, president of the Alliance of Merger & Acquisition Advisors, a leading international organization serving the middle-market M&A industry, stated:

> H.R. 2274, the Small Business Mergers, Acquisitions, Sales, and Brokerage Simplification Act of 2013 is an excellent bipartisan bill, one whose time has come. Congress should get it done before the end of the year.

Sorry, Mr. Nall. We are a little behind schedule, but we are getting there.

He goes on:

> It's not a sexy bill, not one that prime time TV will be talking about, and not one that will evoke a question in the next Presidential debates; but it is a bill that does have teeth, and it is a serious and substantive piece of small business legislation.

Well, maybe we can inject this into the next Presidential election because this ultimately is about the foundation of our country. It is about that ability for entrepreneurs to go out, strike out on their own, go become successful and then reap the rewards of that and, all the while, provide jobs to communities like we all represent.

Well, in today's highly charged political environment, it is nice to show the American people that a positive, effective initiative can be considered and passed with strong bipartisan support. In fact, this important legislation, as has been mentioned, overwhelmingly passed the Financial Services Committee by a bipartisan vote of 57–0. It is legislation like H.R. 2274 that demonstrates Congress can act in a bipartisan manner to positively impact the lives of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, with that I urge a ''yes'' vote on this legislation, and I look forward to working with my Senate colleague to see H.R. 2274 make it to President Obama's desk.

I want to thank Chairman GARRETT for his leadership on this issue.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES).

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Alabama for yielding me time, and my friend from New Jersey and Mr. HUIZENGA for the sponsorship and leadership on this bill.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 2274.

We spend a lot of time in this Chamber talking about the American Dream, and of course in many cases the apex of the American Dream is when that entrepreneur who started a bunch of restaurants or car washes or a local retailer or a local service organization, after working hard over a period of a lifetime, has the opportunity to reap

the rewards of that labor, to sell that business, and to really achieve that success an individual worked a lifetime to do.

Of course, if you have run car washes or restaurants or retail operations, you probably know very little about the very complicated task of selling a small business. There is no reason in the world why that transaction, which again is at the very apex of the American Dream, should be overburdened by regulatory costs that don't make sense.

At the end of the day, the M&A brokers that we are talking about here are not selling stocks to retail investors. They are not marketing mortgages. They are doing a very technical transaction that, again, is so important to wealth creation in this country.

So I thank my colleagues on the other side.

I don't want to let the moment go by without reminding my good friend from New Jersey that, as he blanket condemns regulation today on the floor, there are 300,000 people without drinking water in West Virginia today, in the greatest country on Earth, not because there is too much regulation, but because the regulations weren't good enough.

Years ago in west Texas, a fertilizer train blew up, killing 15 people and injuring 160 people, not because there was too much regulation, but because there was poor regulation.

In the area of our expertise, financial services, this economy was also devastated, not because there was too much regulation, but because there was effectively no regulation under derivatives—complicated, large instruments that brought down institutions like AIG and others because, before Dodd-Frank, you could go into a neighborhood and sell somebody a mortgage without asking for their income.

We succeed and the economy succeeds because we do exactly this, because we find the right balance. We acknowledge that good regulation can save lives in Texas, drinking water in West Virginia, and prevent the destruction of $17 trillion of American's wealth as occurred 5 years ago.

Again, I celebrate and thank my good friend from New Jersey and promise to continue this dialogue on how we don't condemn all regulation, but seek a balance that allows our economy to thrive as it always has.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Connecticut has the unique ability, in order to come to the floor and work in a manner where both sides said we had a bipartisan joint piece of legislation, a jobs-creating legislation, to turn this moment into a partisan attack.

No, I never once said I am against a blanket condemnation of all regulations. In fact, if the gentleman from Connecticut had listened closely, he would have heard that we are, I think, in a bipartisan manner, opposed to overly excessive regulation, regulation that does not make sense, regulation that hurts jobs. I think that is what his colleague also said. She is opposed to those unnecessary regulations, and that is what this bill is about. We are in favor—I think the gentlelady and I both said this—of smart regulation. That is what this bill before us is about trying to achieve.

If he wants to take a look at bad regulation, all we need to do is look at the excessive and the inappropriate regulation that we had prior to the '08 crisis, the fact that we had examiners and regulators in each and every one of the major failed institutions that led up to this crisis, and those individuals failed to do their jobs. Those individuals failed to find the problems before they came to a head. Those individuals failed to find situations even when they were told about them in such cases as Stanford or Madoff or a list of other ones I could go down here as well.

We had regulators who did not perform their job. Even though they had the authority, the ability, the financing, the money and everything else necessary to do it, they turned a blind eye to it and failed to do so. This is not a time for a partisanship. This a time to commend both the sponsor of the legislation and the gentlelady who joins with me on this to say that we can get together; we can find commonality when we want to have smart legislation and smart regulation. And I think that is what we should be commending and moving forward on this legislation today.

With that, I don't believe we have any other speakers; but I reserve the balance of my time to close, unless the minority have other speakers.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER).

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Small Business Mergers, Acquisitions, Sales, and Brokerage Simplification Act of 2013, H.R. 2274.

I want to thank Congresswoman SEWELL and Congressman HUIZENGA for bringing this bipartisan bill to the floor.

Small businesses are the fabric of our economy and oftentimes the fabric of the communities in which we live. Many of these businesses are family-owned businesses. They provide the wherewithal, the stability, and the future aspirations for many families. These businesses frequently are passed from generation to generation, but sometimes the next generation does not or is not able to take over the next business.

It is critical for our communities and critical for our economies that these businesses are able to pass to a new owner to continue to employ people, to continue to drive our economy, and that is exactly what this bill does. It allows those businesses to bring in the expertise, to bring in the knowledge, to bring in the capacity, to move from generation to generation even outside the family. So that is why I rise and I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Right-sizing Federal regulation on M&A brokers in these small business transactions I believe makes good sense. All of us have small- and medium-size business owners in our districts who sooner or later will want to sell or grow their businesses through acquisition or transfer of ownership. They will seek advice and hire highly trained professionals to help them find and screen potential targets. These buyers and sellers are represented by lawyers and accountants who will conduct the due diligence. They will rely on written representations and warranties in these negotiated transactions for their protections.

We should reduce the barriers to capital formation, and this bill is an important step towards that. This bill, by streamlining small private transactions, will free up SEC resources to protect the public against public markets and passive investors.

As baby boomers age, there is a tremendous transfer of wealth and streamlining that will occur over the next generation. As my colleagues so aptly said, it is estimated that over $10 trillion of privately owned businesses will be sold or closed as baby boomers retire.

Jobs are preserved and created when existing businesses are acquired by entrepreneurs or other companies. In Main Street, typically business brokers play a vital role in facilitating these private business mergers and acquisitions. This bill will encourage such business growth.

Helping our small businesses is not a partisan issue. We all benefit when small businesses grow and flourish. I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to make strategic and economically beneficial policy decisions that will be smart regulations, that will strengthen our economy and create jobs.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 2274, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1300

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I begin by thanking the gentlelady for her leadership on this legislation, adopting the word I just used, which is smart regulation is smart legislation, but also the words you used as well as far as reducing barriers and streamlining, which is really what the gentleman from Michigan has accomplished in this legislation that is before us.

The other takeaway I am going to take from the gentlewoman's comment as well is twofold: A, this is being done in a bipartisan manner; but B, we need to move this thing forward. By that, I

mean the House of Representatives today, in a bipartisan manner, is going to be moving a good piece of job-creating legislation.

The next step, we know, of course, is just across the Capitol, in the U.S. Senate. We want to make sure that this legislation, in a bipartisan manner, also moves there as well. Hopefully, we can link arms and join in getting them to move this legislation there as well.

With that, I thank the gentlelady. I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) for all of his leadership in the committee and his work on this legislation and the other legislation he is leading on as well.

With that, I encourage the passage of H.R. 2274, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2274, as amended.

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. GARRETT. 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.

HOLDING COMPANY REGISTRATION THRESHOLD EQUALIZATION ACT OF 2013

Mr. GARRETT. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 801) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to make the shareholder threshold for registration of savings and loan holding companies the same as for bank holding companies.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 801

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 ''Holding Company Registration Threshold Equalization Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. REGISTRATION THRESHOLD FOR SAVINGS AND LOAN HOLDING COMPANIES.

The Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 12(g)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B), by inserting after ''is a bank'' the following: '', a savings and loan holding company (as defined in section 10 of the Home Owners' Loan Act),''; and

(B) in paragraph (4), by inserting after ''case of a bank'' the following: '', a savings and loan holding company (as defined in section 10 of the Home Owners' Loan Act),''; and

(2) in section 15(d), by striking ''case of bank'' and inserting the following: ''case of a bank, a savings and loan holding company (as defined in section 10 of the Home Owners' Loan Act),''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WAGNER). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous materials for the RECORD on H.R. 801, currently under consideration.

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

I rise today, as I did a moment ago as well, in support of this good, commonsense legislation, which is H.R. 801, the Holding Company Registration Threshold Equalization Act. I also, just like with the prior legislation, would like to commend the bipartisan nature of the legislation before us and the bipartisan nature of the sponsors of this legislation, Representatives WOMACK, HIMES, DELANEY, and Mrs. WAGNER, as well, for their outstanding work on getting this important measure to the floor today.

What does it do?

H.R. 801 basically corrects a technical oversight from last Congress' JOBS Act, which was the Jumpstart Our Business Startups Act, and it does so by ensuring that savings and loans holding companies, or SLHCs, are able to take advantage of the law's provisions that modify the thresholds by which bank holding companies are forced to register or allowed to deregister with the SEC.

Most savings and loan holding companies are organized very similarly to bank holding companies and are subject to similar regulatory oversight. Because this is the case, it is appropriate now for us to correct this technical oversight in the law and streamline the registration and deregistration thresholds of savings and loan and bank holding companies.

I will end now where I began, and that is to thank the leadership for bringing up this very important legislation, and the sponsors as well for working in a bipartisan manner. I ask that all Members support this commonsense legislation and the Senate consider it without any delay.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I, once again, thank Chairman GARRETT, chairman of the Subcommittee on Capital Markets, for his support and leadership on this bill. I particularly thank my cosponsors on this bill: Mr. WOMACK, with whom I have worked before; Mrs. WAGNER; and Mr. DELANEY. Additional cosponsors of the bill are Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. RENACCI. I thank them for their hard work.

This is a rare example of a wise bipartisan bill that will achieve something important, which is to basically undertake a technical fix to the JOBS Act, passed into law in April of 2012, which allowed banks to put off becoming public until they reached a threshold of 2,000 shareholders. That sounds like a small and technical point, but it put a tremendous burden on banks that perhaps were not ready to go public with more than 500 shareholders at the time.

The legislation did not directly specify that savings and loans would also receive the same treatment. It was, I believe, the intent of Congress that that be the case. So H.R. 801 goes back to seek to remedy this issue.

The Holding Company Registration Threshold Equalization Act, a rather awkward name for H.R. 801, extends the shareholder registration thresholds to savings and loan holding companies. This bill will ensure that savings and loan institutions operate under the same rules as banks, trying to create a more uniform and simple regulatory apparatus.

This will help these institutions raise capital so that they have the resources to make the loans which drive the economic growth—the businesses, the colleges, the mortgages, the purchases that drive the economic growth of this country.

Madam Speaker, again, I thank Mr. GARRETT for his support. As we seek creative solutions to the Nation's job crisis, we should do everything we can to stimulate the consumer demand that we know drives so much of this economy. This bill is one small, commonsense step we can take in that direction.

Again, I thank Mr. WOMACK, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. DELANEY for their leadership.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. I, too, thank the gentleman from Connecticut.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK), the prime sponsor of the bill.

Mr. WOMACK. Madam Speaker, my thanks to the subcommittee chairman and to Chairman HENSARLING for shepherding this bill through committee and bringing it to the House floor. I, too, would like to express my gratitude to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, particularly Representative HIMES, with whom I worked in the previous Congress on similar legislation that has already been articulated, and Representative DELANEY and Mrs. WAGNER for working with me on this bipartisan measure.

As you know, Madam Speaker, we have been talking about jobs. The House has passed bill after bill to create a better environment for private sector growth and job creation. These conservative solutions would help create new jobs today, would make life for families better across the country, and would expand opportunity for everyone without expanding government. That is

exactly what this bill, H.R. 801, does as well, and I am proud to rise and urge support for its passage.

Small financial institutions are essential to the communities they serve. Their boards are made up of community leaders. Their employees are our neighbors. They sponsor Little League teams and softball leagues and support the United Way. On Friday nights, you see their logos on the scoreboards at high school football games.

These institutions have a deep and abiding love for the towns that they serve, and our constituents—small business owners, farmers, and hard-working Americans—rely on them to meet payroll, to purchase equipment, or to buy a car or a home.

Unfortunately, these institutions are coming under increased pressure from Washington, forcing them to spend more and more of their resources not to put capital into the community but to comply with onerous new regulations and requirements—requirements intended for larger banks—instead of serving the needs of their communities. Our small community banks and savings and loan holding companies were not the cause of the financial crisis, and they should not be treated as though they were.

That is why in the last Congress the House and Senate acted to eliminate some of these unnecessary burdens by passing the JOBS Act. Among other things, the bill raised the registration threshold for bank holdings companies from 500 to 2,000 shareholders and increased the deregistration threshold from 300 to 1,200 shareholders, better positioning banks to increase their business lending and, in turn, promote economic growth in our communities.

Due to an oversight, the JOBS Act did not explicitly extend these new thresholds to savings and loan holding companies. As a sponsor of the original legislation, this wasn't our intent, and I supported report language in the House FY 2013 Financial Services and General Government appropriations bill clarifying that savings and loan holding companies should be treated in the same manner as bank and bank holding companies. Additionally, Representative HIMES and I wrote to SEC Chairman Schapiro to ask that the SEC use its authority to carry out our original intent.

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, we are still without a successful resolution to the problem. At a time when our economy is struggling, Congress must address the issue and ease the burdens on these institutions to allow them to deploy more of their capital throughout the communities they serve. H.R. 801 does this by correcting this oversight and ensuring that savings and loan holding companies are treated in the same manner as bank and bank holding companies.

I urge my colleagues to support this job-creating legislation.

Mr. HIMES. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER), my colleague.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 801, the Holding Company Registration Threshold Equalization Act. This simple, bipartisan measure ensures consumers and businesses—the drivers of our economy—have access to the capital they need.

The JOBS Act gave small community banks flexibility to raise capital without being required to comply with regulations specifically intended for the larger financial institutions that were responsible for the 2008 financial crisis. This was a positive change that injected much-needed capital into our local economies. However, the legislation did not specifically extend it to small savings and loans holding companies.

It is important that we now put the savings and loans on par with our banks, retaining the equity and diversity conducive to the health of our banking system. By putting additional capital in the hands of our local savings and loans, we are helping consumers who are looking for home loans, our neighbors who are starting small businesses, and small businesses that are continuing to invest in their future.

This may be a technical correction, but it remains a correction that has significant beneficial implications for our communities and for our continued economic recovery.

I ask my colleagues to join me in support of this measure.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), also a prime sponsor of the legislation before us and a leading and active member on the committee.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the sponsor of this legislation, Mr. WOMACK of Arkansas, as well as my Democrat colleagues, Mr. HIMES of Connecticut and Mr. DELANEY of Maryland, for their work on this important issue. I also want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee for his very hard work in getting this bill to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, the JOBS Act was a big win for the American economy. Since the law was passed a year and a half ago, a number of American businesses, including more than 40 biotechnology companies, as well as companies such as Kayak and Twitter, have gone public using provisions of the JOBS Act.

Additionally, dozens of community banks across the country have already taken advantage of the updated SEC registration thresholds which made up title VI of the JOBS Act.

Perhaps most encouraging is the frenzy of activity we have been seeing from entrepreneurs around the country, whether it is small technology startups lining up at the gate to begin crowdfunding or small businesses being able to share their story with more investors, now that they are allowed to advertise. We certainly see this kind of activity in the greater St. Louis region, which has become a major hub of innovation.

□ 1315

This is exactly what the JOBS Act was intended to do: allow entrepreneurs and small businesses to focus on innovating and creating jobs, not only complying with outdated government regulations.

Unfortunately, as we all know, Washington tends to move a little slower than the private sector, which is why this legislation is necessary. Title VI of the JOBS Act updates outdated SEC registration thresholds for community banks, and it will allow banks to focus more time on serving their customers than on complying with unnecessary red tape. And while Congress intended to include savings and loans as a part of these new registration thresholds, the SEC, to date, has not interpreted the law in this way.

Savings and loans perform essentially the same function as banks. They are overseen by the same regulators and are a pillar of many small towns and communities across this country.

Missouri is home to about 20 savings and loans that could one day benefit from the provisions in title VI. Many of them have under $200 million in assets and are located in rural areas that rely on their savings and loans for credit. Increasing the ability of these institutions to lend will help increase economic activity in Missouri and all around our great country.

In order to put savings and loans on equal footing with community banks and to codify congressional intent, today we are considering H.R. 801, which will extend the updated threshold in the JOBS Act to savings and loans. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this legislation, because Congress must continue to take steps, no matter how incremental, to increase lending and investment in our economy.

As an added bonus, this legislation comes to the floor today with strong bipartisan support, and I want to again thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their work and their support on this issue, Mr. Speaker.

I urge passage of the bill.

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to just close by thanking you for our partnership and our work on this bill. I hope we can do more of the same.

I thank Mrs. WAGNER and Mr. DELANEY, cosponsors of this bill, and Chairman GARRETT for pushing this through.

As we have said, H.R. 801 is a good idea, a bipartisan idea, and something that I hope we can see the Senate take up.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of H.R. 801 and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I was just thinking as I was sitting here.

Speaker BOEHNER raised the question at the beginning of this administration, where are the jobs? And it is a question that I continue to get when I go home to my district, where are the jobs after all the years of this administration? And it is a question that I hear on the floor once in a while from Members who don't really follow the activity on the floor closely, where are the bills to help create jobs, as if we are not moving them.

Well, today, Mr. Speaker, we have moved two more to the laundry list of other legislation out of this House to answer the question, how can we help facilitate and create more jobs for the American public? That is why I am so pleased to be here with the sponsors of this legislation in a bipartisan manner, H.R. 801, and to be able to get this through the House to answer the question, where are the jobs?

Well, the House of Representatives continues in its tradition of passing legislation to answer that question, to make more jobs for the American public, to streamline the regulatory process, and to reduce the number of Americans who are no longer in the workforce whatsoever.

So I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to not only pass the legislation today, but also to encourage the U.S. Senate, where some often say all good bills go to die, to pick up this legislation and pass it in a forthright manner.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 801.

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. GARRETT. 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.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 106) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 106

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113–46) is amended by striking the date specified in section 106(3) and inserting ''January 18, 2014''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 106.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is a very, very short-term continuing resolution to keep the government open and operating until January 18. The continuing resolution that ended the government shutdown in October provided funding only until January 15, which is, of course, tomorrow.

As you know, yesterday I posted the full fiscal year 2014 omnibus to fund the government for the rest of the year. We hope to pass this comprehensive legislation tomorrow and send it to the Senate in short order. However, in order to allow for the Senate and White House to process, pass, and then sign the omnibus, we simply needed a little extra time for the Senate to take up the matter and work it through their process. This legislation extends the deadline by 3 days and prevents a potential lapse in appropriations that would cause unnecessary problems for government operations.

I ask that my colleagues vote ''yes'' on this necessary bill.

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

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

I rise in support of this clean, short-term continuing resolution to ensure uninterrupted government services while we finish the omnibus bill.

Mr. Speaker, our work could not begin until passage of the Murray-Ryan budget agreement in December. The House and Senate budget resolutions were nearly $92 billion apart. We had already suffered an unnecessary government shutdown.

The December budget agreement passed with bipartisan support, gave the Appropriations Committee a workable number, and allowed bipartisan, bicameral negotiations to occur, and we haven't wasted a moment. Our committee worked through the holidays to produce the fiscal year 2014 omnibus package. I am delighted to report that it contains all 12 spending bills and detailed direction in all areas of discretionary spending.

Reaching agreement on all 12 bills was not easy and required a tremendous level of cooperation and compromise. Nobody got everything they wanted. Last night, Chairman ROGERS and Chairwoman MIKULSKI released the text of the omnibus bill, and Members will now have 2 days to review the details before the House votes.

Unfortunately, the current continuing resolution expires at midnight on Wednesday. To allow time for Senate consideration, we must now consider this short-term, interim CR extension. This clean 3-day CR will guarantee no lapse in funding while the legislative gears turn. It contains no policy provisions or other extraneous material. I support its quick passage.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 106.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

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 questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Motions to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 2274 and H.R. 801, and approval of the Journal.

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

SMALL BUSINESS MERGERS, ACQUISITIONS, SALES, AND BROKERAGE SIMPLIFICATION 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. 2274) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide for a notice-filing registration procedure for brokers performing services in connection with the transfer of ownership of smaller privately held companies and to provide for regulation appropriate to the limited scope of the activities of such brokers, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 422, nays 0, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 14]

YEAS—422

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
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
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
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
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Buchanan
Cleaver
Culberson
Gabbard
Jones
McCarthy (NY)
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sires
Stockman

□ 1358

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to exempt from registration brokers performing services in connection with the transfer of ownership of smaller privately held companies.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOLDING COMPANY REGISTRATION THRESHOLD EQUALIZATION ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 801) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to make the shareholder threshold for registration of savings and loan holding companies the same as for bank holding companies, 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 New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 4, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 15]

YEAS—417

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary

Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
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
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
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
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—4

DeFazio
Dingell
Green, Gene
Visclosky

NOT VOTING—11

Buchanan
Cleaver
Culberson
Deutch
Gabbard
Jones
McCarthy (NY)
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sires
Stockman

□ 1408

Mr. DEFAZIO 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.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 274, nays 138, answered ''present'' 3, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 16]

YEAS—274

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallego
Garrett
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Grayson
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Horsford
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Pascrell
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Quigley
Rangel
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thornberry
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Vela
Wagner
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (IN)

NAYS—138

Amash
Andrews
Barber
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bishop (NY)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Capuano
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Clarke (NY)
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Connolly
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Crowley
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Denham
DeSantis
Duckworth
Duffy
Ellison
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Garcia
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Hanna
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Israel
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Lance
Langevin
Lee (CA)
LoBiondo
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Matheson
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Moore
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
Nugent
Palazzo
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rigell
Rogers (AL)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ryan (OH)
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Sewell (AL)
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Southerland
Stivers
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—3

Gohmert
Owens
Weber (TX)

NOT VOTING—17

Buchanan
Cleaver
Culberson
Deutch
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Garamendi
Jones
Lujan Grisham (NM)
McCarthy (NY)
McKeon
Murphy (FL)
Price (NC)
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sires
Stockman

□ 1414

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

OPM IG ACT

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2860) to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that the Inspector General of the Office of Personnel Management may use amounts in the revolving fund of the Office to fund audits, investigations, and oversight activities, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2860

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 ''OPM IG Act''.

SEC. 2. USE OF OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT REVOLVING FUND FOR AUDITS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES.

Subsection (e) of section 1304 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by adding before the period at the end of the first sentence the following: '', and for the cost of audits, investigations, and oversight activities, conducted by the Inspector General of the Office, of the fund and the activities financed by the fund''; and

(2) in paragraph (5)—

(A) by striking ''The Office'' and inserting ''(A) The Office''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) Such budget shall include an estimate from the Inspector General of the Office of the amount required to pay the expenses to audit, investigate, and provide other oversight activities with respect to the fund and the activities financed by the fund.

''(C) The amount requested by the Inspector General under subparagraph (B) shall not exceed .33 percent of the total budgetary authority requested by the Office under subparagraph (A).''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 2860 responds to the Office of Personnel Management Inspector General's call for increased oversight of the OPM's revolving fund by providing the IG access to a portion of that revolving fund moneys for oversight.

H.R. 2860 recognizes oversight as a legitimate business cost by using existing funds to help the IG respond to the increased referrals of alleged fraud within the OPM's revolving fund operations, including especially in the background investigation used to determine an individual's eligibility for a security clearance.

The Office of Personnel Management serves as the regulator for these rules affecting the management of Federal workers, but has also evolved into a fee-based service provider that provides billions of dollars in services each year to the very agencies governed by OPM's rules.

The revolving fund budget has grown significantly over the past 15 years, from $191 million to more than $2 billion today. OPM's revolving fund budget is almost 91 percent of OPM's budget; yet the resources available for the IG to audit these funds have not kept pace with the growing amounts.

For over 30 years, both the General Accountability Office and OPM Inspectors General have been concerned about the management of resources in the revolving fund. Each has issued a number of reports and audits examining various and, often recurring, problems.

Last year, OPM Inspector General McFarland informed the Committee on Government Oversight and Reform of what he described as a ''serious problem'' inhibiting his ability to perform the duties and responsibilities of his office. McFarland stated his office was at a point where it could not meet its statutory obligation to effectively oversee revolving fund activities. He noted that his office had been ''inundated with requests from OPM to audit and/or investigate different parts of revolving fund programs,'' from technical audit work to the continuing flow of allegations involving falsifications of background investigations and abuse of authority.

The OPM Inspector General has investigated a number of cases involving the falsification of background investigations, including reporting of investigations that never occurred, recording answers to questions that were never asked, and documents record checks that were never conducted. Within the military departments at 81 percent of OPM's customer base, these cases have serious national security implications.

Inspector General McFarland testified before the Federal Workforce Subcommittee in June, and he said the OPM's revolving fund programs ''have been operating in the shadows for too long,'' adding the often-cited phrase ''sunshine is the best disinfectant.''

H.R. 2860 would allow the OPM IG to use a portion of the revolving fund moneys to pay for related audit and investigation work. The OPM IG's resources would be limited to one-third of 1 percent of the revolving fund budget, and the IG would be required to submit an annual budget request and report detailing its revolving fund oversight work.

H.R. 2860 provides resources for critical oversight that can be accomplished at relatively low cost, using existing funds.

I urge the adoption of this bipartisan bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in strong support of H.R. 2860, the OPM IG Act, which is a successful product of the bipartisan efforts of Federal Workforce Subcommittee Chairman Farenthold and Ranking Member LYNCH, and I applaud them for their efforts.

I thank my distinguished colleagues for their work and commitment in sponsoring legislation to provide the Inspector General of the Office of Personnel Management with critically needed funding to perform audits, investigations, and oversight of OPM's revolving fund activities.

Through the revolving fund, OPM provides approximately $2 billion in services to agencies on a fee-for-service basis. These services include background investigations, leadership training, and human resource management.

H.R. 2860 would fix the loophole in the current law which prevents this $2 billion revolving fund from paying for the costs of the OPM Inspector General to properly oversee the fund's activities.

This legislation would allow the OPM Inspector General to use a very small portion of the revolving fund budget, up to a maximum of one-third of 1 percent of the fund, to pay for audit, investigative, and oversight work.

The recent Navy Yard shooting and the Edward Snowden leaks of classified information have highlighted the importance of comprehensive oversight of the Federal Government's background investigation and security clearance process.

During last June's Federal Workforce Subcommittee hearing on OPM's revolving fund, the OPM Inspector General expressed substantial concerns about the falsification of background investigations.

The OPM Inspector General plays a crucial part in ensuring that the background investigation process used by the government to determine whether individuals should be trusted with our Nation's classified and sensitive information is properly conducted.

This legislation would give the OPM Inspector General the funds and resources needed to conduct the necessary oversight activities to help safeguard our government against national security risks.

The Senate has already passed a substantially similar bill, and I ask all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting H.R. 2860.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I would like to thank Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. LYNCH for working together in such a bipartisan manner on this very important national security bill.

It is a commonsense, good government bill that is designed to use existing funds that are brought into the OPM to oversee the OPM. They have got a huge chunk of money here that is coming from the background checks, and they don't have the resources necessary to adequately make sure these background checks are going to be done.

Mr. CUMMINGS cited numerous examples of how the failures in the system have resulted in tragedies and have resulted in information getting out. We need to make sure these background checks are being done properly, we need to make sure this money is being administered properly, and this bipartisan bill does that.

I too urge my colleagues to pass the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH), the cosponsor

of the bill and a member of the Subcommittee on Federal Workforce.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

First of all, I want to say that as the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, I rise in strong support of Mr. FARENTHOLD's measure here, H.R. 2860, the OPM Inspector General Act, legislation that will enhance oversight of the background check process for the issuance of government security clearances.

At the outset as well, I would like to thank the subcommittee chairman, Mr. FARENTHOLD, for working in a bipartisan manner to sponsor H.R. 2860. I would also like to thank our full committee chairman, Mr. ISSA, and ranking member, Mr. CUMMINGS, the gentleman from Maryland, for their hard work and their leadership on this legislation as well.

Recent events involving Edward Snowden and his leaking of classified information and as well Aaron Alexis and the tragic shooting at the Washington Navy Yard have called attention to the need to reexamine and improve the Federal Government's background investigation and security clearance process.

H.R. 2860 is a key component of our examinations. This legislation provides the Inspector General of the Office of Personnel Management with the resources that he needs to assist Congress in our review and oversight of a process that is critical within our national security framework.

We rely heavily on our Inspectors General. They are at the front lines of investigating fraud, waste, and abuse in government programs. We as Members of the legislature rely heavily on them in getting accurate information.

In particular, H.R. 2860 would give the Office of Personnel Management the authority to access a portion of OPM's revolving fund to pay for audits, investigations, and oversight of the agency's revolving fund program, which includes the Federal Government's background investigations process, their leadership training, and personnel management solutions.

I think OPM Inspector General Patrick McFarland did a great job on this in making us aware of the necessity for this legislation. During a June 2013 Federal Workforce Subcommittee hearing, as has been noted, Mr. McFarland stated that his office was handicapped in its ability to conduct proper oversight of the OPM's revolving fund activities.

Under existing law, the Inspector General's oversight costs cannot be charged to the revolving fund. As a result, for fiscal year 2013, the Inspector General had only available $3 million to conduct oversight of OPM's program involving $2 billion.

Because of these limited resources, the OPM Inspector General was not able to thoroughly investigate issues regarding falsification of background investigations, conduct audits of the revolving fund, or examine the fund's high-risk areas.

However, H.R. 2860, if enacted, would allow the OPM Inspector General's oversight costs to be paid from the revolving fund up to a maximum of one-third of 1 percent of OPM's revolving fund budget. Assuming a revolving budget of $2 billion, the Inspector General may be authorized to receive up to a maximum of $6.6 million to fund oversight costs.

□ 1430

Common sense indicates that giving the OPM Inspector General authority for this funding is a sensible and prudent investment. Moreover, if national security is implicated, the importance of preventing or mitigating national security threats is, of course, immeasurable.

Let me also add that this proposal was included in the President's fiscal year 2014 budget request, and the Senate passed, by unanimous consent, substantially similar legislation last October. In addition, a provision granting the OPM Inspector General access to the revolving fund was included in the omnibus appropriation bill released just last night. I would note, however, that that provision expires after 1 year.

So Mr. FARENTHOLD's legislation, which I have cosponsored, is incredibly important and should be adopted. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join with myself and Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, if I could inquire of the gentleman from Maryland if he has any additional speakers.

Mr. CUMMINGS. We have no additional speakers, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. At this point, I would like to wrap it up and close.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Maryland pointed out, this is a commonsense, good government bill that has strong national security implications and I am going to urge all my colleagues to support it.

Again, even though it was included in the omnibus that is coming through that is 1 year, this creates permanent law where we continue to do this necessary and appropriate oversight at a fraction of the percent of the cost of the budget, absolutely a phenomenal bill that we all need to get behind and support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield myself such time as I may consume as I close.

Mr. Speaker, I take this moment to thank Mr. FARENTHOLD, to thank Mr. LYNCH and certainly our chairman, Chairman ISSA, for this bipartisan effort. It just makes sense. There are certain things that happen that we see in government that need correcting, and this is one of those things. The fact that we have now put a spotlight on it and, through a bipartisan effort, have put together legislation that should pass this House unanimously, it just shows what can be done.

So it is a great piece of legislation. It is a very practical piece of legislation, and it is one that is needed. With that, I would urge all of our colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2860.

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. CUMMINGS. 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.

PRESIDENTIAL AND FEDERAL RECORDS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 2014

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1233) to amend chapter 22 of title 44, United States Code, popularly known as the Presidential Records Act, to establish procedures for the consideration of claims of constitutionally based privilege against disclosure of Presidential records, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1233

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Presidential and Federal Records Act Amendments of 2014''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Presidential records.
Sec. 3. National Archives and Records Administration.
Sec. 4. Records management by Federal agencies.
Sec. 5. Disposal of records.
Sec. 6. Procedures to prevent unauthorized removal of classified records from National Archives.
Sec. 7. Repeal of provisions related to the National Study Commission on Records and Documents of Federal Officials.
Sec. 8. Pronoun amendments.
Sec. 9. Records management by the Archivist.
Sec. 10. Disclosure requirement for official business conducted using non-official electronic messaging account.

SEC. 2. PRESIDENTIAL RECORDS.

(a) PROCEDURES FOR CONSIDERATION OF CLAIMS OF CONSTITUTIONALLY BASED PRIVILEGE AGAINST DISCLOSURE.—

(1) AMENDMENT.—Chapter 22 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 2208. Claims of constitutionally based privilege against disclosure

''(a)(1) When the Archivist determines under this chapter to make available to the

public any Presidential record that has not previously been made available to the public, the Archivist shall—

''(A) promptly provide notice of such determination to—

''(i) the former President during whose term of office the record was created; and

''(ii) the incumbent President; and

''(B) make the notice available to the public.

''(2) The notice under paragraph (1)—

''(A) shall be in writing; and

''(B) shall include such information as may be prescribed in regulations issued by the Archivist.

''(3)(A) Upon the expiration of the 60-day period (excepting Saturdays, Sundays, and legal public holidays) beginning on the date the Archivist provides notice under paragraph (1)(A), the Archivist shall make available to the public the Presidential record covered by the notice, except any record (or reasonably segregable part of a record) with respect to which the Archivist receives from a former President or the incumbent President notification of a claim of constitutionally based privilege against disclosure under subsection (b).

''(B) A former President or the incumbent President may extend the period under subparagraph (A) once for not more than 30 additional days (excepting Saturdays, Sundays, and legal public holidays) by filing with the Archivist a statement that such an extension is necessary to allow an adequate review of the record.

''(C) Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) and (B), if the 60-day period under subparagraph (A), or any extension of that period under subparagraph (B), would otherwise expire during the 6-month period after the incumbent President first takes office, then that 60-day period or extension, respectively, shall expire at the end of that 6-month period.

''(b)(1) For purposes of this section, the decision to assert any claim of constitutionally based privilege against disclosure of a Presidential record (or reasonably segregable part of a record) must be made personally by a former President or the incumbent President, as applicable.

''(2) A former President or the incumbent President shall notify the Archivist, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate of a privilege claim under paragraph (1) on the same day that the claim is asserted under such paragraph.

''(c)(1) If a claim of constitutionally based privilege against disclosure of a Presidential record (or reasonably segregable part of a record) is asserted under subsection (b) by a former President, the Archivist shall consult with the incumbent President, as soon as practicable during the period specified in paragraph (2)(A), to determine whether the incumbent President will uphold the claim asserted by the former President.

''(2)(A) Not later than the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date of which the Archivist receives notification from a former President of the assertion of a claim of constitutionally based privilege against disclosure, the Archivist shall provide notice to the former President and the public of the decision of the incumbent President under paragraph (1) regarding the claim.

''(B) If the incumbent President upholds the claim of privilege asserted by the former President, the Archivist shall not make the Presidential record (or reasonably segregable part of a record) subject to the claim publicly available unless—

''(i) the incumbent President withdraws the decision upholding the claim of privilege asserted by the former President; or

''(ii) the Archivist is otherwise directed by a final court order that is not subject to appeal.

''(C) If the incumbent President determines not to uphold the claim of privilege asserted by the former President, or fails to make the determination under paragraph (1) before the end of the period specified in subparagraph (A), the Archivist shall release the Presidential record subject to the claim at the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date on which the Archivist received notification of the claim, unless otherwise directed by a court order in an action initiated by the former President under section 2204(e) of this title or by a court order in another action in any Federal court.

''(d) The Archivist shall not make publicly available a Presidential record (or reasonably segregable part of a record) that is subject to a privilege claim asserted by the incumbent President unless—

''(1) the incumbent President withdraws the privilege claim; or

''(2) the Archivist is otherwise directed by a final court order that is not subject to appeal.

''(e) The Archivist shall adjust any otherwise applicable time period under this section as necessary to comply with the return date of any congressional subpoena, judicial subpoena, or judicial process.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(A) Section 2204(d) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by inserting '', except section 2208,'' after ''chapter''.

(B) Section 2205 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''section 2204'' and inserting ''sections 2204 and 2208 of this title''; and

(ii) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking ''subpena'' and inserting ''subpoena''.

(C) Section 2207 of title 44, United States Code, is amended in the second sentence by inserting '', except section 2208,'' after ''chapter''.

(3) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 22 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''2208. Claims of constitutionally based privilege against disclosure.''.

(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in the amendment made by paragraph (2)(C) shall be construed to—

(A) affect the requirement of section 2207 of title 44, United States Code, that Vice Presidential records shall be subject to chapter 22 of that title in the same manner as Presidential records; or

(B) affect any claim of constitutionally based privilege by a President or former President with respect to a Vice Presidential record.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 2201 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''memorandums'' and inserting ''memoranda'';

(B) by striking ''audio, audiovisual'' and inserting ''audio and visual records''; and

(C) by inserting '', whether in analog, digital, or any other form'' after ''mechanical recordations''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''advise and assist'' and inserting ''advise or assist''.

(c) MANAGEMENT AND CUSTODY OF PRESIDENTIAL RECORDS.—Section 2203 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''maintained'' and inserting ''preserved and maintained'';

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''advise and assist'' and inserting ''advise or assist'';

(3) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g);

(4) by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

''(f) During a President's term of office, the Archivist may maintain and preserve Presidential records on behalf of the President, including records in digital or electronic form. The President shall remain exclusively responsible for custody, control, and access to such Presidential records. The Archivist may not disclose any such records, except under direction of the President, until the conclusion of a President's term of office, if a President serves consecutive terms upon the conclusion of the last term, or such other period provided for under section 2204 of this title.''; and

(5) in subsection (g)(1), as so redesignated, by striking ''Act'' and inserting ''chapter''.

(d) RESTRICTIONS ON ACCESS TO PRESIDENTIAL RECORDS.—Section 2204 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) The Archivist shall not make available any original Presidential records to any individual claiming access to any Presidential record as a designated representative under section 2205(3) of this title if that individual has been convicted of a crime relating to the review, retention, removal, or destruction of records of the Archives.''.

(e) DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENT FOR OFFICIAL BUSINESS CONDUCTED USING NON-OFFICIAL ELECTRONIC MESSAGING ACCOUNT.—

(1) AMENDMENT.—Chapter 22 of title 44, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a)(1), is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 2209. Disclosure requirement for official business conducted using non-official electronic messaging accounts

''(a) IN GENERAL.—An officer or employee of an executive agency may not create or send a Presidential record using a non-official electronic messaging account unless such officer or employee—

''(1) copies an official electronic messaging account of the officer or employee in the original creation or transmission of the Presidential record; or

''(2) forwards a complete copy of the Presidential record to an official electronic messaging account of the officer or employee within five days after the original creation or transmission of the Presidential record.

''(b) ADVERSE ACTIONS.—The intentional violation of subsection (a) (including any rules, regulations, or other implementing guidelines), as determined by the appropriate supervisor, shall be a basis for disciplinary action in accordance with subchapter I, II, or V of chapter 75 of title 5, as the case may be.

''(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) ELECTRONIC MESSAGES.—The term 'electronic messages' means electronic mail and other electronic messaging systems that are used for purposes of communicating between individuals.

''(2) ELECTRONIC MESSAGING ACCOUNT.—The term 'electronic messaging account' means any account that sends electronic messages.

''(3) EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—The term 'executive agency' has the meaning given that term in section 105 of title 5.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 22 of title 44, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a)(3), is further amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''2209. Disclosure requirement for official business conducted using non-official electronic messaging accounts.''

SEC. 3. NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION.

(a) ACCEPTANCE OF RECORDS FOR HISTORICAL PRESERVATION.—Section 2107 of title 44, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 2107. Acceptance of records for historical preservation

''(a) IN GENERAL.—When it appears to the Archivist to be in the public interest, the Archivist may—

''(1) accept for deposit with the National Archives of the United States the records of a Federal agency, the Congress, the Architect of the Capitol, or the Supreme Court determined by the Archivist to have sufficient historical or other value to warrant their continued preservation by the United States Government;

''(2) direct and effect the transfer of records of a Federal agency determined by the Archivist to have sufficient historical or other value to warrant their continued preservation by the United States Government to the National Archives of the United States, as soon as practicable, and at a time mutually agreed upon by the Archivist and the head of that Federal agency not later than thirty years after such records were created or received by that agency, unless the head of such agency has certified in writing to the Archivist that such records must be retained in the custody of such agency for use in the conduct of the regular business of the agency;

''(3) direct and effect, with the approval of the head of the originating Federal agency, or if the existence of the agency has been terminated, with the approval of the head of that agency's successor in function, if any, the transfer of records, deposited or approved for deposit with the National Archives of the United States to public or educational institutions or associations; title to the records to remain vested in the United States unless otherwise authorized by Congress; and

''(4) transfer materials from private sources authorized to be received by the Archivist by section 2111 of this title.

''(b) EARLY TRANSFER OF RECORDS.—The Archivist—

''(1) in consultation with the head of the originating Federal agency, is authorized to accept a copy of the records described in subsection (a)(2) that have been in existence for less than thirty years; and

''(2) may not disclose any such records until the expiration of—

''(A) the thirty-year period described in paragraph (1);

''(B) any longer period established by the Archivist by order; or

''(C) any shorter period agreed to by the originating Federal agency.''.

(b) MATERIAL ACCEPTED FOR DEPOSIT.—Section 2111 of title 44, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 2111. Material accepted for deposit

''(a) IN GENERAL.—When the Archivist considers it to be in the public interest the Archivist may accept for deposit—

''(1) the papers and other historical materials of a President or former President of the United States, or other official or former official of the Government, and other papers relating to and contemporary with a President or former President of the United States, subject to restrictions agreeable to the Archivist as to their use; and

''(2) recorded information (as such term is defined in section 3301(a)(2) of this title) from private sources that are appropriate for preservation by the Government as evidence of its organization, functions, policies, decisions, procedures, and transactions.

''(b) EXCEPTION.—This section shall not apply in the case of any Presidential records which are subject to the provisions of chapter 22 of this title.''.

(c) PRESERVATION OF AUDIO AND VISUAL RECORDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2114 of title 44, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 2114. Preservation of audio and visual records

''The Archivist may make and preserve audio and visual records, including motion-picture films, still photographs, and sound recordings, in analog, digital, or any other form, pertaining to and illustrative of the historical development of the United States Government and its activities, and provide for preparing, editing, titling, scoring, processing, duplicating, reproducing, exhibiting, and releasing for non-profit educational purposes, motion-picture films, still photographs, and sound recordings in the Archivist's custody.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 21 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking the item for section 2114 and inserting the following:

''2114. Preservation of audio and visual records.''.

(d) LEGAL STATUS OF REPRODUCTIONS; OFFICIAL SEAL; FEES FOR COPIES AND REPRODUCTIONS.—Section 2116(a) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''digital,'' after ''microphotographic,'', each place it appears.

SEC. 4. RECORDS MANAGEMENT BY FEDERAL AGENCIES.

Section 3106 of title 44, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3106. Unlawful removal, destruction of records

''(a) FEDERAL AGENCY NOTIFICATION.—The head of each Federal agency shall notify the Archivist of any actual, impending, or threatened unlawful removal, defacing, alteration, corruption, deletion, erasure, or other destruction of records in the custody of the agency, and with the assistance of the Archivist shall initiate action through the Attorney General for the recovery of records the head of the Federal agency knows or has reason to believe have been unlawfully removed from that agency, or from another Federal agency whose records have been transferred to the legal custody of that Federal agency.

''(b) ARCHIVIST NOTIFICATION.—In any case in which the head of a Federal agency does not initiate an action for such recovery or other redress within a reasonable period of time after being notified of any such unlawful action described in subsection (a), or is participating in, or believed to be participating in any such unlawful action, the Archivist shall request the Attorney General to initiate such an action, and shall notify the Congress when such a request has been made.''.

SEC. 5. DISPOSAL OF RECORDS.

(a) DEFINITION OF RECORDS.—Section 3301 of title 44, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3301. Definition of records

''(a) RECORDS DEFINED.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—As used in this chapter, the term 'records'—

''(A) includes all recorded information, regardless of form or characteristics, made or received by a Federal agency under Federal law or in connection with the transaction of public business and preserved or appropriate for preservation by that agency or its legitimate successor as evidence of the organization, functions, policies, decisions, procedures, operations, or other activities of the United States Government or because of the informational value of data in them; and

''(B) does not include—

''(i) library and museum material made or acquired and preserved solely for reference or exhibition purposes; or

''(ii) duplicate copies of records preserved only for convenience.

''(2) RECORDED INFORMATION DEFINED.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term 'recorded information' includes all traditional forms of records, regardless of physical form or characteristics, including information created, manipulated, communicated, or stored in digital or electronic form.

''(b) DETERMINATION OF DEFINITION.—The Archivist's determination whether recorded information, regardless of whether it exists in physical, digital, or electronic form, is a record as defined in subsection (a) shall be binding on all Federal agencies.''.

(b) REGULATIONS COVERING LISTS OF RECORDS FOR DISPOSAL, PROCEDURE FOR DISPOSAL, AND STANDARDS FOR REPRODUCTION.—Section 3302(3) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking ''photographic or microphotographic processes'' and inserting ''photographic, microphotographic, or digital processes''.

(c) LISTS AND SCHEDULES OF RECORDS TO BE SUBMITTED TO THE ARCHIVIST BY HEAD OF EACH GOVERNMENT AGENCY.—Section 3303(1) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking ''photographed or microphotographed'' and inserting ''photographed, microphotographed, or digitized''.

(d) EXAMINATION BY ARCHIVIST OF LISTS AND SCHEDULES OF RECORDS LACKING PRESERVATION VALUE; DISPOSAL OF RECORDS.—Section 3303a(c) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking ''the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate and the Committee on House Oversight of the House of Representatives'' and inserting ''the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate''.

(e) PHOTOGRAPHS OR MICROPHOTOGRAPHS OF RECORDS CONSIDERED AS ORIGINALS; CERTIFIED REPRODUCTIONS ADMISSIBLE IN EVIDENCE.—Section 3312 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking ''Photographs or microphotographs of records'' and inserting ''Photographs, microphotographs of records, or digitized records''; and

(2) in the second sentence, by striking ''photographs or microphotographs'' and inserting ''photographs, microphotographs, or digitized records'', each place it appears.

SEC. 6. PROCEDURES TO PREVENT UNAUTHORIZED REMOVAL OF CLASSIFIED RECORDS FROM NATIONAL ARCHIVES.

(a) CLASSIFIED RECORDS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Archivist shall prescribe internal procedures to prevent the unauthorized removal of classified records from the National Archives and Records Administration or the destruction or damage of such records, including when such records are accessed or searched electronically. Such procedures shall include, at a minimum, the following prohibitions:

(1) An individual, other than covered personnel, may not view classified records in any room that is not secure, except in the presence of National Archives and Records Administration personnel or under video surveillance.

(2) An individual, other than covered personnel, may not be left alone with classified records, unless that individual is under video surveillance.

(3) An individual, other than covered personnel, may not review classified records while possessing any cellular phone, electronic personal communication device, or any other devices capable of photographing, recording, or transferring images or content.

(4) An individual seeking access to review classified records, as a precondition to such

access, must consent to a search of their belongings upon conclusion of their records review.

(5) All notes and other writings prepared by an individual, other than covered personnel, during the course of a review of classified records shall be retained by the National Archives and Records Administration in a secure facility until such notes and other writings are determined to be unclassified, are declassified, or are securely transferred to another secure facility.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED PERSONNEL.—The term ''covered personnel'' means any individual—

(A) who has an appropriate and necessary reason for accessing classified records, as determined by the Archivist; and

(B) who is either—

(i) an officer or employee of the United States Government with appropriate security clearances; or

(ii) any personnel with appropriate security clearances of a Federal contractor authorized in writing to act for purposes of this section by an officer or employee of the United States Government.

(2) RECORDS.—The term ''records'' has the meaning given that term under section 3301 of title 44, United States Code.

SEC. 7. REPEAL OF PROVISIONS RELATED TO THE NATIONAL STUDY COMMISSION ON RECORDS AND DOCUMENTS OF FEDERAL OFFICIALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Sections 3315 through 3324 of title 44, United States Code, are repealed.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 33 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking the items relating to sections 3315 through 3324.

SEC. 8. PRONOUN AMENDMENTS.

Title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 2116(c), by striking ''his'' and inserting ''the Archivist's'';

(2) in section 2201(2), by striking ''his'' and inserting ''the President's'', each place it appears;

(3) in section 2203—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''his'' and inserting ''the President's'';

(B) in subsection (b), by striking ''his'' and inserting ''the President's'';

(C) in subsection (c)—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(I) by striking ''his'' and inserting ''the President's''; and

(II) by striking ''those of his Presidential records'' and inserting ''those Presidential records of such President''; and

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking ''he'' and inserting ''the Archivist'';

(D) in subsection (d), by striking ''he'' and inserting ''the Archivist'';

(E) in subsection (e), by striking ''he'' and inserting ''the Archivist''; and

(F) in subsection (g), as so redesignated, by striking ''he'' and inserting ''the Archivist'';

(4) in section 2204—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''his'' and inserting ''a President's''; and

(ii) in paragraph (5), by striking ''his'' and inserting ''the President's''; and

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking ''his'' and inserting ''the President's''; and

(ii) in paragraph (3)—

(I) by striking ''his''the first place it appears and inserting ''the Archivist's''; and

(II) by striking ''his designee'' and inserting ''the Archivist's designee'';

(5) in section 2205—

(A) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking ''his'' and inserting ''the incumbent President's''; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''his'' and inserting ''the former President's'';

(6) in section 2901(11), by striking ''his'' and inserting ''the Archivist's'';

(7) in section 2904(c)(6), by striking ''his'' and inserting ''the Archivist's'';

(8) in section 2905(a)—

(A) by striking ''He'' and inserting ''The Archivist''; and

(B) by striking ''his'' and inserting ''the Archivist's'';

(9) in section 3103, by striking ''he'' and inserting ''the head of such agency'';

(10) in section 3104—

(A) by striking ''his''the first place it appears and inserting ''such official's''; and

(B) by striking ''him or his'' and inserting ''such official or such official's'';

(11) in section 3105, by striking ''he'' and inserting ''the head of such agency'';

(12) in section 3302(1), by striking ''him'' and inserting ''the Archivist''; and

(13) in section 3303a—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking ''him'' and inserting ''the Archivist'', each place it appears; and

(ii) by striking ''he'' and inserting ''the Archivist'';

(B) in subsection (c), by striking ''he'' and inserting ''the Archivist'';

(C) in subsection (e), by striking ''his'' and inserting ''the Archivist's''; and

(D) in subsection (f), by striking ''he'' and inserting ''the Archivist''.

SEC. 9. RECORDS MANAGEMENT BY THE ARCHIVIST.

(a) OBJECTIVES OF RECORDS MANAGEMENT.—Section 2902 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by striking ''creation and of records maintenance and use'' and inserting ''creation, maintenance, transfer, and use'';

(2) in paragraph (6), by inserting after ''Federal paperwork'' the following: ''and the transfer of records from Federal agencies to the National Archives of the United States in digital or electronic form to the greatest extent possible''; and

(3) in paragraph (7), by striking ''the Administrator or''.

(b) RECORDS CENTERS AND CENTRALIZED MICROFILMING SERVICES.—

(1) AMENDMENT.—Section 2907 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in the section heading by inserting **''or digitization''** after ''**microfilming**''; and

(B) by inserting ''or digitization'' after ''microfilming''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 29 of title 44, United States Code, is amended in the item relating to section 2907 by inserting ''or digitization'' after ''microfilming''.

(c) GENERAL RESPONSIBILITIES FOR RECORDS MANAGEMENT.—Section 2904 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking ''The Administrator'' and inserting ''The Archivist'';

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''their'' and inserting ''the'';

(ii) by striking ''subsection (a) or (b), respectively'' and inserting ''subsections (a) and (b)'';

(iii) by striking ''and the Administrator''; and

(iv) by striking ''each''; and

(B) in paragraph (8), by striking ''or the Administrator (as the case may be)''; and

(3) subsection (d) is amended to read as follows:

''(d) The Archivist shall promulgate regulations requiring all Federal agencies to transfer all digital or electronic records to the National Archives of the United States in digital or electronic form to the greatest extent possible.''.

(d) INSPECTION OF AGENCY RECORDS.—Section 2906 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''their respective'' and inserting ''the'';

(ii) by striking ''the Administrator of General Services and'';

(iii) by striking ''designee of either'' and inserting ''the Archivist's designee'';

(iv) by striking ''solely''; and

(v) by inserting after ''for the improvement of records management practices and programs'' the following: ''and for determining whether the records of Federal agencies have sufficient value to warrant continued preservation or lack sufficient value to justify continued preservation'';

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''the Administrator and''; and

(ii) by striking the second sentence; and

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking ''the Administrator or''; and

(II) by striking ''designee of either'' and inserting ''Archivist's designee''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''the Administrator, the Archivist,'' and inserting ''the Archivist''; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''the Administrator and''; and

(B) by striking ''designee of either'' and inserting ''Archivist's designee''.

(e) REPORTS; CORRECTION OF VIOLATIONS.—Section 2115 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''their respective'' and inserting ''the'';

(B) by striking ''and the Administrator''; and

(C) by striking ''each''; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''either'';

(B) by striking ''or the Administrator'', each place it appears; and

(C) by striking ''inaugurated'' and inserting ''demonstrably commenced''.

(f) RECORDS MANAGEMENT BY THE ARCHIVIST.—.

(1) AMENDMENT.—The heading for chapter 29 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking ''**AND BY THE ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES**''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters at the beginning of title 44, United States Code, is amended in the item related to chapter 29 by striking ''and by the Administrator of General Services''.

(g) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM OF MANAGEMENT.—Section 3102(2) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking ''the Administrator of General Services and''.

SEC. 10. DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENT FOR OFFICIAL BUSINESS CONDUCTED USING NON-OFFICIAL ELECTRONIC MESSAGING ACCOUNT.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Chapter 29 of title 44, United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 2911. Disclosure requirement for official business conducted using non-official electronic messaging accounts

''(a) IN GENERAL.—An officer or employee of an executive agency may not create or send a record using a non-official electronic messaging account unless such officer or employee—

''(1) copies an official electronic messaging account of the officer or employee in the original creation or transmission of the record; or

''(2) forwards a complete copy of the record to an official electronic messaging account

of the officer or employee within five days after the original creation or transmission of the record.

''(b) ADVERSE ACTIONS.—The intentional violation of subsection (a) (including any rules, regulations, or other implementing guidelines), as determined by the appropriate supervisor, shall be a basis for disciplinary action in accordance with subchapter I, II, or V of chapter 75 of title 5, as the case may be.

''(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) ELECTRONIC MESSAGES.—The term 'electronic messages' means electronic mail and other electronic messaging systems that are used for purposes of communicating between individuals.

''(2) ELECTRONIC MESSAGING ACCOUNT.—The term 'electronic messaging account' means any account that sends electronic messages.

''(3) EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—The term 'executive agency' has the meaning given that term in section 105 of title 5.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 29 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''2911. Disclosure requirement for official business conducted using non-official electronic messaging accounts''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1233 would codify the existing executive order that requires former Presidents to appeal to incumbent Presidents to keep certain Presidential documents privileged under the Presidential Records Act.

This bill would lock into statute a process established by President Ronald Reagan in 1989, restored by President Obama in 2009, and used without controversy by four of the last five Presidents.

The bill would ensure greater transparency for the privilege extension requests by former Presidents and help prevent abuses of the system.

The bill does not expand the limits of executive privilege, nor would it give former Presidents custodial rights over their administration's Presidential records. Let me say that again to make perfectly clear, Mr. Speaker. The bill does not expand the limits of the executive privilege, nor does it give former Presidents custodial rights over their administrations' Presidential records.

What the bill does is shift the focus from the technology used to capture and store information to the information itself. Historically, Federal recordkeeping has taken a medium-focused approached to keeping records. In a world where technological advances rapidly and equipment and software become obsolete in months instead of years, making agencies focus their efforts on preserving all information rather than the information in certain forms ensures a more robust historical record, and does so without constant legislative updating.

H.R. 1233 would also create a framework to end the all-too-common practice of executive branch employees using personal email, IM, instant messages, and similar technologies to engage in official Federal business. Specifically, the bill requires official business done on personal accounts be forwarded to an official account within 5 days and authorizes negative personnel actions against individuals who intentionally violate this disclosure requirement.

The bill also phases out paper-focused relics of the current Federal recordkeeping law. The bill would change the so-called 30-year presumption, which lets Federal agencies hold on to their records for a 30-year period before turning them over to the National Archives, a rule which, in the current environment, all but guarantees the information will disappear as the technology used to store that information changes. Imagine delivering punch cards today to the National Archives. It would be a massive challenge to try to make that in a readable form today. Betamax tapes, we see technology change and the need for this to be updated. It would also make it much easier for agencies to turn over their records to the National Archives sooner.

This bill would also eliminate the so-called print-to-file rule, which actually encourages agencies to print out their electronic files and send the paper to the National Archives. Archaic rules like these actually stand in the way of effective recordkeeping.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

First of all, I want to begin by thanking Chairman ISSA for supporting this legislation and for making this a bipartisan effort. The Presidential and Federal Records Act Amendments is aimed at giving the American people access to the records Presidents create while they are in office.

Under the Presidential Records Act, a President has discretion to restrict access to his records for up to 12 years after he leaves office. After that time, a President can continue to restrict access to his records by arguing that the records are protected by executive privilege.

The Presidential Records Act does not currently include guidelines for the consideration of Presidential privilege claims. This bill would amend the law by adding procedures to ensure the timely release of Presidential records.

Under the bill, current and former Presidents would have up to 90 days to object to release of records or those records would be released. The Presidential and Federal Records Act also would require that any assertion of privilege by a former President be affirmed by the incumbent President or through a court order.

The bill we are considering today also makes clear that the right to assert the privilege is personal to current and former Presidents, and that they not be bequeathed to assistants, relatives, or decedents. Putting this language into statute will ensure that future Presidents are held to the standard first set by President Reagan.

The chairman of the Oversight Committee, Representative DARRELL ISSA, added an amendment during the committee markup of the bill to address the use of personal email by Federal employees. There is nothing currently in the Presidential Records Act or the Federal Records Act that prohibits employees from using personal email accounts to conduct official business. These acts simply require preservation of these records. This bill will continue to allow employees to use their personal email account when necessary, but it would require employees to copy their official email account or forward their email to their official account.

This is a good government bill. Similar versions of this bill overwhelmingly passed the House in two previous Congresses. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1233 so the Senate can take it up quickly and so that it might be sent on to the President for his signature.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I stand with Mr. CUMMINGS in supporting this good government bill that continues to preserve information from the Federal Government for historians and future generations, adapts to modern technology and closes the loophole with respect to private email accounts.

I am a huge supporter, happy we are working together in a bipartisan manner on these and other good government bills.

I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

Again, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to thank our chairman and the members of our committee for making this happen.

Again, there are situations where we find the law needs clarification. This is one of those clarifying opportunities, and we have taken advantage of it in a bipartisan way. Again, I would urge all of our Members to vote in favor of this legislation.

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

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from Maryland in urging my colleagues to support H.R. 1233, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1233, as amended.

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. FARENTHOLD. 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.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1700

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) at 5 p.m.

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. 2860, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 1233, by the yeas and nays.

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

OPM IG ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2860) to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that the Inspector General of the Office of Personnel Management may use amounts in the revolving fund of the Office to fund audits, investigations, and oversight activities, and for other purposes, 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 Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 0, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 17]

YEAS—418

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
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
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—14

Buchanan
Cleaver
Conyers
Culberson
Gabbard
Jones
Kingston
McCarthy (NY)
Pallone
Payne
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sires
Stockman

□ 1727

Ms. DUCKWORTH and Mr. GRIJALVA changed their 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.

PRESIDENTIAL AND FEDERAL RECORDS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1233) to amend chapter 22 of title 44, United States Code, popularly known as the Presidential Records Act, to establish procedures for the consideration of claims of constitutionally based privilege against disclosure of Presidential records, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 0, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 18]

YEAS—420

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
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
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—12

Buchanan
Cleaver
Culberson
Gabbard
Jones
Kingston
McCarthy (NY)
Payne
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sires
Stockman

□ 1735

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

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 3547, SPACE LAUNCH LIABILITY INDEMNIFICATION EXTENSION ACT; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM JANUARY 17, 2014, THROUGH JANUARY 24, 2014; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. COLE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–327) on the resolution (H. Res. 458) providing for consideration of the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 3547) to extend the application of certain space launch liability provisions through 2014; providing for proceedings during the period from January 17, 2014, through January 24, 2014; and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SERVING THOSE WHO SERVED IN UNIFORM

(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, as a father of a Purple Heart wounded warrior and father-in-law of a recently discharged soldier, my promise is to serve and advocate for those who serve this country. Our troops have earned our support not just during their service, but after they return to civilian life.

I am proud to support the COLAs for medically retired Armed Forces personnel and survivors, particularly doing away with the 1 percent reduction that has been put in place. This will be considered in the House later this week under the Consolidated Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014.

Also included in this legislation is a 1 percent pay raise for our troops, as well as funding and guidance for the Department of Defense to support our warfighters overseas and our military and humanitarian missions around the globe.

Our military must remain strong to enforce the peace, and the soldiers, airmen, sailors, and marines that make this happen must always be the best trained and equipped force in the world.

Mr. Speaker, let's continue to serve those who serve in uniform. Our American heroes deserve as much.

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, somewhere in America a young child will not be able to see their immigrant parents come home this evening. In every State in the Union, there are individuals that are undocumented that simply want an opportunity to work and dream here in America.

I am in the midst of a 1-day fast to encourage the passage of reasonable, sensible, comprehensive immigration reform. Yesterday, 119 Houstonians stood with me to commit to fasting until this bill of comprehensive immigration reform is passed: border security; earned access to citizenship; elements of paying fines; elements of doing charitable work; ensuring that the arts and businesses come together and have the resources and talent that they need; and creating jobs.

In Texas, there are 400,000 immigrants with some billion-plus dollars. Removing that would have a terrible impact on the economy. Passing comprehensive immigration reform is not only economically sound, but it is the

humane, dignified thing to do. This Congress must come together, Republicans and Democrats, and give dignity to those soldiers and others who simply want an opportunity to serve and be part of the American Dream.

□ 1745

CUIDADODESALUD.GOV OR CAUTIONOFHEALTH.GOV

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a large number of Spanish-speaking Americans live in my congressional district. They recently brought to my attention the new 2-month-late Obama enrollment Web site: cuidadodesalud.gov. Here it is right here on the Web site. But in English that translates to: ''cautionofhealth.gov.'' Sounds like a warning to me.

Only the government could be so incompetent to get the title of the Web site wrong. This site is riddled with embarrassing computerized English-to-Spanish translations. Some things are in Spanish, some things are in English, and some things are in Spanglish. This incompetence is insulting and confusing to Americans who speak only Spanish.

Ironically, the Web site does tell the truth: people should be cautious about government health care. The name of the Web site should be officially changed to ''Caution:ObamaCare.''

It is hard enough to sign up for ObamaCare. If the government decides to have a Spanish ObamaCare Web site, you would think the government and its vast resources could at least have a Spanish Web site in accurate Spanish.

And that's just the way it is.

IDENTITY THEFT PREVENTION

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

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Tax Identity Theft Awareness Week, and I urge my colleagues to join me in working to reduce this invasive crime.

Floridians suffer from some of the highest rates of identity theft in the country, with over 70,000 people filing complaints of identity theft last year. Whether they shop at neighborhood mom-and-pop stores or large retailers, Americans deserve to buy what they need without living in fear of having given away private information or being compromised.

That is why I introduced the Safe ID Act, in order to address the growing problem of identity theft and tax fraud.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill and other commonsense efforts to stop this heinous crime.

HONORING THE CAREER OF DANIEL LEHMAN

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

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the career of Mr. Daniel Lehman and his outstanding contributions to our Nation's scientific community.

By developing and implementing project peer review and evaluation processes for the Department of Energy's Office of Science, he has had a profound impact on many large-scale scientific construction projects, helping to complete them on time and on budget.

Known as ''Lehman Reviews,'' his processes have been recognized and copied worldwide as a best practice for managing large and complex scientific construction projects.

During over 30 years of Federal service, until his retirement on January 3, 2014, his dedication to excellence and proactive approach shepherded many scientific facilities to successful construction and operation.

His passion, devotion, and commitment to improving the management culture of highly complex projects has made a tremendous impact on the vitality, perception, and future of the Office of Science programs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Mr. Daniel Lehman for his inspiring leadership and outstanding contributions to our Nation's scientific programs.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN AMERICA

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, it is good to be back on the floor once again as we have for most every week to talk about jobs in America, to talk about the unemployed, to talk about those who are less fortunate and those who need a strong Federal program to create jobs.

I often start with this because it is kind of the compass, the touchstone of what, at least, I would like to think we ought to be doing.

This is from Franklin Delano Roosevelt. This is actually on one of the marble slabs at his memorial here in Washington, D.C. It reads this way:

> The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much. It is whether we provide enough for those who have too little.

All across America today there are far too many that have too little. A couple of weeks ago, I did a jobs fair in Fairfield, California. It was about 38 degrees outside that day, and we had just under 1,000 people come to that jobs fair—there were about 50 employers—and maybe 50–70 people actually got jobs.

This is a picture of the men and women that were lined up waiting to get in to have a very quick interview with one or more of those 50 potential employers.

I have used this photo before here on the floor to point out the need for a jobs program here in America. The President 2 years ago in his State of the Union put forth a proposal. It had several elements—and we will probably cover some of those today—but it has not been enacted. The Republican leadership in this House has refused to pass even one of those jobs programs. There was infrastructure, education, reeducation; there were programs to provide for the opportunity for men and women to get jobs here in the United States.

But I was looking at this photo just today and I said, I am going to use this again, because in this photo approximately half of the people lined up, 1,000, just under 1,000 were women. It caused me to think about another program that the Democratic minority here in the House has been working on for some time, that is, the issue of women in the American economy.

I know that in my own district there is this issue of equal pay for equal work. A woman doing stenography work next to a man doing stenography work would be paid 85 cents while the man is paid $1. So it is 85 cents when a man would have the same job, same skill set, same tenure, would get $1. That is wrong. It is one of the issues we want to address.

Also we know that many of the women that are searching for work here are going to be finding minimum-wage jobs. Now, California is different. We have already passed a minimum-wage law in California that in another year and a half will be $10 plus a little. But the national is still at $7-plus; way, way under what anybody working 40 hours a week, 52 weeks a year could possibly support a family on. So the minimum wage is another issue for women, as it is for men; but I dare say more so for women than for men.

There is a multitude of issues that we need to consider as we talk about jobs, employment, increasing the employment opportunities in the United States for these people; men and women, and particularly women, that are lined up wanting to get a job.

Joining me tonight is an extraordinary group of people who have been working on this issue of women and jobs, employment, equal employment opportunities, daycare, family care programs.

I would like to start with JAN SCHAKOWSKY of Illinois, who has been one of the leaders throughout this entire Nation, often seen on television speaking to this issue and the issue of opportunity in America.

JAN, would you care to start us off on this 1-hour and talking about women and jobs.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Thank you, Representative GARAMENDI, for coming to the floor and talking about the community. And it really is ''the economy stupid'' for most Americans who feel a sense of growing insecurity. Wages haven't gone up for decades.

But the leader, our leader, NANCY PELOSI of our leadership, has launched a campaign on behalf of women in America saying, when women win, America wins, and highlighting the issues that really affect women day to day, calling for things like affordable child care, an increase in the minimum wage, paid leave, which it turns out is a major priority of women.

I see you have got a sign there.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Would you like to have it?

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. No. Why don't we just turn our attention to that sign.

Ending the gender pay gap, which actually is 77 cents to the dollar that men earn; paid sick leave; permanent child tax credit; improve diagnosis and care for Alzheimer's patients; and on and on.

But we have been bolstered by an incredible new effort that has turned into a remarkable book called: ''The Shriver Report.'' It is a co-effort, and it is a study by Maria Shriver and the Center for American Progress called: ''A Woman's Nation Pushes Back from the Brink.''

The idea here is to give a voice to women. It has got all the facts and figures one would want; but it also has the stories, the actual voice of women who feel so pressured by this economy, but also feel that their voices aren't being heard.

It is a really important book. I wanted to read on the back there are kind of some of these ''wow'' facts that are there that everyone should keep in mind about the status of women in our economy:

> One in three women in America is living in poverty or teetering on its brink. That's 42 million women plus the 28 million children who depend on them.

The second bullet:

> The American family has changed. Today, only one in five families has a homemaker mom and working dad. Two out of three families depend on the wages of working moms who are struggling to balance caregiving and breadwinning.

Three:

> The average woman continues to be paid 77 cents for every dollar the average man earns. The average African American woman earns only 64 cents and the average Latina only 55 compared to White men.

The fourth bullet:

> Closing the wage gap between men and women would cut the poverty rate in half for working women and their families and would add nearly half a trillion dollars to the national economy.

Five:

> Women are nearly two-thirds of minimum wage workers, and a vast majority of these workers receive no paid sick days. Not one.

When they did a survey of what is the number one thing that you want, women said: sick days for themselves and to go home and take care of their children.

Six:

> More than half of the babies born to women under the age of 30 are born to unmarried mothers, most of them White.

Seven:

> Nearly two-thirds of Americans and 85 percent of millennials believe that government should adapt to the reality of single-parent families and use its resources to help children and mothers succeed, regardless of family status.

So the American people, two-thirds say government does, in fact, have a role.

Eight:

> An overwhelming 96 percent of single mothers say paid leave is a workplace policy that would help them most, and nearly 80 percent of all Americans say the government should expand access to high-quality, affordable child care.

That is a worry that so many mothers have every single day.

□ 1800

Nine, women living on the brink overwhelmingly regret not making education a bigger priority.

Ten, the trauma and chronic stress of poverty are toxic to children, making them two-and-a-half times more likely to suffer as adults from COPD, hepatitis, and depression.

So actually, poverty is dangerous to the health of children as they grow into adulthood in very dramatic and particular ways.

And so when we think about poverty in America, when we think about extending unemployment benefits, when we talk about the SNAP program, and when we push to raise the minimum wage, one of the important lenses to look through is how is it affecting the women, one-third of whom are on the brink or actually living in poverty.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Those statistics are a wake-up call for America. More than half the population are female, and yet our policies are not women-friendly policies. Our laws are not women-friendly laws, and we need to change that.

I would like now to yield to my colleague from California, JANICE HAHN, a longtime city councilwoman in the City of Los Angeles, a woman who knows these issues from her experience representing the communities in that area and now an outstanding Member of the Congress.

Ms. HAHN. Thank you. I appreciate you taking this first hour tonight to focus on women and jobs. It is certainly an issue that we women are very aware of and have worked on a lot in our jobs, in our districts, in our homes, but it is nice when our men are enlightened.

Mr. GARAMENDI. If I might interrupt for a moment.

I am highly motivated. My wife of almost 48 years now and my five daughters keep my constantly abreast of this issue.

Ms. HAHN. Good for them.

I think, as JAN SCHAKOWSKY talked about, NANCY PELOSI and ROSA DELAURO, we have had this incredible campaign called When Women Succeed, America Succeeds. The point is it is good to help women in this country because this will really help America to succeed. And we no longer have the kind of families that many of us watched on television in the fifties. In fact, the American family has permanently changed, and women head up more families on their own. More than half of the babies born to women ages 30 and younger are born to unmarried women—by the way, most of them White.

We have got women who are heading their families. We have got women who are trying to take care of their families. They are now the sole breadwinners in their family. They are not necessarily the second income or the income that helps out with the man having the major income.

The statistic, I think, out of the Shriver Report that was really eye-opening for me, when we talk about the minimum wage, is that two-thirds of the workers who earned a minimum wage in this country are women. And if we could raise this minimum wage to $10.10 an hour, how many more women that would lift out of poverty. And not just the women, their families. We have too many families, children, who are living on the brink, and this is so important.

To talk about women wanting sick days, it is unbelievable to me how many women who work in these minimum wage jobs don't get sick days. Do you know how many women have the painful choice of either putting their sick child on the bus to go to school or staying home and losing a day's wages to take care of their sick child because we don't have the kind of child care in this country that can accommodate children who are not well enough to go to school? We have women choosing between missing a day's work—possibly if they have too many of those, they are going to lose their job—or putting a sick child on the bus to go to school.

We need to raise the minimum wage. We need to have affordable child care. We need to make sure that women have sick days that they can use either for themselves—mostly it is never for yourself when you are a mother. You forgo being sick as a mother and you spend those days for your children.

How many women are taking care of their parents? Even though many women have brothers in the family, it usually falls to the woman to take care of her parents when they become ill or need help being taken care of. We have got to really focus on women making sure they have good jobs.

By the way, our women veterans—our women veterans in this country—have the highest unemployment rate. That is terrible to think that our women who have put their lives on the line for this country come home and

cannot find good jobs to take care of themselves or their families.

I am glad we are doing this tonight. I think it is an important message. I think the Shriver Report that was just released really sheds light on how many women in this country are near or on the brink of living in poverty.

Thank you for doing this tonight.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Representative HAHN, thank you so very, very much.

This chart here, When Women Succeed, America Succeeds, picks up a handful of the bills that have been introduced by the Democratic Caucus, many of these bills by women, a few men along the way. These are the kinds of things that we really ought to be dealing with here as we move—or, unfortunately, fail to move—legislation.

Paycheck fairness, this is the issue of that 77 percent in California, my district being about 85 percent.

The minimum wage, which we talked about here. The issue you raised Representative HAHN about paid sick leave and the problems that occur. Make permanent the child tax credit, which is exceedingly important in providing that income necessary to support the kid. The education issues, and I notice one of my colleagues, MIKE HONDA, will talk about that in a few moments.

I would like now—and we will pick up the rest. This one down here is one really at the bottom, Alzheimer's, and you mentioned this. The children are now taking care of their parents. Of course, the children are now in their fifties, sixties, and the parents are in their seventies and eighties and beyond. And this issue of Alzheimer's, an overwhelming tidal wave is coming on us.

I know in our own home, the last 2 years of my wife's mother's life was spent in our home. She and I, my wife had night care taking care of her. Fortunately, we were able to have day care come in. This is a huge, growing issue, one in which we need to find ways to support the children taking care of their parents in their homes.

I would like now to turn to another colleague from Ohio, one who has often joined me here on the floor. And thank you so very, very much, MARCY, for joining us, MARCY KAPTUR, who has a great deal to do with the appropriations process. Congratulations on the omnibus bill just coming up.

Ms. KAPTUR. Thank you, Congressman GARAMENDI. Thank you for bringing us together as you so often do. We are so fortunate that you are here and bringing us together as voices from the heart of America here in our Nation's Capital to talk about what is on the minds of the vast majority of the American people, and that relates to their family life, how they are going to survive in this economy.

In listening to the statistics that Congresswomen SCHAKOWSKY and HAHN were relating, what has happened to family life in this country, because many times if you read articles, you see families can't hold it together. Why? Because of money, because of their inability to hold the household together because the jobs just vaporized. And when you have trade deficits for 30 years in our country, and we have an average of 15 factories closing every day, jobs vaporize. It doesn't matter where you live—whether it is Ohio, California, Florida, New York—American people have felt directly the impact of this global economy, and many times they can't hold the social unit of the family together.

Many, many of the women who are supporting their children now have done so because of fallout in the economy. What you say about the gender pay gap is absolutely there.

I was very surprised to learn in Ohio, as a result of a study done by Progress Ohio, that, in fact, one of the major companies, I think the largest company in our country, Walmart, employs about 4,500 people in Ohio. And of their employees, those employees that work for minimum wage, or probably less if they are part-time, they apply for food stamps, for SNAP assistance. So they are trying to support their families. Just those in Ohio are using $23 million in Federal food support because they can't earn enough to feed their families. And this type of corporate behavior is repeated over and over and over again, so essentially what is happening is the Federal Government ends up subsidizing low wages because the workers can't earn enough to support their families.

I am fortunate enough to come from a working class family. Our mother worked; our grandmother worked. Thank God for Franklin Roosevelt, because I think what our family has lived represents the story of a vast numbers of Americans.

Our grandmother could hardly speak English. She worked in hotels, in kitchens, peeling carrots and potatoes and so forth, washing dishes, paid the immigrant workers the very least. And then her husband always out of work, taking in tenants in their home. And they lived in 13 different places because they could never manage to own anything, trying to just hold it together with a sick daughter and a husband who often lost his job. So that was Grandma on one side of the family.

Then our mother, who became the sole support of her parents—and five children in that family—working at age 13, going across town to clean homes and so forth, it wasn't until the Democrats under Roosevelt passed the minimum wage that she began earning something more than she earned before.

Do you know what happened in the first place she worked, which was a little luncheonette on Broadway in Toledo, Ohio? When the minimum wage was passed initially, her boss, who wasn't such a nice guy, would cash her check and then pocket the difference between what she used to earn and what she then earned in the workplace. That was before we had the Department of Labor fully developed and we had inspectors on the job and so forth.

This is what American working women have dealt with for generations. And so I have to say, I am so proud I am standing on the shoulders of families like my own to be a voice for these women and these families whose economic struggle is excruciating. It is excruciating. Many of them don't have cars.

Our own mother, she was brilliant. She should be here, not me. She never got her high school equivalency until after she went on Social Security. And there were two things she had in her billfold when she died. One was her library card because she was brilliant, but the other one was her Social Security and Medicare card—because of Democrats. Because of Democrats, she could die with dignity.

I think about the families across this country, and I am so proud to be a voice for them here. I want to thank you very much for standing up for a raise in the minimum wage so that people who are struggling out there don't have to be on food stamps and EBT coupons because they are trying to earn their way forward. They should earn a decent wage, that working family life, paid sick leave.

I took care of our mother when she was ill. I know how hard it was to try to work and to care for someone who was so ill.

I just left a funeral home over the weekend in Ohio where a former county engineer, George Wilson, lost his beautiful wife, Pat, to Alzheimer's. And what were you saying, Congressman GARAMENDI, what this took for that family and that working daughter to try to hold everything together. It is such a cruel illness. So any help for caregivers across this country, for making caregiving a profession where you earn a decent wage, however we figure out how to do that, we are going to need it in the coming years.

□ 1815

So I support my colleagues in their efforts to raise the minimum wage, to close the gender pay gap, to make sure that there is paid leave, to make sure that we work as a society to find ways to care for those who are ill. I know that with men such as yourself and those who are on the floor this evening, and with women who have now been educated and able to fully participate in this society and to express the needs from coast-to-coast, we will change this country for the better.

Thank you so very much for coming down here this evening. I agree with you that when women succeed, America succeeds, but we can't do it without our men.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you so very much for your work on the appropriations and pushing these issues along.

Representative MIKE HONDA from California has been working on the issues of education for many, many

years and has some insights into how this issue of women and equality are taken up in the educational area.

Mr. HONDA, if you would like to proceed.

Mr. HONDA. Thank you, Congressman GARAMENDI, for putting these evening discussions on the board here.

I want to also rise to join you and other colleagues of mine in commemorating the 50th anniversary of President Lyndon Johnson's declaration of the war on poverty, and, as you had mentioned, President Franklin Roosevelt's effort to close the income gap. The inequities that we have faced and we are still facing are growing even larger today because of the gender pay gap, because of the unpaid portions where people have to leave their work in order to take care of their children or their families. Also, to be able to address the child care issues that became very prominent in the seventies, when both parents started to work and wondered how they were going to be addressing child care.

Also, we have the caregiver support, where adult children are taking care of their parents. We are seeing that this is a necessity that has crept up on our society and our community, almost very quietly, and become an issue because of different kinds of situations our parents are facing, not only because of the physical illness but because of the mental health illness that they have faced.

So all these things play a part in drawing down the resources of middle-income families trying to take care of their own responsibilities, raising their own family, and also the responsibility of their parents who are aging.

In the area of universal pre-K education and early childhood education, both President Roosevelt and Johnson knew that education is an important tool in this war on poverty and closing the income inequity gap.

Last week, I read an article in the Lexington-Herald Leader about two schools in east Kentucky, just hours apart from each other—Anchorage and Barbourville, two communities of about 3,000 in population.

The median household income in Anchorage is more than 3.5 times larger than the median income of that of Barbourville. Yet Barbourville spends only $8,000 per student, while Anchorage spends approximately $20,000 per student. Equal size population, only a couple hours apart.

The question comes up: Why is it that this country, our communities, continue to refuse to recognize the inequities in funding in our public schools? Why is that?

The quality of education that our children receive should not be dependent on or determined by the ZIP Code in which they live or in which they were born. Each and every child should receive support according to their needs, not according to the ZIP Code in which they reside—each and every child.

In the fifties, when we realized that the States were responsible for education, we interpreted it as the States' constitutional responsibility to move forward on education, and we found that some States had a principle of separate but equal. In the fifties, we realized that that was not supportable, not constitutional, and this became an issue in our current time when we were able to bring this issue to the living rooms of our country through technology—television. Upon this country and the States becoming more aware of what was going on, on a Federal level we moved the communities to correct this inequity, the unconstitutionality of separate but equal in our education systems and other policies in our different communities and different States.

Today, we have come to a point where we understand that equal opportunity for all children is a necessary principle, but I think, having studied education a little bit more, we should refine that principle into another principle, to wit: each and every child should receive support according to their needs, not according to the ZIP Codes or the median income of their parents.

One of the more important steps to accomplish this and achieve equity in funding for our youngsters in the preschool and early childhood education arena is to fully fund Head Start for each and every child. So we must encourage States to adopt a more equitable funding formula to ensure that each and every child receives the necessary financial and human resources required.

President Obama declared that he has an initiative that addresses universal preschool education. The Governor of California, Jerry Brown, passed a bond that said that we want more equitable funding for children in the State of California. We passed a bond that increased the funding for education to achieve more equitable funding for each and every child. It is the first step. It is the right direction, but we have miles and miles to go.

This journey for equitable funding for each and every child is a journey that we must continue and start now, in order to achieve the civil rights of each and every child in this country.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Representative HONDA, thank you so very much.

Among the many pieces of legislation that the Democratic Caucus has put forward on this issue of when women succeed, America succeeds is the issue of universal pre-K. Head Start is one part of that. There are many other kinds of programs, but it is absolutely clear that if we have universal educational opportunities before kindergarten and beyond that the chance of a kid making it in this economy is going to be substantially greater.

This is just part of the agenda over the next several months. We will be talking about the remaining portions of the agenda that we are putting forth.

We know that if this Nation is to succeed, we better make sure that the majority of our population, the women in our society—girls young and old—have every opportunity to succeed. There are barriers, some legal, some historic, and some custom, that make it very difficult for women to have an equal chance in our economy.

So we are going to address those. We would like to have the Republican side of the House work with us on those issues. We know that one of the major parts of that is the minimum wage issue. That is front and center.

I would like now to turn to my colleague from New York, who has joined me all so often, but never quite enough, on the floor.

Representative TONKO, you have been on this issue of economic development for so long. I think it is almost 4 years now we have been dealing with this, not every week, but often talking about jobs in America, economic growth, and what we can do.

Why don't you pick it up and carry the ball for a while, and then we will see where we are.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you to the gentleman from California for yielding.

I want to thank you, Representative GARAMENDI, for leading us in an hour of very important discussion which highlights the efforts of the Democratic Caucus within the House of Representatives. I, for one, am very proud to serve with a group of leaders, women and men, within that Democratic Caucus who have a vision of where they want to take this Nation, how we can address the inequality, how we can empower our economy by reaching to individuals and families across this Nation with an order of economic justice. That, I think, is the moral compass that guides us in that Caucus. I believe that many of these ills within our economy can be resolved.

I, with great interest, listened to the opening of this hour of Special Order, where discussion on the economy began with your quoting President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. As you cited within that quote the contrast between those who have an abundance and those who have little, we know that in that historic time President Roosevelt guided this Nation with a program, and we had reference to his administration being that of a New Deal.

Today, many of the workers, many working families, women, those who struggle in our economy, are given a bad deal. The bad deal is intolerable. The bad deal needs to be discontinued.

So we work, in very progressive format, here on the House floor offering a Democratic agenda, making certain that all people are embraced, are brought into an inclusive sort of politics where we engage in the ills of the past and correcting those ills of the past, studying them, understanding where the empowerment is required.

Certainly, when you look at some of the issues today, there is this greater impact on women in many measurable

ways. We have the minimum wage issue, with two-thirds of those working in minimum wage being in a category of women.

So we need to address that minimum wage. America stands behind that concept. They understand that if you work hard and are trying to raise a family, you need to do it with great remuneration, with social and economic justice, again, and the appropriateness of enabling people to have just pay for the work that is done.

We can address that with a minimum wage agenda here in the House. I believe that those dollars are recirculated into the economy. People earning a minimum wage are going to spend on the basic essentials of life for themselves and for their family members. So it, I believe, is a way to strengthen regional economies, State economies, and this national economy, by being fair to workers and working families.

There was also talk about the efforts to provide for family leave time, for sick leave, and the worthiness of providing for that and removing of the stress factor within families. It is critical. It is important to quality of life, and it is the right thing, the fair thing to do.

Also, I find very incredibly important the discussion routinely on this House floor about the extension of emergency unemployment insurance. Well, that is something that has received a lot of attention of late, but the leadership of the House is rigid in not addressing the extension of emergency unemployment insurance.

Well, let me tell you that that denial of unemployment insurance has impacted women particularly hard, but both women and men, and families in general.

Let me tell you about two discussions I had this weekend. I gathered with some folks from my district who are communicating with us about the need to have this done. Two individuals—they happen to be women—Laurie, Lisa, and I, and others, had met, along with a local assembly member, Pat Fahey, from the Albany region of New York. We heard their stories.

They have been without work for nearly a year. They have been actively pursuing work, sending out resumes, indicating wherever a job is possible that may fit their skill set, and they are not getting the response they require.

So they have talked about it. We wanted to get a personal saga here, a story. We wanted to relate really well so we could be a stronger voice here on the House floor.

Both Laurie and Lisa brought to my attention the fact that their children are watching this. They are watching this whole episode, and they can't understand the insensitivity, the callousness, the cold-heartedness. They thought that government would be there at a time when their parents were struggling for work. They want to work. Unemployment insurance means people have paid into that concept. So when you stumble across hard times, somebody will be there to assist you. They are not getting that assistance.

You look at the discrimination, with many that are calling my office, women and men, who may have been 45, 50, 55 years of age, if not 60-some. They are feeling age discrimination as they go to these interviews. They are being bypassed, they believe, because of their age.

So the work out there that they require, where three people are chasing every available job, we need in this post-recession to continue to be there on their behalf. We have never not chosen to reauthorize and provide for the unemployment insurance opportunities.

□ 1830

In the seven recessions that have followed since 1958, we have always extended that unemployment insurance. Why now? Why now do we say no?

We need to be sensitive. We need to understand that many people, a great number of women, require this reauthorization. A number of people are feeling age-discriminated against, and so the right thing to do is to empower these families.

The dollars come right back into the economy. In fact, it has been stated that for every dollar of unemployment insurance that is paid to individuals out there, $1.52 is realized in the local economy, and so it more than pays for itself.

And when the theories out there, when the many institutes, the economic policy institutes, measure the impact of not doing this, we understand full well that it sets back the economy. Some 400,000 jobs are lost. $400 million was lost in the early stages of not doing the unemployment insurance reauthorization.

So there are many ills that come with a lack of action here. There are many ills that need to be undone that have been decades long, generations long in their impact on women, making certain that, as we empower women, as we empower them, we empower families, we empower this Nation.

There are many things that need to be done, and I, again, am so proud to work with the Caucus that understands it, that gets it, that is trying to be out there speaking the progressive voice of policy reform that will strengthen this economy, grow the economy.

There is no more important issue today than growing our economy, and we do it by a sense of inclusion. With those inclusive politics, women and men, younger workers just entering the workforce, senior workforce members, everyone is empowered when we do the progressive order of reform that enables us to grow this economy.

So Representative GARAMENDI, I am certainly pleased that you are leading us in this discussion on growing the economy, on doing an order of fairness, social and economic justice that speaks to individuals out there, in many cases, the ills that are borne upon women because of a lack of fine tuning to our policy that needs to be addressed. So I am pleased that you are leading us in this discussion here this evening on the House floor so that we can express the contrast, the difference.

It is not everyone just holding back on progress. There are those who have an agenda that speaks to the common folk, the workers out there, the individuals, the families, the children that are empowered by quality daycare, child care services, that are empowered by a minimum wage increase, empowered by the extension of emergency unemployment insurance, by skills development programs.

There is a package out there, Making It In America, that has been addressed by this Caucus, by the Democratic Caucus in the House, that will grow the economy and strengthen the future and provide a sense of hope.

It has been done. We need to replicate history. We saw what happened when we engaged in issues like Social Security, Medicare, workers' rights, standing up for the individuals out there in order to provide for the remuneration that they require and deserve. That is respect, and that is providing hope for America's working families.

So let's hope we can move forward with a progressive agenda for this Nation's working families.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, I knew that I would enjoy listening to you. The passion, the knowledge, the intensity that you bring to this issue is critically important. You have worked at these issues for a long time, and I want to talk, just wrap up the unemployment insurance issue with going back to where I started here some time ago.

Again, in early December, a jobs fair in Fairfield, California, nearly 1,000 people came to it, 50 employers. More than half of the people in this line are women. I could probably go down through this line. I remember a conversation with a couple of the women here, and they were on unemployment insurance.

Now, unemployment insurance actually started with the New Deal. It was part of the effort to deal with poverty in America, and it was an insurance program, a program into which the employer and the employee pay for insurance for the employee should there be a layoff, should they be unemployed, should that individual be unemployed. It is an insurance program. It is not a welfare program. It is an insurance program.

But if I were to go back down this line and talk to each one of these individuals, probably, maybe, 15 percent of them have lost their unemployment insurance because the House of Representatives has refused to extend the long-term unemployment insurance.

So where are they today?

They are without a job because, as you said, Mr. TONKO, for every job available in America today, there are three people looking for that job. So two are going to go without the employment.

Minimum wage doesn't count because they yet don't have a job. We need to develop a jobs program, and we need to extend that unemployment because these women are mothers of children that now have a family with no income, no unemployment insurance.

The food stamps, the proposal on this floor by our colleagues was to cut the food stamp program by $40 billion. So where will the food come from? Not from SNAP, which is the new name for the food stamp program, Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. That is going to be cut.

Hunger in America among children—one in four children go hungry, and we are adding to it. We are adding to that number today by the refusal to extend the unemployment insurance.

Some 72,000 people will lose their long-term unemployment insurance each month as this rolls along—each week.

Thank you, Mr. TONKO. You are welcome to interrupt me whenever, and we can have a dialogue here. So thanks for the lipreading.

Each week 72,000 people. At the end of the year, another 3½ million will have lost their unemployment insurance. Will they have a job? They could have a better opportunity for a job if we carried out the President's jobs program.

I think we have got about 10 minutes or so. Let's spend some time on that.

I am going to put up one of my favorite and often-used charts here. Mr. TONKO, you will recognize this.

Mr. TONKO. Absolutely.

Mr. GARAMENDI. It is the Make It in America chart. It is the revitalization of manufacturing in the United States. And I could probably give your speech on the industrialization of the State of New York. I will let you do it, however.

But these are the issues that we think are critical. We have spent most of this night talking about this one—labor. Last week I said we would pick this up, and we are, and particularly focused on women in the labor force. But here it is, trade policies, international trade.

I gave a speech this morning on the maritime industry, the decline of the maritime industry, the necessity of maintaining it. We are a maritime Nation. We have oceans surrounding us, whether it is the Arctic Ocean, the Pacific Ocean, the Caribbean, or the Atlantic Ocean.

So it is trade issues.

Tax policies, why do we continue to subsidize the wealthiest industries in this world? The oil industry, why do we continue to subsidize the oil industry? Energy policy. Fortunately, we are having a good run on the energy issues, and we will come back and talk about that.

Mr. HONDA talked about educational policy, research and infrastructure. These are the elements of the Make It In America agenda. And when we use our tax money to buy American-made equipment, really good things happen. Americans go to work.

In my district, or just on the edge of my district, in Sacramento, Siemens, that huge German manufacturing company, opened a manufacturing plant to build 100 percent American-made locomotives for the first time in generations because, in the stimulus bill, a sentence was added to the support for Amtrak, and that sentence said these locomotives will be 100 percent American-made.

A German company said, oh, $600, $700 million contract, we will make them in America. And so all across this Nation, manufacturing companies are now participating in the construction of 100 percent American-made locomotives using American taxpayer money.

That is the key here. Mr. TONKO, I know you get really excited about this issue, as you were about poverty and equality in America just a moment ago. Why don't you pick this up and carry it for a while?

Mr. TONKO. Sure. And I thank, again, the gentleman from California for yielding.

The Make It In America program, the concept of that, is a very strong domestic agenda. In and of itself, it has great merit. But let's put that into the context of the bigger picture, and that is the international sweepstakes for the economy, for landing jobs.

Many of us can recall the global race on space in the sixties, and it was critical to win that race. We had come off a failing moment with Sputnik, dusted off our backside and said never again.

So this Nation committed, with passionate resolve, that we would win that global race on space. That was just two nations, U.S. vs. USSR. Who would land on that Moon, stake their flag first? We were determined it was going to be the United States. And a rather youthful President led the Nation, again, with passionate resolve, so that we had dollars for training, for research, for education, for equipment, and we were going to win that race, and we did.

In my first year in Congress, in 2009, we celebrated the 40th anniversary. Neil Armstrong was here to shake the hands of many Members of Congress, thanking him for the poetry of the moment in that July of 1969. It was more than the one small step for man, one giant step for mankind, the poetry of the moment. It was the unleashing of untold amounts of technology that impacted communications, energy generation, health care. Across the gamut of job creation, technology entered in.

Fast-forward to today. A rather youthful President is asking again that we embrace, with passion, our entry into a global race, this time on innovation and clean energy and high tech. But this time, dozens of competitors.

So Make It In America is noble in and of its own right, but it is critical when we place it into the bigger picture of a global race on innovation. And it is not our choice to determine if we are going to enter the race. Our choice ought to be how prepared, how strong, how competitive will we be as we enter that race.

That requires education, higher education, skills development, energy costs, innovation of all sorts. That comes with the passion of reform. So we need an agenda like that presented with Make It In America that addresses the needs of the workers, that speaks to the empowerment that comes with research which equals jobs. For us to have that pioneer spirit, which I believe is in the DNA of America and her workers, we need to embrace that pioneer spirit and move forward.

Now, Representative GARAMENDI is going to joke that I always talk about the donor area that the 20th Congressional District of New York is and was to the development of the Industrial Revolution in this Nation. But the Erie Canal made a port out of a little town called New York, and then developed into the birthing of a necklace of communities called mill towns that became the epicenters of invention and innovation.

We need that same spirit to be embraced today with this out-of-the-box thinking, where we can bring about the best of America and provide hope for workers, for families across this Nation, and do it in a way that allows us to win this given race, this global race on innovation.

Whoever wins this race, as the President, President Obama, has been quoted oftentimes, will be the kingpin of the international economy. That is an important assignment to this House, the House of Representatives. It is an important assignment to Congress. It is an important challenge to all of us, as Americans, to commit to that agenda of investing, investing in America so that our best days lie ahead. I am convinced that with this sort of progressive thinking, our best days lie ahead, and that we deliver hope to the doorsteps of individuals and families across this Nation with a vision of how we can win this next quarter of global competition.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Representative TONKO, once again, you have laid it out very, very clearly, the challenge that we have. There are 435 of us here in the House of Representatives. I think we are a little lower than that because of some retirements, but let's just say 435, and 100 Members of Congress. Together with the President, we set the national policy. We set the national agenda. And frankly, at the moment, the agenda is one that has stalled out. Really, we have been prevented from pushing forward an aggressive agenda such as you have described. Those elements, research, education, manufacturing, infrastructure, the role of labor, particularly the role of women

in the labor force, those issues are roadblocked.

□ 1845

There is a stop sign that has been put up here in the House of Representatives that basically says we shouldn't do any of that, that government has no role in any of those issues. I would challenge that philosophy. I would challenge that philosophy with the Founding Fathers.

Our colleagues on the right often talk about we ought to do what the Founding Fathers did. Well, one of the things that George Washington, one of the Founding Fathers, did was to turn to Alexander Hamilton and say, Develop a strategy for American manufacturing, for building the American economy. So Hamilton went off, probably talked to a few people, and came back with a lengthy report, which you would never see nowadays, which was like 30 pages. And in that document, he laid out a strategy for building the American economy.

Interestingly, guess what he talked about. He talked about trade. He talked about infrastructure. Among the infrastructure that was specifically in the plan that Hamilton presented to George Washington, who then presented it to the Congress, was canals. And shortly thereafter, about 30 years later, the Erie Canal.

Here in Washington, the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, the canal on the Potomac River. It also talked about roads. It talked about ports. Those were the infrastructure projects of the day. The Constitution, by the way, says that the Federal Government must maintain and build postal roads. Infrastructure, we talk about that nearly all the time we are here.

Research. At that period of time, Thomas Jefferson—not exactly in league with the representatives from New England, but nonetheless—was pushing forward the research agenda and the education agenda. Go back to the Founding Fathers, pick up those elements of economic growth that they put on the American agenda in the very earliest days of this Nation, and carry those forward.

We are not a shy country; but if one would look at the policies emanating from the Congress today, you would think that we are a country that does not envision the necessity of grabbing the strength of the past and using those elements that have created the economic growth and pushing them forward.

We can, and we must, do this. And as we do it, I want to go back to where we started today's discussion, and that is, we started this discussion with the role of women in our economy. 77 cents. Equal pay? No, no. A man will earn $1; and a woman at the same job, same skill sets, same tenure on the job will earn 77 cents across this Nation. In my own district, it is 85 cents.

A woman working full time at minimum wage cannot earn enough money in this Nation to feed her child and pay the rent. A woman in this Nation with a child, she has a job, the child gets sick: she is faced with a dilemma.

We need to address these issues; and we must keep in mind the Make It In America agenda, the jobs agenda that we push forward; and we must always remember that when women succeed, America will succeed.

And with that, I thank my colleagues Mr. TONKO, Mr. HONDA, the three women that joined us earlier, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. HAHN, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, for bringing this message to the American people and to our colleagues here on the floor.

And I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) to wrap up.

Mr. TONKO. I will just indicate that not far from the 20th Congressional District in upstate New York is the Women's Hall of Fame. And just recently, our leader, Minority Leader NANCY PELOSI, was inducted into that hall of fame. We think of the stories of women in the chronicles of American history, the women who embraced sacrifice and struggled to make a difference. Think of what happens when we empower the inexorable outcomes that they have journeyed through over the course of our history. Think of the empowerment that comes. So with the vision of progressive orders of reform, our best days lie ahead; and we can deliver that hope that we are challenged to deliver.

So it has been tremendous speaking with you and our colleagues on the floor here this evening. Let's move forward and provide that hope to America's working families.

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

CALIFORNIA'S HIGH-SPEED RAIL

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, our subject here tonight is about California's high-speed rail project, a project that was voted in in 2008 by the voters of California with approximately $9 billion worth of bonds to help fund what would be a project that would seek outside private investment as well, a project that would link San Francisco to Los Angeles with possible additional spurs to Sacramento and San Diego. It has run into large funding problems and such. So the subject of our time tonight is that we see that there are huge problems with the funding and where will the funding come from.

I have my colleagues here from California, as well, who would like to speak on this subject. First of all, I would like to yield to my good friend and colleague from the north San Joaquin Valley, Congressman JEFF DENHAM, who has been a leader on this issue here in Congress as well as chairs the Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure, which deals directly with rail and this issue. So, Congressman DENHAM, I would love to hear from you tonight.

Mr. DENHAM. I thank the gentleman from California.

I, as many other Californians at one time, supported the California high-speed rail project. It was initially supposed to be a $33 billion project with equal amounts coming not only from the California taxpayers, in the form of a bond, but also private investors and the Federal Government.

Yet this $33 billion project has ballooned up to $100 billion. So what do they do for cost controls? They cut off the very legs that Mr. LAMALFA talked about, the section going to Sacramento, the section going to San Diego; but, still, it is a $68 billion project with a more than $26 billion hole just in the first initial operating segment alone.

Tomorrow, as chair of the Subcommittee on Railroads, we will be discussing a review of the challenges facing California's high-speed rail.

I want to reiterate I believe that high-speed rail is our future. I believe that as a growing economy, with more trucks and goods movement on the road, with more goods movement on rail that we have to look at alternative opportunities to move people. High-speed rail is one of those opportunities.

But in Florida, a project that is being done by private investors will have no ongoing subsidy. They need no Federal dollars. Texas will have its own high-speed rail system, again, with private dollars, no ongoing subsidy. Yet here in California, you have a $68 billion project with no private investor, with huge subsidies and overruns, and a project that cannot even get out of the initial gate.

So where we are today: California has no money to meet its Federal obligation. On November 14, we had a court decision that came back and said that they cannot spend the $9.95 billion that was approved by voters because they had failed to complete a full business plan. So with no dollars available, the Governor came out this week and said that we are going to use $250 million of the cap-and-trade dollars, cap-and-trade dollars that were supposed to be used for environmentally friendly projects. Yet this project is going to be a net polluter, a net polluter for at least the next 30 years. So how he could come up with a legality of using these cap-and-trade dollars I think is in question.

But I think a bigger issue is a timing issue: $180 million is due April 1. The Antideficiency Act says that the State has to have its first set of matches, and that 50/50 match is due April 1. Yet the legislature is not even going to vote on this new budget and this theoretical $250 million in funds until, at the earliest, late June. California budgets usually come in in August, and I think it

is a real question on whether liberals and conservatives can agree on whether or not this environmental money will be used on high-speed rail.

But specifically on the operating segment, itself, the judge has said not only that they need to come up with the money on this initial construction segment, which stops in Bakersfield—so now we are going to have two sets of rail that stop in Bakersfield, and then you have to get on a bus to get across the Tehachapis. But they don't even have the funding for the initial operating section, which goes all the way to Palmdale. You won't be able to get the speed that they need going around, instead of through, the Tehachapis; and they have a $20 billion funding gap in that first segment.

So some real questions: Are they going to meet the timeline of April 1? Is using the cap-and-trade dollars actually legal? And, third, this huge funding gap, where does that money come from? I think the Federal taxpayers across the Nation need to be asking the question, If you are going to subsidize all of California's high-speed rail projects, where do the matching dollars come from? If they could use the $9.95 billion, it is still not enough money. So if California can't come up with the Federal match, what are the teeth that the Federal Government has to be able to hold California up to that Federal obligation?

We have some real questions that are going to be coming out tomorrow. The FRA has altered its approach. Once they realized that they couldn't do a 50/50 match, they went to a tapered match. That means that the Federal Government is going to come in with their money first, and then, hopefully, someday the State will come up with its matching dollars in a tapered manner. That tapered manner is coming through April 1. That is when that first $180 million is obligated.

But I think the real question is, Who is making these decisions? Did this go all the way up to the President? Was the past Department of Transportation Secretary or the new Department of Transportation Secretary involved in this decision? And if California can't come up with this tapered match, will they, once again, adjust this outside of Congress a second time?

So we have some real questions on what those legalities are. The next question would be the contingencies. What are the contingencies for the Federal Government to recoup its taxpayer dollars if California defaults on its obligations?

We have some real priorities in California. And as the Central Valley continues to suffer with a drought, as our schools continue to lag behind, as our public safety dollars continue to get robbed, is this the best use of our money? And should we be investing in something that, unlike Texas and Florida, has no private investors, has no State match, has a lot of funding questions that need to be answered before we move forward?

Mr. LAMALFA. Thank you, Congressman DENHAM.

Indeed, the more time that goes by on this issue, the more problems and flaws are exposed in this. This is a measure that passed in 2008, was put in front of the voters, known as ''Prop 1(a)'' at the time that passed by a 52–48 margin. I think the voters were sold something completely different than what we are actually seeing as Californians in the project.

Congressman DENHAM mentioned that the price has ballooned from approximately what people saw on the ballot, $33 billion for that initial San Francisco to L.A. segment; and just 1 year later, it was revised up after the voters had voted on it to $42 billion. And then we saw that the Sacramento segments, the San Diego segments were dropped off as even options.

Interestingly, we have all been in the State legislature—Congressman DENHAM and myself and another gentleman who will be speaking here in a moment—and we saw these numbers go past us at a time. And at a hearing that was held in the California State Senate in November of 2011, it was finally exposed that their numbers were way off, and they admitted that the project that voters expected would be right near $100 billion to do the San Francisco to Los Angeles segment if it was going to be truly a high-speed rail from port to port. And also during that time, in order to build up and say what an economic boom it would be, they were advertising that 1 million jobs would be created by this.

□ 1900

We pinned them down in that Senate hearing that it wasn't really 1 million jobs. It was a term called 1 million job years, which really translates out to perhaps 20,000 jobs of building the entire system. So we have seen a lot of very creative—I would say phony—numbers on costs, on benefits, and even some of the very highly optimistic ridership numbers as well.

So, Congressman DENHAM, what does that mean in your district here as far as what you really think the jobs would translate out to? And then what are some of the impacts on the property involved, as well?

Mr. DENHAM. Well, certainly, one of the big concerns right now is where are these jobs? These were stimulus dollars that were supposed to be ready for shovel-ready projects 5 years ago—5 years ago—and still not one shovel is in the ground. Not one job is created. Now, unlike Texas and Florida that are creating jobs, that are putting the infrastructure in, certainly in California they could come up with a better plan. They could go along the I–5 corridor. They could use the existing rail corridor that has been abandoned. There are other opportunities if they truly want to cut costs. But if they don't want to change, they don't want to revise their budget and they have no private investor, the question still remains, what obligation do you have to go back to the California taxpayer? You are obligating the California taxpayer for nearly $10 billion, and you are not fulfilling the Prop 1A guarantee that they voted on.

So, at a certain point, I believe that we have to force the California High-Speed Rail Authority to go back to the voters and seek approval. Change your plans. Go back to the voters and let the voters decide.

Mr. LAMALFA. Indeed, I attempted that in 2012 with legislation at the time called SB 95 in California to place that back in front of the voters, give people the option, now that they have more information, to say do they really want to go through with this with California's other issues. You mentioned, Mr. DENHAM, the challenges we have had with water supply. Even our Governor is saying that this is a huge priority and a huge problem for California to face in 2014, and yet we have a very difficult time allocating a few billion dollars to enhance our water storage in California and instead are faced with this.

What would that mean for jobs in the valley if we are able to turn the water, turn the tap back on to agriculture at a fraction of the price of high-speed rail?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. DENHAM. It would be a fraction of the price, tens of thousands of jobs that would be lost of seeing farmland that goes by without being planted this year.

We have a huge drought. There are huge issues. And what everybody is trying to say is a high-speed rail—keep in mind, this initial segment, this initial operating segment which has a $20 billion funding gap, is not going to be electrified. It will not be high-speed. By their numbers, by their plan, this is another set of track that will not be electrified, that will run as it is being run today, with a $20 billion gap. So even if you came up with the entire $32 billion of this initial segment, we are still stuck in the same situation that we are. We are just that much further in the hole.

Now, I know some of my colleagues would say, well, just spend the money as quickly as you can. Let's just spend some of it, and like other projects, once you have started it, some day the money will come. I don't think we can deal with that type of pie-in-the-sky rhetoric. I believe we have got to have a full funding plan that makes sense, one that has a private investor that was promised to us.

We have heard several times that, if you just write the legislation, we will have a private investor; if you just put it on the ballot and approve it by the legislature before it actually goes to the voters, we will have private investors that will sign on to this. Then it was right after the ballot passed, we have nearly $10 billion committed to by the taxpayers, for sure we are going to have a private investor now.

Five years later, after the Federal Government has come up with several billion dollars, after the voters are now on the hook for $10 billion, and still today there is no private investor. You would be a fool to invest in this. This isn't Florida's project. This isn't Texas' project. This is a project with a huge funding gap that still is not going to be electrified—by their plan.

Mr. LAMALFA. Indeed, when we look at the project in totality here, what ended up being $100 billion to be legal under Proposition 1A, to have a true high-speed rail—which is required—to go from San Francisco to L.A. at a high speed, 2 hours and 40 minutes, a $100 billion project was revised now down to a $68 billion project, which does not include high-speed all the way to San Francisco in the north. It would stop at the San Jose area, and then you are required to use local transportation, local light rail, what have you, to get all the way up to San Francisco. And at the southern end, you have, in L.A. County, it doesn't go to downtown Los Angeles under the new plan. It would stop somewhere in the north, remote north L.A. County portion. So it isn't truly high-speed rail anymore.

As you mentioned, too, Mr. DENHAM, on that, if they take the Palmdale route, they probably can't even sustain those speeds. So it is illegal on that count that it probably can't make a 2-hour-and-40-minute ride. And with that, you have three different segments. So if you have to buy three different tickets, I don't know how the customers are being suited by three different stops like that, as well.

We were told back in the day that the price of a ticket would somehow be tied to 85 percent of what an airline ticket was to go from north to south or south to north; and a real estimate, if this were self-sustaining, it would be somewhere maybe triple of that.

So the impacts of that, again, California agriculturally with water supply is struggling this year. So for a fraction of the amount of money it would take to bolster California's storage, we are going to spend perhaps what would have been $100 billion—in the revised number, $68 billion—to do an illegal Prop 1A version from south San Jose to north Los Angeles. That is a $55 billion gap on the entire project right there.

We can only point to $13 billion worth of funding, the 9.9 from the bond. Bonds have consequences. They have to be paid back by an already financially strapped State. As well, the 3.5 billion or so that is promised from the Federal Government under the 2009 stimulus has strings, too. It has an expiration period.

Please embellish on that a little bit, Mr. DENHAM, because we know there are some very important deadlines coming on that as well, if we can.

Mr. DENHAM. There are important deadlines. Again, this is part of the Antideficiency Act that says the 50/50 match now is coming due for the State. So April 1, $180 million is due. The question for the Governor is: Where is that money going to come from? We can't just continue to change deadlines. And the question to the administration is: Are you going to continue to allow California not to guarantee its matching funds? It is going against the Antideficiency Act, the reason that is put into law.

Mr. LAMALFA. California just passed a recent tax known as Prop 30 last year, 2012, that was going to pay for a whole lot of things, go for a lot of different measures with perhaps schools and other infrastructure. We had talked about cap-and-trade. You can even point to truck fees, that they are all now trying to be shifted towards high-speed rail instead of other priorities. I wonder if that is what the voters' intentions were on Prop 30 or on their truck fees or weight fees, et cetera.

So I think there has been a lot of deception around this, again, on cost and on ridership. As I mentioned a minute ago, if it has been revised down to a $68 billion plan, we can only point to, for sure, approximately $13 billion from Fed stimulus and the State bond. Where does the other $55 billion go to build what is really an illegal plan? Where is it going to come from?

Mr. DENHAM, you mentioned we haven't seen the private-sector money from anywhere, yet you can point to, recently, a proposal came out for an east coast plan to build a maglev, magnetic levitation train, that would link east coast urban centers, and there are already interested investors from Japan on that with much more modern technology. You can say that rail isn't new technology because it is wheels still running on a steel rail. And in California, which is supposed to lead the way in technology and innovation, we are really not leading on this at all.

So what do you see as far as the problems with that bigger funding gap? And then, bringing that back, what is that going to do for our economy?

Mr. DENHAM. Well, certainly, we are falling way behind the rest of the world. Other technologies are starting to flourish in other parts of the world, yet here this project will take at least 30 years but, more likely, 50 to 60 based on where they are currently standing on the project. So this is something that will be far outdated technology if it ever gets completed.

But the real question is on the funding. Where is the commitment? This President certainly could look for or come up with other money. He could propose other money to fulfill this project. Not even Democrats will support that. That is not a Republican issue. This is an issue across the Nation saying, why would we come up with money, when we are starved across the Nation, to throw at a project in California that is being mismanaged?

I think that there are real questions there not only for the administration but private investors that are not willing to sink money into a failing project. They don't know what they are on the hook for. They don't know how long of a commute this will be or what the ridership numbers will ever be.

Even by this entire plan, there are too many stops. Whether you talk to the Rail Authority or whether you talk to investors around the world, with that many stops in those locations, you will never get to the 220-miles-per-hour speed, and you will never get to 2 hours and 40 minutes.

This thing is full of holes. It makes no sense for voters, and voters should have a say-so on whether or not they are going to commit any initial money or any further money as we move forward. This is about our future, not yours and mine, but our kids, our grandkids, and the type of debt that we saddle them with. At a certain point, I think that not only Californians, but Americans, need to wake up and say whether or not this is a project that deserves an investment.

Can we do things smarter? Can we do things like Florida and Texas? I don't think Florida and Texas are going to be alone. I think there will be other States that step up and find ways to do high-speed rail and find ways to make a commonsense solution in their States.

But in this State, this project is flawed. It is initially flawed by $20 billion, but certainly by more than $55 billion if we decide to move forward. At a certain point, you have to ask, how much is enough? I would say that now is enough.

Mr. LAMALFA. Indeed, when the stimulus money first started coming available, there were other States that applied for high-speed rail money, such as Florida, Ohio, and Wisconsin. I believe that after they looked at their numbers, ran the figures on projects that were eligible for that stimulus money, they turned that money back and went back into this pool. Of course, California said it wants it; but interestingly, it would have been a much smaller portion had California been sharing with those other States what Federal money would have come to the State. So the other ones said, We have looked at the numbers, and we are turning that money back in.

I think we ought to apply some of the same logic as the other States looked at when they had Federal money available, eligible funds, that they indeed turned back.

So I really appreciate your leadership on this, Congressman DENHAM, and we will be doing a lot more to make sure this is held accountable to the public here. I look forward to your hearing tomorrow on this matter.

Mr. DENHAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. LAMALFA. We are also joined by a colleague from the lower San Joaquin Valley area of the State for whom this issue is very important, very key to his district as well, on the impact of the

rail route as well as the economy, as well as what it means for the taxpayers of the State and the entire country. Indeed, this has an effect on national taxpayers and the budget as well. So people in other 49 States are looking at what is going on here and saying, Why is our Federal money going into something that can't possibly work out?

And so I know we are all willing to help people in other States with sensible infrastructure projects. That is the way it works in this country with our interstate system that President Eisenhower had the vision for back in the day. And yes, there might have been naysayers there, but you could actually point to positive results in something that works long term and other infrastructure projects that were invested in, but this one here, the numbers just don't run.

So my colleague, DAVID VALADAO from the valley, has got very great concerns and has been very strong in leading in his area too, as well, on what are the impacts going to be, what are the costs.

I would like to yield to Congressman DAVID VALADAO.

Mr. VALADAO. I thank the gentleman rice farmer from northern California for the opportunity to speak here today.

Where do you start with something like this? I grew up a dairy farmer in Kings County and continue to be a dairy farmer in Kings County to this day. I spent my first 2 years in elected office in the California State Legislature on a budget subcommittee and watched as this project moved along; and right before election when this was passed back in '08 and up until my election in 2010, the project didn't seem that bad. It seemed like something that was just voted on and put on the shelf and they would continue to build on it. Then, at the last minute, some money showed up and it basically put this project in high gear, and the project wasn't ready for it.

As the Congressman from the northern part of the valley mentioned earlier, there is no real plan. When you show up at the last minute and say, ''Here. Here is some money. Start building right away,'' as if it is shovel ready, it set this project up for a really, really tough time.

□ 1915

What we are facing now today, we see a train system being built, a high-speed rail, and like was mentioned earlier, older technology. Forty years ago, rail with wheels was the technology. Now maglev is the new technology. So to see a project that is starting today with technology that is already 40 years old that probably won't be running for another 30 years, I think we are setting ourselves up for failure.

When you look at what else has been going on with this project, as far as what the opportunities are, when you look at my district specifically, California District 21, you have got communities like Hanford, Corcoran, Wasco, who all rely on a system that we have today, Amtrak. Amtrak doesn't really pay its bills, but it gets people from A to B, and it serves its purpose. You have got a system there where people who live in those communities are able to get to the doctor in Fresno or get to the doctor in Bakersfield or get to work, but a small, commuter train that gets them where they need to be for relatively low cost.

You look at high-speed rail, and as the map that was up on the screen earlier showed, what we have there is a track that will basically pass from Hanford, if Hanford ever gets built, but for sure Fresno to Bakersfield, and it leaves all of the people in California 21 basically out to dry. That is sad. I mean, when you see a project that was supposed to help those less fortunate, or those people who need it the most, you have a project now that is actually going to hurt them and put potentially at risk what they have today, Amtrak, their mode of transportation.

Because this project lacks so much money, that is why it puts us in that position. We have a system in place that is built on someone else's train tracks. It is on Burlington Northern's train tracks in my area, and I am sure it is on other tracks in other parts of the State, but if the project that they have today starts to move forward and they run out of money like we expect them to do, part of the plan is to move Amtrak over there. So what happens to those stations in my district? That is just one of the issues I see.

In California 21, like I mentioned earlier, and a good portion of the valley, we face a water shortage, a drought. Some of that is natural, but a lot of that is regulatory. We have also got a severe lack of infrastructure to deliver water. We have Tempered Flats and we have Pikes Reservoir, we have a lot of infrastructure that needs to be built, and that is infrastructure that would benefit not just California but the whole State in general.

When you look at a project like high-speed rail, if that project was to go forward and be built, you would have a high-speed rail that most people couldn't afford to ride.

If you build water infrastructure, you now have water to grow products, water to feed families, water for our communities, and once you have that, you start to grow crops and produce product. You start to improve an economy and produce a product that you actually can sell and bring dollars back into your community. That, in my opinion, makes a lot more sense.

Education. California has struggled with funding for education for years. We have seen plenty of programs that were cut out or cut back or just flat out gotten rid of. If you have a project like high-speed rail spending money when they are not prepared for it, when we should be investing in our future, education, making sure our kids have the best opportunities, the best foundation to bring, to improve our economy, to be good, productive members of our society and to make a real difference—I think education should be our first priority.

You look at everything we could be spending money on. Right now in California, we have been letting prisoners out of prisons because we don't have enough money to build facilities for them and to keep some of the community correctional facilities open. There is a lot going on, and we have to be spending money on a project like this when we should be focusing on something that helps keep our communities safe.

Those are all things that we should be paying attention to that we are not because of this project. They are in a hurry to build this project right now because they say it creates jobs, but, like was pointed out earlier, those numbers are all bogus. They were pushed up. They were not honest numbers. We are starting to see this project that will put our children and grandchildren into debt for a long time for a small amount of jobs that we really can't account for and we can't ensure will be our own community jobs.

So this is something that has had me concerned my whole time in the legislature, and I have talked about it for a long time. It is something that I am going to continue to fight. It needs to be talked about and pushed out there.

The more people who get involved—you take groups like my Kings County group of residents who have sued the State and sued the Federal Government over this project. When they first got involved, they looked at this project and said this is going to affect our families and homes, let's fight it. Once they started getting into the details and saw where the funding was coming from, or the lack of funding, the amount of deceit that goes into this project just to get it rammed down our throats, they decided to keep fighting no matter what, even though the alignment was moved off their property across town to another part of town. The high-speed rail people thought all of these people will back off now because it doesn't affect them personally, but once they knew what was really in this project, they thought there is no way we can let this fight go. So the group actually grew.

Now that the new constituents were affected by the new alignment, the new guys joined with the old guys and the group grew. Now they have moved the alignment back. The first group is continuing to fight, and the second group is in it as well. It is just amazing how the more you get to know about this project and how it is being pushed and how it is being run, the more you want to fight it, and the more you want to shut this thing down.

Just to close, California high-speed rail comes at a tremendous cost to taxpayers while delivering no benefit to my constituents. This project will destroy homes and businesses throughout

California's 21st Congressional District and divert precious tax dollars away from water infrastructure, public safety, and education.

I will continue to uphold my promise to my constituents and do whatever I have in my power to stop this project as fast as possible.

Mr. LAMALFA. One question: a commission, a board in California, recently moved to the three-person board to authorize the rail authority to start condemning property under eminent domain. Of course, there is going to be a lot of resistance. Kings County is a hot bed of resistance to this project. The eminent domain procedures are not easy or cheap to get through a court process. They are already moved to condemn two pieces of property, I believe, in Fresno County, and I believe there are at least 380 that may have to go through this process. How do your constituents feel about the forced taking of land and an alignment that doesn't make a lot of sense and some of the infrastructure that might be lost in these communities?

Mr. VALADAO. Over the years, there have been a lot of things built in the valley—freeways, just different things that obviously needed to be built for the good of the State. Farmers, and constituents in general, if they understand why it is being taken and it makes sense for the State, usually it is an easy deal.

But once they get involved in the details of this project and start to see how they are being treated themselves and how the project is going to end up looking, because it is pretty apparent with the lack of funding and with the rest of the Federal Government looking at this project and understanding that it is pretty much ruined now because of the management, they are not happy. They are fighting this thing tooth and nail.

When it comes down to their own personal property, obviously they are offended with some of the prices and some of the numbers they are seeing. If they owned the property or if their family owned it, if it is a generational thing, or just in general an eyesore running alongside their home, affecting how they drive to work or how they move around the district in general, it is just offensive to many of them, depending on the different route or how you want to approach it.

Mr. LAMALFA. Indeed. Let me ask you, too: How easy is to relocate a rendering plant? A rendering plant, that is a facility that processes dead agricultural animals, which happens, and so they need to be taken to be processed, and one of those is right in your district, I understand.

Mr. VALADAO. We have a rendering plant that is right in the middle of the alignment as the alignment is today. Obviously, the alignment moves on a weekly basis, but the rendering plant has been in the alignment twice now. The first time, and we are back in there again.

As far as permitting for a new rendering plant, back in 2006 during the heat wave, we struggled in the Central Valley to handle the amount of animals that were needing to be processed at that time. Permitting for a new facility was nearly impossible, and we were never able to upgrade or expand the facilities. So to actually build a new one today I would say is nearly impossible.

Mr. LAMALFA. Is the high-speed rail authority guaranteeing to help or see through as part of the environmental documents to help make sure this is replaced or other infrastructure is replaced? There are dairies in line. Again, in California, securing a permit for a new dairy has become nearly an impossibility, as my colleague in the dairy industry would probably report. So there are a lot of people weighing in on that. Relocating the dairy, these are facilities and lands that have been for generations of families that have been there. Is anything being taken into account on the authority helping with these processes as part of the impact they are having?

Mr. VALADAO. We have no guarantees on any of that. Some of the things that affect some of our constituents, somebody that has a restaurant and the high-speed rail goes through their property, they go in and give them what they assume is the value of that, but no one takes into account replacement value. Or they bought their first home when prices were high, and now prices have come down, and now it is an opportunity for high-speed rail to come in and offer them market price, which basically leaves that person homeless and in debt. So there are a lot of situations.

We have farmers with long-term leases on property who do not own the property, but own the permanent crop on top of that. High-speed rail hasn't taken into account the value of that crop on top. People will invest $10,000 to $15,000 an acre to get trees planted, and if they are only buying the land for the value of the land but not what is on top of that land, that obviously will put a lot of people upside down in a really bad position and affect a lot of jobs.

One of the biggest economic drivers in the valley, and in California, we export a lot of agricultural products. That brings a lot of dollars in. That will have an impact on our economy as well.

Mr. LAMALFA. Indeed. We are both from long time farming families. I think when you are a farmer, or any business that is multi-generational, but especially on the land, you develop a bond. You develop a love of the land that you don't really put a price on. I think most farmers will farm until they can't farm any more, either due to age or regulations taking it away from them, or whatever. So how do you put a price on my family, raising the fifth generation, and you and your neighbors, you have multi-generations as well. How do you put a market price on your legacy? Someone is coming in from Sacramento or Washington saying we think it is worth that. It may be worth infinitely more to you and your family and the generations behind you. How do you quantify that?

Mr. VALADAO. Well, you can't. When it is a project necessary for the benefit of the country, benefit of the State, one that actually makes sense with a good plan behind it, it is a little easier to swallow, but when you see this project in general and how big of a disaster it has been and how little information has been out to the public, how they plan on funding it, how they plan on moving forward, if people are going to be able to actually afford to ride this thing, it makes it that much worse. This is important. I mean, when you look at how hard some people have worked to build their homes and build their farms and companies, we have restaurants and we have a little bit of everything that is being affected by this. When you see their blood, sweat and tears, you can't put a price on that.

Mr. LAMALFA. Certainly. Eminent domain is something that governments should use very reluctantly, very rarely, and only when there is no other option available. My farm has been affected by that as well with the large towers, the power lines that move basically from hydroelectric projects in the northeast part of the State down to the San Francisco Bay area. It is something that affects our fields, but it is part of the greater good. Our tractors have to drive around those now and figure out how to still keep straight lines going through towers running at an angle, and you have ag aircraft that have to tangle with avoiding wires and flying over the towers at 200 feet and trying to drop seed or fertilizer, things like that. So we get some pretty strange streaks in our fields because of that infrastructure, but it is important. We want the folks in the Bay area to have that.

Eminent domain isn't always very fair. What I am seeing here is the promises, if there are any promises made by the high-speed rail authority, to truly keep people whole on this and give them options, and as you mentioned, the alignment changes frequently. We are not even sure if they have a full 520-mile alignment decided yet. They could have gone for a more low-impact route, perhaps putting it down the middle of Interstate 5 or adjacent to it, using parts of 99, perhaps.

Mr. VALADAO. Or maybe fill in gaps where Amtrak doesn't serve today. Currently, if you want to go from Bakersfield to L.A., you get on a bus. There is no connection there. That would have been a great place to start this project.

□ 1930

That is one of the arguments we have. When you have got a project of this size and such a percentage of the

money that is needed to build this project, you can see the failure coming. But you have to make sure that whatever resources are spent are spent in a way that benefits the overall majority of the people.

Right now, if you are riding Amtrak from Fresno to L.A. and you get off at Bakersfield and you get on that Greyhound bus and ride over the hill, I am sure Greyhound does a great job, but that would be a great place to fill in the hole and build a rail, and build it up to today's standards and put something in place that we can build on in the future that makes sense.

Mr. LAMALFA. Certainly you can make an argument that the first places you should look are the urban areas where you can have the potential ridership. Here on the east coast, you have a lot of ridership between Washington, D.C., on up all the way to Boston. I don't know about the financial viability of that, but at least you can make a case there. Here, as was reported just a couple of years ago, they wanted to start in the Valley because, as was quoted, they had the least amount of resistance to building the rail starting in the rural Valley as opposed to what it was going to take to run through the South Bay area, places like Palo Alto and others, that some people are feverishly opposed to what that would do and what that infrastructure tends to bring to high-value communities like that as well.

But, again, the promise lies in the Central Valley for us in what we do well already. My portion in northern Sacramento Valley, San Joaquin Valley, these are strong agricultural areas.

I am wondering—and maybe you can touch on this as well—we have had different ideas for water projects that for a fraction of the money we are talking about with the high-speed rail system, how far could we go to do one or two water storage projects and what would that mean for especially communities like you have down there that have seen a huge economic impact with the cutoff of water due to the delta smelt and those other problems? What would that mean in real jobs for the people that have the skills and education level that likely aren't going to be working on a high-speed rail project, but have a strong background in agriculture? What do you see that doing to help your area?

Mr. VALADAO. Well, when we look at a company that wants to invest in the Valley, if they are in agriculture, obviously they are attracted to the area for those reasons. But if they are looking for an affordable place that makes sense between L.A. and San Francisco because of access to larger populations, they look at the Central Valley, but they also want to make sure that there is security there. If you are going to build a company, you are going to make sure it is in a great place for your employees.

I think the focus should be right now making sure that people have affordable energy to live there because obviously it gets hot in the summer, and the water situation. Are you going to move your family into an area where the water isn't safe to drink, which is commonplace in some of those communities that we have been fighting for funding for some of the water treatment facilities that are so necessary.

Then when you get into the infrastructure itself, if you are going to build a plant or anything or a processing facility for the type of commodities we grow, water is a necessity. It starts from growing the crop, to cleaning the crop, to making sure that the facilities are up to code and that we've got some treatment in place and that we have a product that we can sell and bring dollars to those communities.

That is how you create jobs, that is the right way to do it, and that is something that we should be focusing on and investing our limited resources on today. Obviously, we have been making some really tough decisions in the last few months over spending and budgets and everything else that we have got going on. Not just on the national level, but at the State level there are going to be some tough decisions as well.

Those decisions should be based on priorities, and those priorities should be making sure we have the resources, and resources today means water. Water is the number one priority, and that is where it should be focused at.

Mr. LAMALFA. I think everybody in California in the midst of this drought probably find agreement with that. Our own Governor was underlying that in a speech the other day, and yet still so wedded to this high-speed rail project, which the funding for is highly questionable. Indeed, a judge handed down a decision the other day ordering California not to spend any of the State bond money because it wouldn't be legal to do so under the lack of a plan they have.

We both served in the State legislature. And is California's financial situation such that it can get out there on its own somehow with new funding? If the Federal money falls short or no private investment comes out, where will it come from?

Mr. VALADAO. Well, we have got a lot of priorities here in Washington, D.C. The different Members from different parts of the State are not looking at California's high-speed rail project the way it is being rolled out today and thinking that is a good place to invest the resources that the taxpayers in their district want to see them spend the money on.

It is not going to be an easy lift. As this project seems to move forward and the press gets worse and worse, and when you've got judges involved saying that they are not following the letter of the law, what was asked of the voters when they voted for it, it just makes it that much harder to come up with the rest of the money they are going to need to finish this project.

So to get it started, just to build a big berm, or maybe even a berm with some metal on top to hopefully throw some older-style Amtrak trains on top, doesn't make a lot of sense, especially when you are going to cut off communities that need it today, need what we have got in place today and not put that in jeopardy.

Mr. LAMALFA. What doesn't get talked about much are different impacts like the high-speed rail. In order to sustain a high-speed, you have got to build a very long elliptical form in order to make turns with a train going 220 miles per hour. It is kind of like the angled towers running at angled lines on my property that we farm. It doesn't fit in real well with a grid that is set up on straight lines and squares like that.

So when an elliptical-shaped rail comes through your community through agricultural zones, as well as high-speed rail having to cut off all the crossings, can you build enough overpasses to not stop the flow of traffic, whether that is cars or trucks or even a farmer on a tractor who now may have to drive his tractor instead of just across 6 miles down the road and back up to get around. I mean, there are a lot of impacts that are really not meeting the eye here when you line them out.

Mr. VALADAO. Like I mentioned earlier, when this project was started, it was started as a long-term project; but then $3 billion showed up from the Federal Government and the project managers basically said put this thing in high gear, start breaking ground.

You have got a project of this type that affects so many people in so many different communities—how they travel around their homes to work, around their farms, around their businesses, transporting products between warehouses and processing facilities. You have so much going on, and you have got this project now that is going to disrupt all of that just because they have got a timeline that they have got to spend.

The timeline is really on a small portion of it. We are talking a couple percentages of the total cost of the project. It is not worth risking a project of this size over such a small amount of money.

That is probably one of the worst things that has happened to this project since its inception. It could have been something great. It could have been a project that could have made a big difference if it was given the time to be designed and planned in a way that benefited the State, didn't burden the State with debt forever, and actually helped the constituents of that State.

It is too bad this project has gone down the path it has; but, again, we are going to try to stop this thing so that this doesn't happen and doesn't affect our communities.

Mr. LAMALFA. Well, indeed, it does appear that they are hell-bent on

spending that approximately $3.5 billion that has Federal deadlines on it in order to get the project started; and then at that point, well, we are invested in the project, we can't stop now, even though the judge ruled it is illegal to spend the State dollars because it is not fulfilling the plan. So, indeed, big impact on the Valley and on taxpayers.

Mr. VALADAO, I really appreciate your time and your leadership on this here tonight. Let's keep putting the message out that there are better ways. Most anything might be better than investing in this at this point. So I thank you for your help here tonight.

Mr. VALADAO. Thank you.

Mr. LAMALFA. So, indeed, the investors that were supposed to come in, private investment for what had been billed to voters as a $33 billion project, up to $45 billion if you built the San Diego and Sacramento link, they have not materialized. When you see that the price for a time went up to $98.5 billion—hence California's Senate bill 985—it scared everybody away from this.

You see, in a Baltimore to Washington proposal to do a maglev project here locally that has outside investors that want to come in on that, nobody is touching California's high-speed rail.

So in the absence of this outside investment, California has moved in many different ways to try and find other pots of money. The Governor plans on diverting truck weight fees that are collected from commercial truckers away from repairing California's aging roads.

Just try and drive in the right-hand lane of any freeway—I get to enjoy Interstate 5 a lot—and see what the condition of that road is. Some areas have been repaired. Caltrans had a pretty good year last year. Other areas it is still pretty rough. Interstate 80, near Sacramento, they are doing repairs now; but the potholes on that were pretty bad.

Yet we are seeing the effort by the State to shift funding away from repairing roads that everybody uses versus a project that maybe few can afford to actually use. My colleagues from the Valley here would probably tell you that there is not going to be a whole lot of people that jump on high-speed rail to ride from Bakersfield to Fresno because it doesn't make any sense for them.

The promise of a low-cost ticket being 85 percent initially of an airline ticket from L.A. to San Francisco or vice versa, how can that be met without having the tickets subsidized at these costs? $85 we were told, $90. It was revised later maybe $120 when we had a hearing about it. Try $300 if it is not going to be underwritten by the taxpayers for ridership on this.

How many people are going to spend $300 on that trip? Other than those that might do it for the novelty of the train ride from north to south or south to north. We saw pie-in-the-sky numbers on what the amount of ridership would be, numbers that at one time were greater than the entirety of Amtrak across the 48 continental States. They have had to revise them down to some other vague number.

So there is not a lot of trust in anything being put forward by the California High-Speed Rail Authority on costs, on ridership, on impact, promises made or not made to those that are impacted in the line of many different proposals of where the route is. Yet they are still trying to move forward and start condemning people's property, at who-knows-what price of reimbursement, in order to spend as quickly as they can this $3 billion-plus of Federal stimulus money put in place almost 5 years ago.

It is really looking more like a fraudulent enterprise from what the voters saw in 2008 to now. Indeed, polling out there shows that now that people have heard about this the last couple of years and what it really means and the other choices they have to make on schools, on water, on their actual highways, that they have a whole lot of different opinion on it. A lot of editorial pages around the State are saying at the very least if you are not going to stop it, you should put it back on the ballot.

I attempted that in 2012. The mood wasn't there in the State legislature to do that. My former colleague there that I served with, Assemblyman Jeff Gorell from the Santa Barbara area, he is putting forward legislation to put it back on the ballot and re-vote the rail. So I hope that catches fire and that the legislature will look at this project and decide maybe that would be worth a vote of the people of California to decide if this is still a priority at these prices.

So Assemblyman Gorell has got a pretty big task to put that in front of the legislature and achieve the votes. But interestingly—still talking State politics here—but in the State Senate, to put forward the first segment of funding in late 2012, it received the bare majority of votes to fund that. In our California State Senate, there are 40 Members. They have got a vote of 21–19. All the Republicans voted ''no'' and four of the Democrats, who up to that point had been pretty favorable on high-speed rail. It barely got out of the State Senate floor.

I think that is saying a lot, that the opinions have changed, certainly amongst the voters. Now we just have to put the State legislature in a figurative headlock and get them to think about it and do that.

So I hope Assemblyman Gorell is successful in this measure because it would be proper to put this back in front of the voters and ask them again: would you rather have this or water projects, highway projects, school projects, any number of things that could be done to help move California forward instead of this boondoggle that has no way of paying for itself or sustaining itself?

We see, again, with the court handing down a ruling, that the plan is diverted so far from what was initially voted on and approved by the voters that it is now illegal. Why should State government be doing things that are illegal? Because they are right now in such a hurry to get the money spent, the Federal money. If the Federal money was to stop, the State money also has to. They both have to have a match with each other; but if there is not the match happening, then there are giant legal problems.

□ 1945

Congressman DENHAM mentioned a while ago: What is the payback procedure if Federal money is misspent, improperly spent? Because California had the capacity to do that if it doesn't meet its timelines, it doesn't meet the goals, it doesn't meet the tenets laid out in proposition 1(a). It would be in a true high-speed rail system all the way from San Francisco to Los Angeles, which so far that plan is not. You have to ride three different train types to accomplish that under this current plan.

Now we know the folks in the Bay Area and parts of Los Angeles are interested in seeing some of their tracks electrified as beneficiaries of some of the money that will be coming from this. I get that, I understand that. That probably would be a benefit for them, some upgrades in their local infrastructure. I don't know why you could not support that separately from this. If it helps to get Caltrain in the Bay Area electrified, then that should be a separate question, a separate set of funding, because right now this is illegal.

The people in the Bay Area do not want to be part of an illegal project, likely, and maybe perhaps lose that funding they are depending on to electrify and upgrade their system. I don't think so. That is a lot of money when it gets around to doing that above what is going on in the valley, with the condemnation of the land, and building in an area where they said would have the least amount of resistance for the project, let alone the Bay Area and perhaps parts of north L.A. County.

So it is very problematic. It is really time, as I proposed back in my senate days, to slow down the project and really get some real numbers. That was my first bill in the State Senate, SB 22. It was a no spending, no doing anything, until we have fully vetted and thought out a plan.

Honestly, this reminds me of ObamaCare. I have been calling this around my neighbors ObamaCare, Jr., because it is so poorly thought out; and the plan for funding it looks largely the same, pie in the sky. Investors won't touch it. Federal Government, are they going to come in and bridge the gap of the other $55 billion that is missing, if we believe a $68 billion plan, or on up to the approximately 100, let alone the inflation things that might drive a real project all the way to $150 billion? All for what?

What could really be seen as an outdated technology and something that a lot of people can't afford to assess, nor even make sense for them to use in short segments within the valley. Yes, it may make sense possibly if you had a fast train that could go all the way from San Francisco to L.A. and complete that.

One of the things brought up is that in order for the project to be technically legal, they would only have to send one train per day in each direction at full, nonstop length. They would have other trains perhaps that are making all these stops, stopping at every little burg along the way. That is not high-speed rail. That is glorified Amtrak, glorified local commuters. That is not the intent of voters or anybody on this measure, or for that funding which is scarce money these days in California. The huge problems we have in trying to get a budget done and move eventually towards the balance in our Federal budget, it isn't a priority that we should be doing.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just want to note that again Congressman DENHAM will be having a hearing tomorrow in his Transportation and Infrastructure subcommittee on rail that will be at 10 a.m. in Washington time, developing more on this situation. So I would invite you to participate, or watch that, and expose what really needs to happen with Federal funding as well as maybe perhaps the people in California have an opportunity to weigh in on Assemblyman Gorell's proposal to have this back on the ballot and maybe perhaps shift our scarce funds to other things.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of illness.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS AND OTHER BUDGETARY LEVELS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2014 BUDGET RESOLUTION

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, January 14, 2014.

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, Office of the Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to division A of House Joint Resolution 59 (113th Congress), the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record the aggregates, allocations, and other budgetary levels for the Committee on Appropriations set forth pursuant to the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, which establishes a budget resolution for fiscal year 2014.

These aggregates, allocations, and other budgetary levels are provided for bills, joint resolutions, and amendments thereto or conference reports thereon, considered by the House subsequent to this filing, as applicable.

The chair of the Committee on the Budget is also permitted to adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels to reflect changes resulting from technical assumptions in the most recent baseline published by the Congressional Budget Office.

An associated table is attached. These aggregates, allocations, and other budgetary levels are made for the purposes of enforcing titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, and other budgetary enforcement provisions.

If there are any questions on these aggregates, allocations, and other budgetary levels in the budget resolution for fiscal year 2014, please contact Paul Restuccia, Chief Counsel of the Budget Committee.

Sincerely,
PAUL D. RYAN of Wisconsin,
Chairman, House Budget Committee.

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

[In millions of dollars]

	02014
Base Discretionary Action:	
BA	1,012,237
OT	1,154,816
Global War on Terrorism:	
BA	91,938
OT	45,207
Disaster Designated Funds:	
BA	5,626
OT	281
Program Integrity:	
BA	924
OT	832
Total Discretionary:	
BA	1,110,725
OT	1,201,136
Current Law Mandatory:	
BA	749,400
OT	738,140

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 230. An act to authorize the Peace Corps Commemorative Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 15, 2014, 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:

4469. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Fresh Apricots From Continental Spain [Docket No.: APHIS-2011-0132] (RIN: 0579-AD62) received January 7, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4470. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Avocados From Continental Spain [Docket No.: APHIS-2012-0002] (RIN: 0579-AD63) received January 7, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4471. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Department's final rule — Releasing Information; General Provisions; Accounting and Reporting Requirements; Reports of Accounts and Exposures (RIN: 3052-AC76) January 7, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4472. A letter from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Home Mortgage Disclosure (Regulation C): Adjustment to Asset-Size Exemption Threshold received January 7, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4473. A letter from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Truth in Lending (Regulation Z): Adjustment to Asset-Size Exemption Threshold received January 7, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4474. A letter from the Regulatory Specialist, LRA, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Community Reinvestment Act Regulations [Docket ID: OCC-2013-0024] (RIN: 1557-AD77) December 31, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4475. A letter from the President, ParlAmericas, transmitting a report of the 10th Plenary Assembly of ParlAmericas held from the 21st to 24th of August 2013; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4476. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Greenland Turbot in the Bering Sea Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management [Docket No.: 121018563-3148-02] (RIN: 0648-XD029) received January 7, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4477. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Trawl Rationalization Program; Coast Recovery [Docket No.: 110708376-3995-02] (RIN: 0648-BB17) received December 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4478. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; 2013 Accountability Measure and Closure for Hogfish in the Gulf of Mexico [Docket No.: 100217097-1757-02] (RIN: 0648-XC981) received January 7, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4479. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Bering Sea Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 121018563-3148-02] (RIN: 0648-XD013) received January 7, 2014,

pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4480. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Commercial Quota Harvested for the Commonwealth of Virginia [Docket No.: 111220786-1781-01] (RIN: 0648-XD004) received January 7, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4481. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Pacific Halibut Fisheries; Catch Sharing Plan for Guided Sport and Commercial Fisheries in Alaska [Docket No.: 101027534-3999-02] (RIN: 0648-BA37) received January 7, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4482. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Inflation Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties (RIN: 1990-AA43) received January 13, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4483. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Motion Picture Stunt Work and Filming; Chicago, IL [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0868] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4484. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulated Navigation Area; Reporting Requirements for Barges Loaded With Certain Dangerous Cargoes, Inland Rivers, Eighth Coast Guard District; Extension of Stay (Suspension) [USCG-2013-0760] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received January 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4485. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Fireworks Display, Willamette River, Oregon City, OR [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0623] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4486. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Old Mormon Slough, Stockton, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0196] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 801. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to make the shareholder threshold for registration of savings and loan holding companies the same as for bank holding companies (Rept. 113–325). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 2274. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide for a notice-filing registration procedure for brokers performing services in connection with the transfer of ownership of smaller privately held companies and to provide for regulation appropriate to the limited scope of the activities of such brokers; with amendments (Rept. 113–326). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 458. A resolution providing for consideration of the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 3547) to extend the application of certain space launch liability provisions through 2014; providing for proceedings during the period from January 17, 2014, through January 24, 2014; and for other purposes (Rept. 113–327). 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 Mr. LATTA (for himself and Mr. WALZ):

H.R. 3862. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to assist municipalities and regional sewer authorities that would experience a significant hardship raising the revenue necessary to finance projects and activities for the construction of wastewater treatment works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 3863. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to establish uniform requirements for thorough economic analysis of regulations by Federal agencies based on sound principles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RENACCI (for himself and Mr. CARNEY):

H.R. 3864. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Social Security Act relating to demonstration projects designed to promote the reemployment of unemployed workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 3865. A bill to prohibit the Internal Revenue Service from modifying the standard for determining whether an organization is operated exclusively for the promotion of social welfare for purposes of section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3866. A bill to prohibit an increase in the number of flag and general officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York (for himself, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. HANNA, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 3867. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 3868. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to limit assistance to the Palestinian Authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself, Mr. GRIMM, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 3869. A bill to provide for an equitable management of summer flounder based on geographic, scientific, and economic data and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. HOLT, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 3870. A bill to provide for the use of funds in the Hazardous Substance Superfund for the purposes for which they were collected, to ensure adequate resources for the cleanup of hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Energy and Commerce, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 3871. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow increased contributions to health savings accounts, to allow Medicare and VA healthcare participants to contribute to health savings accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA (for himself and Ms. HAHN):

H.R. 3872. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to reauthorize the State infrastructure bank program; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 3873. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to support the community schools model; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HUDSON:

H.R. 3874. A bill to provide for the periodic review of the efficiency and public need for Federal agencies, to establish a commission for the purpose of reviewing the efficiency and public need of such agencies, and to provide for the abolishment of agencies for which a public need does not exist; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 3875. A bill to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to reform the telephone metadata program; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself and Ms. BROWN of Florida):

H.R. 3876. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a grant program to provide burials for homeless veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HONDA:

H. Res. 459. A resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3372) to provide a process for ensuring the United States does not default on its obligations; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

169. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 88 urging the Congress to adopt House Concurrent Resolution No. 50; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

170. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Ohio, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 19 urging the Congress to oppose any legislation containing provisions that require Ohio's public employees who are members of a state retirement system to participate in Social Security or any federal pension program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 3862.

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. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 3863.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution which outlines Congress' authority ''to regulate commerce . . . among the several states.'' This is where Congress derives its regulatory powers.

By Mr. RENACCI:

H.R. 3864.

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

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution, whereby Congress shall have the power ''[t]o provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.''

As affirmed by Justice Benjamin Cardozo in Steward Machine Company v. Davis, 301 U.S. 548 (1937), upholding the constitutionality of unemployment benefits.

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 3865.

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

Article I, Section 8, clauses 1 and 18.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3866.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 3867.

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

Article I, Section 8. ''The Congress shall have the Power . . . to coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;''

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 3868.

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

Article I, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 3869.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 3870.

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

The Constitution of the United States provides clear authority for Congress to pass tax legislation. Article I of the Constitution, in detailing Congressional authority, provides that ''Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes . . .'' (Section 8, Clause 1). This legislation is introduced pursuant to that grant of authority.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 3871.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 3872.

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

The Constitutional authority on which this bill rests is enumerated in Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 3873.

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

section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. HUDSON:

H.R. 3874.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 8 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 this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 3875.

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

The Telephone Metadata Reform Act is constitutionally authorized under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper Clause. Additionally, the Preamble to the Constitution provides support of the authority to enact legislation to promote the General Welfare.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 3876.

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

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 sec. 8 cl. 18)

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 7: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. MASSIE, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 15: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 26: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 164: Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. EDWARDS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CARNEY, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 176: Mr. MCALLISTER.

H.R. 199: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 223: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 337: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 494: Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 630: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 631: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 645: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 689: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 715: Mr. TURNER and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 755: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 855: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 871: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 872: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 904: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 920: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 997: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 1010: Mr. MAFFEI and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1091: Mr. MCALLISTER.

H.R. 1179: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 1354: Mr. LABRADOR, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1423: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin and Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 1466: Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1507: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 1563: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 1629: Ms. CHU and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1658: Mr. HANNA, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 1661: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1692: Mr. CASSIDY.

H.R. 1699: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1726: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 1728: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 1798: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 1861: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 1921: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 2001: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 2285: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 2288: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 2309: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 2364: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 2424: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 2502: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 2536: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 2753: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 2807: Mr. JOYCE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 2835: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 2893: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2901: Ms. LEE of California, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 2998: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 3015: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 3040: Mr. TONKO and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 3135: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 3179: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 3279: Mr. YODER.

H.R. 3303: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 3335: Mr. LONG, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 3344: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. POCAN, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 3370: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 3377: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 3408: Mr. YODER and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 3429: Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 3464: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 3488: Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 3529: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 3541: Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. YOHO, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 3543: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 3571: Mr. SCHOCK and Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 3573: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 3594: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 3600: Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 3635: Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. CARTER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. AMASH, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 3643: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 3663: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 3665: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. LEWIS.
H.R. 3683: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 3658: Mr. GARDNER.
H.R. 3717: Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 3722: Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 3724: Mr. ROSS
H.R. 3726: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. KEATING, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, and Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 3757: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 3762: Mr. WALBERG and Mr. MICA.
H.R. 3763: Mr. WALBERG and Mr. MICA.
H.R. 3764: Mr. WALBERG and Mr. MICA.
H.R. 3776: Mr. STUTZMAN and Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 3787: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 3824: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. SIRES, Sires, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 3852: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 3855: Mr. AMASH, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. YOHO, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H. Con. Res. 67: Mr. CICILLINE.
H. Res. 36: Mr. MCALLISTER and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H. Res. 72: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H. Res. 109: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H. Res. 231: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. LAMBORN.
H. Res. 365: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H. Res. 401: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H. Res. 418: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H. Res. 440: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES PRIOR TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT OF THE 113TH CONGRESS 1ST SESSION

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT PRIOR TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President, prior to sine die adjournment of the 1st Session, 113th Congress, notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates, he had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles:

July 25, 2013:

H.R. 2289. An Act to rename section 219(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 as the Kay Bailey Hutchison Spousal IRA.

August 9, 2013:

H.R. 267. An Act to improve hydropower, and for other purposes.

H.R. 678. An Act to authorize all Bureau of Reclamation conduit facilities for hydropower development under Federal Reclamation law, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1092. An Act to designate the air route traffic control center located in Nashua, New Hampshire, as the ''Patricia Clark Boston Air Route Traffic Control Center''.

H.R. 1171. An Act to amend title 40, United States Code, to improve veterans service organizations access to Federal surplus personal property.

H.R. 1344. An Act to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to provide expedited air passenger screening to severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1911. An Act to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish interest rates for new loans made on or after July 1, 2013, to direct the Secretary of Education to convene the Advisory Committee on Improving Postsecondary Education Data to conduct a study on improvements to postsecondary education transparency at the Federal level, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2167. An Act to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to establish additional requirements to improve the fiscal safety and soundness of the home equity conversion mortgage insurance program.

H.R. 2576. An Act to amend title 49, United States Code, to modify requirements relating to the availability of pipeline safety regulatory documents, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2611. An Act to designate the headquarters building of the Coast Guard on the campus located at 2701 Martin Luther King, Jr., Avenue Southeast in the District of Columbia as the ''Douglas A. Munro Coast Guard Headquarters Building'', and for other purposes.

September 30, 2013:

H.R. 1412. An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring authorities affecting veterans and their families, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3092. An Act to amend the Missing Children's Assistance Act, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3210. An Act making continuing appropriations for military pay in the event of a Government shutdown.

October 2, 2013:

H.R. 527. An Act to amend the Helium Act to complete the privatization of the Federal helium reserve in a competitive market fashion that ensures stability in the helium markets while protecting the interests of American taxpayers, and for other purposes.

October 4, 2013:

H.R. 3233. An Act to extend the period during which Iraqis who were employed by the United States Government in Iraq may be granted special immigrant status and to temporarily increase the fee or surcharge for processing machine-readable nonimmigrant visas.

October 10, 2013:

H.J. Res. 91. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for death gratuities and related survivor benefits for survivors Of deceased military service members of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

October 15, 2013:

H.R. 3095. An Act to ensure that any new or revised requirement providing for the screening, testing, or treatment of individuals operating commercial motor vehicles for sleep disorders is adopted pursuant to a rule-making proceeding, and for other purposes.

October 17, 2013:

H.R. 2775. An Act making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

October 31, 2013:

H.R. 3190. An Act to provide for the continued performance of the functions of the United States Parole Commission, and for other purposes.

November 13, 2013:

H.R. 2094. An Act to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the preference given, in awarding certain asthma-related grants, to certain States (those allowing trained school personnel to administer epinephrine and meeting other related requirements).

H.R. 3302. An Act to name the Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in Bay Pines, Florida, as the ''C.W. Bill Young Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center''.

November 21, 2013:

H.R. 2747. An Act to amend title 40, United States Code, to transfer certain functions from the Government Accountability Office to the Department of Labor relating' to the Processing of claims for the payment of workers who were not paid appropriate wages under certain provisions of such title.

November 27, 2013:

H.R. 1848. An Act to ensure that the Federal Aviation Administration advances the safety of small airplanes, and the continued development of the general aviation industry, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3204. An Act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to human drug compounding and drug supply chain security, and for other purposes.

December 9, 2013:

H.R. 3626. An Act to extend the Undetectable Firearms Act of 1988 for 10 years.

December 20, 2013:

H.R. 185. An Act to designate the United States courthouse located at 101 East Pecan Street in Sherman, Texas, as the ''Paul Brown United States Courthouse''.

H.R. 1402. An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring provisions of law, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2251. An Act to designate the United States courthouse and Federal building located at 118 South Mill Street, in Fergus Falls, Minnesota, as the ''Edward J. Devitt United States Courthouse and Federal Building''.

H.R. 2871. An Act to amend title 28, United States Code, to modify the composition of the southern judicial district of Mississippi to improve judicial efficiency, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2922. An Act to extend the authority of the Supreme Court Police to protect court officials away from the Supreme Court grounds.

H.R. 3458. An Act to treat payments by charitable organizations with respect to certain firefighters as exempt payments.

H.R. 3588. An Act to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to exempt fire hydrants from the prohibition on the use of lead pipes, fittings, fixtures, solder, and flux.

December 26, 2013:

H.J. Res. 59. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

H.R. 623. An Act to provide for the conveyance of certain property located in Anchorage, Alaska, from the United States to the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium.

H.R. 767. An Act to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to modify the Pilot Project offices of the Federal Permit Streamlining Pilot Project.

H.R. 2319. An Act to clarify certain provisions of the Native American Veterans' Memorial Establishment Act of 1994.

H.R. 3304. An Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3343. An Act to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to clarify the rules regarding the determination of the compensation of the Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia.

H.R. 3487. An Act to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act to extend through 2018 the authority of the Federal Election Commission to impose civil money penalties on the basis of a schedule of penalties established and published by the Commission, to expand such authority to certain other violations, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT PRIOR TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President, prior to sine die adjournment of the 1st Session, 113th Congress, notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates, he had approved and signed bills of the Senate of the following titles:

September 18, 2013:

S. 130. An Act to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to the Powell Recreation District in the State of Wyoming.

S. 157. An Act to provide for certain improvements to the Denali National Park and Preserve in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes.

S. 256. An Act to amend Public Law 93–435 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands, providing parity with Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa.

S. 304. An Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Mississippi 2 parcels of surplus land within the boundary of the Natchez Trace Parkway, and for other purposes.

S. 459. An Act to modify the boundary of the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes.

October 2, 2013:

S. 793. An Act to support revitalization and reform of the Organization of American States, and for other purposes.

October 4, 2013:

S. 1348. An Act to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act.

November 21, 2013:

S. 330. An Act to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish safeguards and standards of quality for research and transplantation of organs infected with human immunodeficiency virus (HIV).

S. 893. An Act to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2013, in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

November 27, 2013:

S. 252. An Act to reduce preterm labor and delivery and the risk of pregnancy-related deaths and complications due to pregnancy, and to reduce infant mortality caused by prematurity, and for other purposes.

December 2, 2013:

S. 1545. An Act to extend authorities related to global HIV/AIDS and to promote oversight of United States programs.

December 20, 2013:

S. 1471. An Act to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of the Army to reconsider decisions to inter or honor the memory of a person in a national cemetery, and for other purposes.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 14, 2014 No. 8

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Spirit, today teach our lawmakers to do things Your way, embracing Your precepts and walking in Your path. Remind them that the narrow and difficult road less traveled leads to life and few find it. As our Senators receive guidance from You and follow Your leading, replace anxiety with calm, confusion with clarity, and despair with hope. May Your peace become the hallmark of their labors as You keep them focused on the priorities that reflect Your kingdom. We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

HOMEOWNER FLOOD INSURANCE AFFORDABILITY ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 266.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 266, S. 1846, a bill to delay the implementation of certain provisions of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we will have further discussion on this matter today; that is, the matter I moved to. On our side, we have cleared the bill. We could complete it quickly. We are waiting to hear from the Republicans. This is one of the bills where, if we need to do some amendments on it, we can do some amendments on it.

The point is, I think we should try to get this done. We have been waiting for a long time to get this done. This is truly a bipartisan bill. As I explained to the Republican leader yesterday, I have had a number of Republicans come to me to see if there is a way this bill could be moved quickly. It has become a desperate situation, with so many problems. Construction has been, in some areas, brought to a halt. So hopefully we can work something out on this in the immediate future.

SCHEDULE

Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will resume consideration of the unemployment insurance extension. The time until 12:30 will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the majority controlling the first 30 minutes and the Republicans the second 30 minutes. The Senate will then recess from 12:30 until 2:15, as we do every Tuesday, for our caucus meetings. At 2:30, there will be up to two rollcall votes; first, a cloture vote on the Reed of Rhode Island substitute amendment. If cloture is not invoked, there will be a second cloture vote on the underlying bill.

We have had some good discussions, and I am going to—as I know the Republican leader will—discuss if there is a way to move forward on unemployment insurance. I hope there is. At 2:30 today, after our caucuses, we will come out and see if there is a consent agreement we can present to the Senate to move forward with the legislation. I hope that is possible, and we are certainly trying.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. President, each day Bloomberg releases a list of the 300 richest individuals in the world—the Bloomberg Billionaires index. The list includes 67 fortunate and really fabulously wealthy Americans. More than any other country in the world, we have 67 of the 300. Last year, the members of the billionaire index added $524 billion in new wealth to their net worth.

Listen to that, Mr. President: Last year, the billionaire's index—these 67 people—added $524 billion of new wealth. Not million but billion—$2 billion per person last year.

These are 300 fortunate individuals, flooded with their already flush coffers, with another $2 billion each, while millions of American families struggle to pay their rent. I don't begrudge these people at their making a lot of money. Their good fortune is something that speaks well of our country. We are truly a land of opportunity. But I do believe it is time for average Americans to share in that prosperity, particularly as the economy recovers.

If this were just a quirk in the indexes of how rich people are, that would be one thing, but in the last 30 years this same top 1 percent have seen their wealth increase—their incomes triple—while the middle class has gone down 10 percent in the same 30 years. It is time for average Americans—and I believe this so sincerely—to share in that prosperity in some way, especially as the economy is now recovering.

For most Americans, hard work isn't paying off the way it does for the top 1 percent. For many it has been impossible to even find steady full-time work since the recession began. That is why we must not abandon the 1.4 million Americans who are out there struggling—unemployed people who have been cut off from these crucial benefits now for the last 2 weeks, and they are looking forward to maybe being cut off forever.

This small stipend—an average of $300 per week—is helping them keep

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

food on the table and, literally, roofs over their heads while they look for work. I read here on the floor a letter from someone in Nevada, a woman, who said she doesn't know where she is going to go, what she is going to do. She, as have many people, has looked for work so very hard. As part of the unemployment compensation, an individual has to have been fired or laid off through no fault of their own and then they have to look for work every week.

Americans do want to go back to work. They do not want to set a bad example for their kids. They do not want to live off the system—whatever that means. But there is still only one job for every three people searching all over America. Some places are worse off than others. In Nevada, a man wrote to me—1 of almost 20,000 Nevadans who lost unemployment benefits last month—and he said he had applied for 700 jobs in the last 10 months—not 70, not 7, but 700. He has been able to get a dozen interviews but still can't find work.

But he hasn't given up hope. He hasn't given up the hope of finding a good-paying job, and he hasn't given up hope that Congress will restore emergency unemployment benefits until he does find a job. Neither have the 200 Nevada veterans who attended a job fair I put on last week. It was held at the University of Nevada over the weekend. It is shameful that tens of thousands of veterans of this Nation's armed forces lost their unemployment benefits last year.

It is inspiring to hear the stories of hard-working Americans who simply won't give up until they find a job. So I hope Senators will remember the perseverance of these brave individuals as they continue to seek a compromise here in this body that would restore emergency unemployment benefits to 1.4 million Americans.

This says it all: 67 of the richest people in the world living in America got a $2 billion tip last year. For 1.4 million Americans, they lost $300 on average per week. That is not fair. This is America, the land of opportunity. People who work hard are supposed to be rewarded—but not during the last 30 years.

The middle class has lost 10 percent of their income, and that doesn't take into consideration the poor—the poor. There are more poor than ever in America. The middle class, we know, is being squeezed out of existence. It is time for us to take care of these people who are desperate for help. That is what the government is all about.

Looking back at my home life, I feel government has been good for the people who live in my little town of Searchlight. It is a town mostly of old people. Many of them are getting pensions from wherever they worked. They get Social Security. But the government has done so many good things. Let us not denigrate government. This is a time when people have no opportunity. They need government help. They are desperate. All they want is one job, but they know if there is a vacancy over here, there are going to be scores—and we have seen this in the news accounts of job opportunities—thousands of people showing up for sometimes just a handful of jobs.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on the unemployment insurance bill, there have been productive conversations between the majority leader and several Members on this side. The Republicans have offered numerous commonsense proposals to get to a conclusion. Ideally, we would have spent the past week voting on those proposals, so there is really no good reason for us to be in the position that we are in right now.

Let me just underscore some of the things on my side that we would like to see in the final product. First, the Senate should actually be paying for whatever it passes, and not with spending cuts 11 years from now that we know aren't going to happen. It is also reasonable to expect practical progrowth job creation measures so we can actually get people back to work, and for a solution to be reasonable it should also respect the right of our constituents to be heard on this issue through a more open amendment process.

We have to get away from an attitude that essentially says the views of half the American people don't matter in the Senate. These days it has gotten even worse than that; ideas on both sides are often completely ignored. That is just not how the Senate is supposed to work. So we have an opportunity to begin to start fixing the problem on the bill that is before us. It is the right thing to do. I am hopeful common sense will prevail.

(The further remarks of Mr. MCCONNELL pertaining to the introduction of S. 1916 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. MCCONNELL. I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION EXTENSION ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1845, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1845) to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Reid (for Reed) amendment No. 2631, relating to extension and modification of emergency unemployment compensation program.

Reid amendment No. 2632 (to amendment No. 2631), to change the enactment date.

Reid motion to commit the bill to the Committee on Finance, with instructions, Reid amendment No. 2633, to change the enactment date.

Reid amendment No. 2634 (to (the instructions) amendment No. 2633), of a perfecting nature.

Reid amendment No. 2635 (to amendment No. 2634), of a perfecting nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 12:30 p.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the majority controlling the first 30 minutes and the Republicans controlling the second 30 minutes.

The Senator from Vermont.

CONSOLIDATED APPROPRIATIONS ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I should first note I am pleased to see the Presiding Officer. It is a pleasure to share the podium with him today.

I ask unanimous consent that upon the completion of my remarks, the Chair recognize the senior Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, after many long days and nights of four-party negotiations across a dozen subcommittees over the past month, on Sunday night the Appropriations Committee completed work on the fiscal year 2014 Consolidated Appropriations Act.

I commend Chairwoman MIKULSKI, without whom this would not have been possible. It was, above all, her relentless pursuit of this goal and her unmatched ability to rally her subcommittee troops together to get us to this point.

I would also note that she was helped by some of the most hard working members of the Senate staff one can imagine. I want to especially commend Tim Rieser of my staff, and Janet Stormes and Nikole Manatt who worked with him. I could not keep track of the number of times I received emails or calls at midnight or 1 a.m. from Tim as we worked through all the difficult parts of this bill.

And it could not have been done without the cooperation of my friend from Alabama Senator SHELBY, the committee's ranking member, who knew how important it was to pass appropriations bills rather than put the government on autopilot.

This means there will be no sequester in fiscal year 2014, and there will not be another disastrous government shutdown that achieved nothing, disrupted the lives of millions of American families, and cost the taxpayers some $24 billion and private industry tens of billions of dollars more.

As Chairman of the Department of State and Foreign Operations Subcommittee, I want to thank Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM, who brings a level of energy and knowledge to our subcommittee few can match. He and I

agree on an awful lot more than we disagree.

I want to mention a few things in the bill. But first, the big picture. For the Department of State and foreign operations, the bill provides $49 billion in discretionary budget authority to protect a wide array of U.S. security, humanitarian, and economic interests around the world. This total is $2.2 billion below the fiscal year 2013 enacted post-sequester level.

Of that amount, $6.5 billion is for overseas contingency operations in Afghanistan, Pakistan and Iraq and other areas in political transition, including the Middle East and North Africa, and to respond to humanitarian emergencies, particularly in Syria, the Middle East, and Central Africa.

If anyone should question why these funds are important, look at what is happening in Syria, and Lebanon, Jordan, and Turkey, where 2 million Syrians have fled, and in South Sudan and the Central African Republic, where hundreds of thousands of people have been displaced because of an explosion of ethnic and tribal violence. The bill provides significant increases in funding for refugees and other humanitarian programs.

The bill provides funding above the President's request for security at U.S. embassies and other diplomatic facilities; it fully funds our commitment to key allies such as Israel and Jordan; it substantially funds our contributions to the United Nations and other international organizations and for U.N. peacekeeping; and it fully funds the U.S. contributions to the Global AIDS Fund.

Many Senators care about global health, for good reason. HIV/AIDS and other infectious diseases threaten millions of Americans who travel, live, study, and serve in the Armed Forces overseas as well as here at home. Many of the diseases we work to eradicate are only an airplane trip away from our own shores. Billions of people in the poorest countries, especially children, die or suffer from illnesses that can be easily prevented or treated. Our children and grandchildren will be immunized, but many children born in the poorest countries die before the age of five because of these diseases.

We provide a total of $6 billion—the highest amount in history—for programs to combat HIV/AIDS, including $1.65 billion for the Global Fund. We provide historic levels to combat polio, malaria, tuberculosis, and neglected tropical diseases, and $175 million for the GAVI Alliance which provides lifesaving children's vaccines.

For Egypt, which many have been asking about, the bill provides up to the amounts requested for fiscal year 2014—$250 million for economic aid and $1.3 billion for military aid. But the military aid is only available to pay current defense contracts, and the goods and services may not be delivered to Egypt unless the Secretary of State certifies there is a national referendum and the government is taking steps to support the democratic transition and there are democratic elections and a newly elected government is taking steps to govern democratically.

These are the same commitments the government of Egypt made to the Egyptian people. Contrary to some inaccurate press reports, there is no waiver if the Egyptian Government reneges on these commitments. These are the toughest conditions the Congress has imposed on aid to the Egyptian military.

We want to see the restoration of democracy and respect for fundamental freedoms in Egypt, including the rights of women, civil society, and religious minorities. This is discussed in the explanatory statement accompanying the bill. If the military continues its repressive tactics, arresting democracy activists, and does not hold free and fair elections, the certifications will not be possible and U.S. aid will be cut.

The bill cuts aid for Afghanistan by 50 percent from the current level. It has become abundantly clear that as U.S. troops withdraw, the security environment is worsening. This reality, coupled with the refusal of the Karzai government to sign a bilateral security agreement, widespread corruption in that government, and the diminishing ability to monitor how U.S. funds are spent, compel a more targeted, sustainable approach.

I am pleased we were able to include the amounts requested for the Clean Technology Fund and the Strategic Climate Fund, and to protect tropical forests which are being destroyed at an alarming rate, and to combat poaching and trafficking of wildlife.

There are some things I wish were not in here, particularly a House provision which would weaken limits on carbon emissions from projects financed by the Export-Import Bank and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation. We should be using public funds to support exports of clean, renewable technology, not to fund polluting projects that worsen global warming.

I am also very disappointed that a Senate provision to bring the United States into compliance with the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations was rejected by the House of Representatives. By not including this provision we jeopardize the essential rights of consular assistance for Americans arrested in foreign countries, and we also weaken our credibility as a nation that respects the rule of law.

I would point out, the next time a constituent of a House Member is arrested overseas and denied access to the U.S. embassy, they should ask why they refused to support bringing the U.S. into compliance with the treaty that requires that access. It is hard for us to insist on consular assistance when Americans are arrested abroad, when we don't provide the same right to foreigners arrested here.

I do appreciate, however, the way the House—particularly Chairwoman GRANGER and Ranking Member LOWEY and their staffs—worked with me, Senator GRAHAM and his very able staff, and others. And, we all owe a debt of gratitude to the printing and editorial staff of the Government Printing Office who worked day and night, week after week and on many weekends, to produce draft after draft of the documents. It was a collaborative effort from beginning to end, and the outcome is a balanced bill that deserves bipartisan support.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, how much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. About 20 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent that I be given 10 minutes and that Senator SCHUMER be given the remaining 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, pending before the Congress now is debate about unemployment benefits.

On January 1 1.3 million Americans got a notice that they were not going to receive any more unemployment benefit checks. These are people out of work through no fault of their own who are required, under law, to be actively pursuing additional employment and regularly reporting to the government. For that, they receive average unemployment benefits of about $300 a week. Three hundred dollars a week is not a generous amount in this day and age. It is very difficult for any family to get by. They are going to have to dip into their savings to make rent payments, utility payments, put gas in the car to look for a job, and pay for the cell telephone they need in order to go looking for work. So we are now debating as to whether we should extend those unemployment benefits which were cut off on January 1. I think we should. Historically we have. Even with lower unemployment rates in the past, we have extended unemployment benefits.

Think about this for a second. The average person unemployed in America takes 38 weeks to find a job. However, we are cutting off unemployment benefits at 27 weeks in most places. That means people will have 10 or 11 weeks on average without any support.

What happens to a family under those circumstances? Awful things happen. They cannot make their rent payments or their mortgage payment or the utility payments or their health payments, and they find themselves literally facing bankruptcy. Losing a job is bad enough. Making it worse by cutting off unemployment checks is unacceptable. So we are debating it.

Historically, we have extended these unemployment benefits on an emergency basis, which means we do not pay for them because we understand this is an unusual time in our economy when we need to give a helping hand. We also understand the money that we

give to these families is frequently spent immediately. They have to spend it to get by. As they put money back in the economy, it helps other people go to work. So it is a bit of an accelerant. It is a catalyst for more economic growth. It is good for the overall economy.

However, we have run into something new. The Republican side of the aisle has now said if you want to give unemployment benefits to Americans, you have to pay for them. In other words, you have to cut spending in other areas to pay for them.

Listen to what the Republicans have suggested we should do in order to provide unemployment benefits for 1.3 million people who were cut off on January 1. MITCH MCCONNELL, the senior Senator from Kentucky and Republican leader, came to the floor and suggested last week that the way to pay for the unemployment benefits was to eliminate that section of the Affordable Care Act which creates a personal responsibility for people to buy their own health insurance and a tax to be paid if they do not, about $95 a person per year. He says eliminate that.

The problem with eliminating it is you do raise some revenue, but on the other hand you cut off the pool of uninsured people who are now buying insurance. By doing this, you eliminate the protection we built into the law for every American family that has someone in the household with a preexisting condition. You cannot say to insurance companies and others cover everyone, even those with preexisting conditions, unless you expand the pool of people insured. Senator MCCONNELL wants to cut that off. Senator MCCONNELL's proposal would, in fact, eliminate this protection in our bill against discrimination because your child has asthma, your child has diabetes, your wife is a cancer survivor.

That was the reality of insurance before this bill. The Republicans believe that eliminating that protection is the way to pay for unemployment benefits. They would penalize 300 million Americans and their families in order to take care of 1.3 million unemployed on a temporary basis. That is a terrible tradeoff.

Then comes Senator PORTMAN from Ohio. He has a little different approach. He suggests that if you are disabled in America, adjudged disabled in America, you should never draw unemployment benefits. ''Double dipping'' is what they call it.

Wait a minute. You are getting a government check that says you are disabled, and you are getting another government check that says you are unemployed? What is wrong with this picture?

I invite him—and I am sure the Presiding Officer has done this—to the sheltered workshops of his State. If you have ever visited a sheltered workshop, here is what you will find, and I found it in Decatur, IL: Profoundly retarded people and people with serious mental challenges are given a chance to work a little bit. They can make only about $1,000 a month maximum. What kind of work do they get? Much of it is very simple manual labor. In my State they make license plates at this facility in Decatur.

They told me the story about a person who was brought in there who had suffered from serious mental illness his entire life and was nonfunctional. He just stood there. They brought him in and put him on the line with the license plates and showed him a simple task. He blossomed. His life opened. He became a different person. He started accepting more and more responsibilities. There came a point when there was a blizzard in Decatur, IL, and they closed the sheltered workshop. He was not going to miss a day of work. He walked in the snow and stood outside, ready to go to work.

The people working in that sheltered workshop are only paid a few dollars an hour, but for him it is the most important part of his life, and while he is being paid, his unemployment benefits are building up to protect him. The day may come when the sheltered workshop can't find a job for him or closes down. He would then be eligible for unemployment benefits. Senator PORTMAN of Ohio says no, we should cut off his unemployment benefits to pay for the temporary unemployment benefits of others. I invite Senator PORTMAN to go to a sheltered workshop in his State to meet these people, and I bet he changes his mind on that Republican pay-for.

Then comes Senator AYOTTE of New Hampshire. She says we have a terrible situation with the child tax credit. The child tax credit is available for wage earners who can claim a credit on the tax they owe and a refundable credit as well, in some circumstances, for their children. In other words, if you are low-income in America, we reduce your tax burden based on the number of children you have. The obvious reason is to give you $1,000 more a year for your child, $20 a week for your child. That, to me, is not unreasonable. It alleviates poverty for literally millions of Americans. Senator AYOTTE says for those who are filing a so-called I–10; that is, those who do not have a Social Security number but work in America and pay taxes as they are required to do, she would cut them off so they could not claim this child tax credit for their children even if their child is a U.S. citizen, and that is the requirement under the law. So she would cut off child benefits for citizen children to pay for temporary unemployment benefits.

We can clean up the child tax credit situation, and I think there are ways to do it in a reasonable fashion, but to cut off millions of children who are legally here in the United States, eligible for this child tax credit—is that what we have come to? Cut off a child tax credit? Eliminate the help for those who are working in sheltered workshops, disabled people cross America? Eliminate the protection under the Affordable Care Act for discrimination against people with preexisting conditions? Those are the three Republican alternatives? Does that define the difference between the parties?

I am afraid it does. It tells you from our point of view that helping folks who need a helping hand in this country is just part of who we are. There is a compassion gap here when you believe the only way you can help some is by hurting so many others who are struggling to get by in life, and that is all we heard from the other side of the aisle.

I commend those who want to work on a bipartisan basis to solve this, but let's get it done. Let's extend these unemployment benefits. Do it as we did 5 different times, without paying for it, under previous Republican Presidents. Let's do it in a fashion that speaks well of our country. Let's give those folks who are searching for jobs a helping hand so their families can stay together during these winter months, these challenging months, so they can get back to work and pay their taxes and be right where they want to be, a part of the workforce of the future.

I yield the floor to Senator SCHUMER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, I thank my colleague and friend and roommate from Illinois—we are going to miss our landlord deeply—for his articulate enunciation of where we are here. We have always extended unemployment benefits, and we have done it, in most instances, in a bipartisan way and not paid for it. Under George Bush, 2007, unemployment was only 5.6 percent. Now it hovers around 7 percent. He moved it forward. It had bipartisan support.

Things have evolved. I guess we do not have that bipartisan support. As Senator DURBIN outlined, a lot of the amendments to try to pay for this sort of rob Peter to pay Paul. I have heard a lot of my Republican colleagues say let's talk about how we deal with poverty. These amendments that we have heard talked about are kind of punitive and do not really deal with the issue.

I would like to address another issue, and that is how we come to an agreement here and get this place working again. On both sides of the aisle, there is a great deal of consternation that we are not legislating. We have had this problem for a while. Thursday it came to a head. There were some harsh words that were issued by some. The question is how do we get things working again.

First, I remind my colleagues there are instances when this place, the Senate in particular, is still working. We had a farm bill, an immigration bill, the WRDA bill. They all had one thing in common and that is the chairman and ranking member agreed on a proposal. When the chairman and the ranking member agree on a proposal,

or a large group of Democrats and Republicans agree on a bipartisan proposal—in immigration we had great help from the chairman, but Senator MCCAIN and I—neither chairman nor ranking member of the Judiciary Committee—came to an agreement with the help of Senators MENENDEZ, DURBIN, BENNET, GRAHAM, FLAKE and RUBIO. But we can get something done, and we can shepherd even the most controversial and difficult legislation through the floor.

But there are many instances—these days more than ever because the parties are further apart than they used to be and there is less overlap—there are instances where the chair and ranking member can't or there does not seem to be a bipartisan agreement. What do we do in those instances?

I have discussed this with many on the other side of the aisle. There is a tradition here. I am here sort of a middle level amount of time, about 14 years. The general theory has been whichever party is in the majority, whichever is in the minority, that the majority gets to set the agenda and the minority gets to offer amendments. There is a lot of discussion as to why that is not happening anymore, and there are different explanations on each side of the aisle. There will be a discussion in our caucus, and I think in the Republican caucus, at this lunch, as to how to try to break that logjam. That is a good thing.

I will just make one point here that has been largely forgotten and that is this. There are two parts to this sort of agreement, deal, arrangement. The first part is the ability to offer amendments. Should it be unlimited amendments? Should it be all nongermane amendments? That has to be discussed and worked out. But certainly the minority should get to offer amendments. There is a general theoretical agreement among everybody about that.

But the other side is that the majority should be able, once the amendments are disposed of, to get an up-or-down vote on the final passage of the bill—that the bill not be filibustered—not just the motion to proceed, but once we go through the amendatory process, the bill itself.

If friends on the other side of the aisle say I want to offer my amendment but unless it passes I am going to vote to block the bill from coming up for an up-or-down vote, that does not seem right. My purpose for a brief few moments, coming to the floor, is to remind both sides of the aisle, but particularly my Republican colleagues, that to get this place moving again requires two things. One, an ability to offer amendments. But second, an ability to vote on final passage, have an up-or-down vote on final passage once those amendments are disposed of one way or the other.

We know that our colleagues will offer tough amendments sometimes. That is the nature of things. Many times the amendments are just offered with an idea to improve the bill or have a different idea. Sometimes they are amendments that just make it very difficult to vote against, but so be it. That is how this place has always been run. I think most of my colleagues on this side of the aisle are willing to accept that. But at the same time, we do not want to go through an amendatory process and then, because we are 55, not 60, never be able to get an up-or-down vote on final passage of the legislation.

There are two sides to this story. There are two sides to an agreement to get the floor of the Senate working again—particularly when the majority and minority cannot agree on an overall bill. One side is an ability to offer amendments; the other side an ability for an up-or-down vote once those amendments are disposed of. I don't think you can have one without the other.

Just as we could not ask our Republican colleagues for an up-or-down vote, if they were not able to offer amendments, I don't think it is fair for our Republican colleagues to ask us to go through the amendatory process, some of which will be difficult, and then not get an up-or-down vote on final passage.

That is the little piece I wanted to say here. I hope it will help bring us together because the greatest fun I have had in this place and the greatest effectiveness I have had in this place is when I worked in a bipartisan way on bill after bill. It happens less frequently now. Although, as I said, the immigration bill is an exception to that, and other bills are an exception to that. But maybe we can get back to working together if each side tries to understand the grievances and the gravamen of the position of the other.

I hope we can do that on this bill and on many other bills in the future.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, it is no secret that every Republican in this Chamber, every Senator on this side of the aisle voted against the President's health care law. We said it would do great harm to the American people, and we are finding out that is true. It is also no secret that every Democrat in the Senate voted in favor of the health care law. It was partisan, it was a bad idea, and it has failed the country in many ways.

People know about the health care Web site. The Web site was a spectacular public failure, and that was just the tip of the iceberg. When we look under the iceberg, we see that people are being hit with higher premiums and canceled coverage. Five million people lost their coverage around the country. People were not able to keep the doctor they had and liked in spite of the President's promise that if you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. There are concerns about higher copays and deductibles, and fraud and identity theft is also an issue that is plaguing all of America. I believe the health care Web site is a spot where we are going to see more problems in that area. Americans know that fraud and identity theft are big concerns. It has been clear from the start that the health care exchange was vulnerable to con artists and hackers. Information from the government actually went out telling people to be careful with their information because of the concerns about con artists and hackers. So that is a problem, and it is something Washington and this body need to take seriously.

Whenever President Obama talks about the health care law, he says that if Republicans have good ideas, please bring them forward, share them, and he will support them. Republicans have offered a lot of ideas on how to give the American people the health care reform they wanted all along. We passed bills in the House of Representatives. We tried to bring up bills here in the Senate. Democrats won't even allow us to vote on those bills in the Senate.

As a doctor, I can tell you what people are looking for with health care reform. They want access to quality, affordable health care—care they need from a doctor they choose at lower costs. They didn't get that with the health care law the President and the Democrats shoved down the throats of the American people. Every time the majority leader—at that desk—blocks reform, I believe he is making things worse for millions of Americans.

We are trying again to take the President at his word that he will support good Republican ideas. Senator JOHANNS of Nebraska and I have introduced a commonsense bill that will help protect Americans who use the government insurance exchange. Our bill, called the Health Exchange Security and Transparency Act, requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services to notify Americans within 2 business days if their personal information has been stolen due to security breaches on the exchanges. We are not saying it is going to happen, but it sure could happen, and if it does people need to be informed.

The House passed a version of this bill last Friday, and it was clearly a bipartisan bill. Sixty-seven Democrats joined Republicans to support this good idea. Now I believe it is our turn here in the Senate. There shouldn't be anything controversial about this at all. This should be the kind of bill we can pass by unanimous consent.

After forcing so many Americans to buy insurance through this program, I

believe it is the government's responsibility to safeguard Americans' private information. Even Senators who voted for the President's health care law should agree with this. That should be the minimum we require from Washington—keep Americans' private information private. If the government fails to keep that information safe, they should have to admit it and tell people what happened.

This bill is a single page. Americans are concerned about their safety online, about having their identity stolen, and this bill would give people at least the reassurance that they would be informed, that if there is identity theft, they would know about it.

Look at what just happened to the Target stores. It now looks as if 70 million people had their personal data compromised. Target ran a full-page ad in the Washington Post talking about what happened with their 70 million customers. They apologized for it. The same ad that ran here in the Washington Post also ran in the New York Times, the Wall Street Journal, and other papers around the country. Target has told people about the security breach so they can take appropriate steps and watch for signs of identity theft. Target also said they will do free credit checks for a year and addressed the concerns many American people have and said: This is how we will take care of it. All the bill we are offering today says is that if something happens—as happened with Target—on the government's health exchange Web site, Washington should do the same. They should tell people that someone has had access to their personal information so people can protect themselves.

The health care law was completely inadequate in how it dealt with personal security issues. The Web site has been a debacle, and we know that. It is a hacker's dream. Even before the Web site was launched last March, it was a mess.

CBS News reported that deadlines for the site's final security plans were delayed three times over the summer. So we saw that problem. Final end-to-end security tests were never finished before the Web site was launched.

In November, after the Web site was launched, four experts testified before the House about Web site problems. They were asked: Would any of you advise an American citizen to use this Web site as the security system now exists? Not one of the four experts said they would—none.

By December, one of those same industry experts said that the situation was even worse. The so-called fixes caused new security patterns and problems. Remember, that was after the White House was claiming it had fixed the Web site. What they had fixed was just the tip of the iceberg, and these problems under the tip continue today.

So the House passed a bill on Friday by an overwhelming bipartisan majority, and the President still says he opposes it. Why would the President oppose this bill? Why would he oppose being honest with the American people in helping them protect themselves from identity theft? President Obama has dug in his heels so deep on his health care law that he won't even consider good bipartisan ideas that will help the American people. Senator JOHANNS and I are going to continue to push for a vote and to call on the President to support this bill.

The President needs to keep his promise to support good Republican ideas and to protect the American people from identity theft. As I said, this is just the tip of the iceberg with the Web site. All one has to do is go to this morning's newspapers.

The Washington Post, above the fold, front page: ''Insurance sign-ups by young adults lag. Key measure for health-care law. Premiums could jump if more don't enroll.'' Higher premiums, that is what I am hearing from home in Wyoming.

Today's Wall Street Journal: ''Health Sign-ups Skew Older, Raising Fears of Higher Costs.'' That is not what the President promised. The President came to the floor of the House of Representatives in a joint session of Congress and said: If you like your coverage, you can keep your coverage. If you like your doctor, you can keep our doctor. He said insurance premiums would drop for people. He made statements over the past years that under his plan insurance policies would drop $2,500 per family. Why is the New York Times saying premiums could jump? The President says one thing; the rest of the world sees another.

The New York Times today, again, front page, above the fold: ''Older People Lead Sign-Ups For Insurance. Pattern Could Result in Higher Premiums.'' There are questions about the law's financial viability.

The President put together a program, and those of us who actually read the bill ahead of time had great concerns about its success, its viability, its ability to deliver what it promised. The President's promises, one of which has now been called the lie of the year, continue. It has been called that by a group that looks at statements and is somewhat of a referee as political statements are made. To get that kind of an accomplishment for the President just shows how misleading the efforts have been on the American people.

The American people see what they are getting in their mail—cancellation notices. They see what happens when they go to the Web site: higher premiums, sticker shock, and now this threat of ongoing security concerns, especially in light of what is occurring throughout the rest of the country.

It is time for the President to keep his word that he does want to work with Republicans for good ideas, and he could do so by adopting this measure passed by the House on Friday that Senator JOHANNS and I have presented to the Senate for approval today.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

TPA RENEWAL

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate my colleagues on the recent introduction of legislation to promote trade promotion authority.

Increasing free trade levels the playing field for U.S. companies. We all know that. It increases competition. We know that too. It also increases access to foreign markets, with all the attendant benefits. U.S. businesses stand the best chance to see gains in accessing foreign markets through bilateral and regional free-trade agreements. Given the complexity of these agreements, the consultation process and the expedited consideration provided by TPA is really the only way to go.

According to the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, the United States is ''the world's largest economy and the largest exporter and importer of goods and services.'' We exported more than $2.2 trillion in goods and services last year.

For those of us who represent border States, the issue hits very close to home. In recent years Mexico has become America's third largest trading partner and our second largest export market. According to the Arizona-Mexico Commission, Arizona's ports of entry serve as gateways for $26 billion in U.S.-Mexican trade annually. Arizona benefits from more than $13 billion in bilateral trade with Mexico every year.

Given the benefits of vibrant export markets and access to low-cost imports, it is difficult to overstate the importance of getting trade agreements in place. A U.S. Chamber official recently noted in Roll Call that nearly half of U.S. exports go to our free-trade agreement partners and that these countries make up just one-tenth of the world economy. Let me repeat that. Half of our exports go to those countries with which we have free-trade agreements. Yet those countries represent just one-tenth of the world's economy. That tells us the importance of getting these free-trade agreements in place.

In a recent opinion piece in the Wall Street Journal, former U.S. Trade Representative Robert Zoellick noted that ''on average, in the past five years of a new free-trade agreement, U.S. exports grew nearly three to four times as rapidly as U.S. exports to others.''

This is great news given that negotiations on the Trans-Pacific Partnership, or TPP, are ongoing. Its successful approval would yield the largest free-trade agreement the United States has ever been a part of. Approval of the TPP agreement would provide increased access to critical Asia-Pacific markets for U.S. businesses at a critical time. It is difficult to see how this agreement will be concluded without TPA reauthorization.

Given that a 2010 study prepared by the Business Roundtable found that 38 million jobs—1 in 5 jobs in the United States—are supported by trade, the introduction of TPA renewal legislation couldn't be more timely.

Again, I congratulate my colleagues for the introduction of this legislation. I look forward to its consideration.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

OSHA POLICIES

Mr. JOHANNS. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to acknowledge my colleagues in the Senate for standing up for family farms. I am also here to issue a very straightforward warning to OSHA: The Senate makes crystal clear in the new appropriations bill that OSHA policies and inspectors better get in line with the law.

Since 1976 Congress has included specific language in appropriations bills very specifically prohibiting OSHA from enforcement action on farms with 10 or fewer employees. However, this did not stop the agency from distorting the definitions of farming practices in sending inspectors to small family-owned farming operations anyway.

In my home State of Nebraska, OSHA targeted a family farm that grows corn and soybeans and has just one nonfamily employee. It is clearly within the scope of the congressional exemption. As do most American farms, this farming operation includes grain bins for crop storage after harvest. But according to OSHA's absurd logic, grain storage, they say, is not part of farming operations, so it is not exempt from the regulations. I can't make this stuff up. While OSHA made no claim that anyone on the farm had been injured, the agency said the grain bins failed to comply with OSHA regulations, and—get this—they slapped the farm with fines totaling $132,000.

This is not an issue that is confined to one farm in Nebraska. A 2011 memo from OSHA's enforcement chief to regional administrators acknowledged that the law prevents the agency from regulating small farms. They got that right. However, the memo proceeds to recategorize farming operations that happen after harvest, and OSHA said those are not exempt. Under this recategorization, OSHA claimed that its inspectors had the authority to regulate small family-owned farms and their grain storage facilities. This is a blatant overreach and yet another example of this administration's backdoor rulemaking.

Whenever I meet with farmers and ranchers in Nebraska, they oftentimes raise concerns about Federal regulatory overreach. It is absolutely no wonder farmers and ranchers feel as though they have a target on their backs. OSHA's twisting of the law serves as evidence that farmers' concerns are legitimate.

In response to OSHA's regulatory overreach, I wrote a letter to Secretary Perez, joined by a bipartisan group of 42 of my Senate colleagues. We requested that OSHA immediately stop its unlawful regulation of family farms. We also directed OSHA to issue updated guidance correcting its obvious misinterpretation of the law.

I am pleased that the Omnibus appropriations bill further reinforces our position through report language specifically addressing OSHA's overreach while continuing the long-standing small-farm exemption. The report language calls on OSHA to work with USDA before moving forward with any attempts to redefine and regulate post-harvest activities such as storing grain. It also makes it clear that the exemption applies to those activities that occur on the farm. That includes the entire farming operation.

I thank my 42 colleagues who joined me in signing the letter, as well as my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for sending a clear message that Federal agencies are not above the law. As I stated earlier, small family-owned farms have been exempt from OSHA regulations for the past 35 years. This is not a new concept. Simply put, this language reaffirms the commonsense ideas that Federal agencies cannot and should not bypass the law by redefining it to expand their jurisdiction.

Let me be clear that we all want farms and ranches to be safe. In fact, a safe working environment is especially important for small farmers and ranchers whose families are oftentimes the only ones who work the farm or the ranch. Small family farms and ranches in my home State and across this country should be able to continue their work to feed and fuel the world without fear of being targeted by this administration in direct violation of the law. If the administration believes the law should be changed, they should come to Congress and make their case. They should not ignore the law as if it does not exist.

Again, I thank my colleagues for affirming the law of the land and supporting our Nation's farmers and ranchers.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MILITARY COLAS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise to discuss my growing concern about the effects of our actions—or in this case inaction—in Washington on our military families and veterans in Virginia. As we all know, the Senate and House passed the Bipartisan Budget Act last month, which hopefully will be a first step toward getting us back on the right track toward a functioning Congress. But I was disappointed—and I know many of my colleagues were disappointed—that in that legislation was included a reduction in military pension cost-of-living adjustments for retired and medically retired servicemembers. Our service men and women deserve much better than seeing their pensions arbitrarily cut by lawmakers in Washington. What was particularly disappointing was that this action singled out our military families and veterans disproportionately.

Yesterday evening, the appropriations committees released their 2014 budget. I was pleased their omnibus budget proposal repeals the COLA cuts for a portion of those military families—for those disabled military retirees who are medically retired and for survivors of military retirees who elected to pay survivor benefit annuities to take care of their families after their deaths. This is progress. But I hope we can finish the job and pass an amendment I have been working on with Senators SHAHEEN and MCCAIN and a series of other proposals to make sure we fully roll back this unfair cut to our military families and veterans.

We know over the last two decades our military has fought two wars. Their families have made unprecedented sacrifices. Unfortunately, this sacrifice was again brought home last week when a Navy MH–53E helicopter crashed off the coast of Virginia Beach. Our thoughts and prayers are with the families of the missing and fallen: LT Sean Christopher Snyder, LT Wesley Van Dorn, and Navy Aircrewman Brian Andrew Collins.

Virginia is home to one of the Nation's largest concentrations of Active-Duty and retired military personnel. I consider it an honor and a privilege to represent them in Congress. So while we are shutting down government and signing short-term CRs, the pensions of our service men and women are being unfairly singled out. This isn't right, this isn't fair, and my hope is that today and over the next few days we will fully correct the mistake we made in the Budget Act last month.

In my time in the Senate, working for our military families and veterans has been one of my top priorities. I am proud I have relentlessly worked across the aisle on this issue. I would like to point out one particular action where we have made dramatic progress.

I have worked with the Puller Clinic at William & Mary Law School in Hampton Roads to develop a model for veterans legal clinics to help solve the Nation's backlog of veterans' benefits claims. To my mind it is an embarrassment that our veterans sometimes have to wait for over 1 year to get their claims processed to receive the benefits they have already earned.

Working with the William & Mary Puller Law Clinic, we got the VA to accept this model and to be certified by the VA to become the first law school in the country to be able to complete fully developed claims. Now 19 universities in Virginia are committed to serving veterans and more than 15 law

schools across the country have adopted the William & Mary model.

The incredible thing about this project—and we often use the term ''win-win-win''—is this truly is a win-win-win. It is a win for the taxpayers because there are no taxpayer funds involved, it is a win for our veterans who are able to get their claims processed in a more rapid and expeditious manner, and it is a win for the law students who gain valuable experience in both dealing with a large Federal agency—the VA—but, more importantly, being able to help one-on-one veterans who deserve to get their benefits.

I have also worked with my friends and former Virginia colleague Jim Webb to draft legislation for a complete comprehensive look at military compensation and retirement. We have worked with Chairman LEVIN as well, and this Commission will be reporting later this year. I look forward to the results because we do have to recognize our overall compensation and benefits packages need an overall review. I believe this Commission will make strong recommendations on how we can both modernize and achieve fiscal stability for our military.

I am proud of the work I have done on veterans' issues in terms of the Puller Clinic, in terms of the overall look at the military compensation package as part of an effort to make sure we honor our commitment to our military. But as we honor that commitment to our military, we have to recognize as well that threats to our Nation are not just those posed by outside forces but also the continuing threat of our increasing debt and deficit. I often like to cite former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Mullen, who said the single largest threat to our Nation was not the threat of terrorists but the threat of that $17 trillion debt and deficit, which goes up by over $4 billion a night—a debt burden that may weigh down our ability to compete in the future.

I continue to come to the floor—not always successfully—to suggest to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that we cannot continue to punt on this issue; that, ultimately, both political parties are going to have to give. We are going to have to find ways to generate additional revenues through a comprehensive reform of our Tax Code. We are going to have to find a way to make sure that not only the promise of military pensions and benefits but also the promise of Social Security and Medicare will be here for future generations. That means both political parties will have to be willing to give on their sacred cows.

We have to make sure as well, if we put together this comprehensive approach on debt and deficit, that it will provide the kind of financial stability to our military families, making sure those pensions, benefits, and other kinds of compensation packages will be there for themselves and for future people who serve. But that is for a future battle. Right now we have to finish the work the Appropriations Committee started on getting rid of this unfair attack on the military COLAs that was included in the Budget Act.

I hope my colleagues will join my friends, Senator KAINE and Senator SHAHEEN and others, to replace the cuts to the military COLAs. The approach we have taken would do this by closing a tax loophole that allows some corporations to actually avoid paying their fair share of taxes. There may be other alternatives as well. I will look at any that are fair and reasonable and make sure our military families don't get singled out.

Virginians have served with honor in our military for generations, and I want to assure our service men and women there is ample time to undo these changes before they take effect. I would remind those who are listening this decrease in the COLA doesn't actually take place until next year, so we still have time to rectify this.

I promise to continue using every tool I can to fight these unfair pension cuts and to make sure the promises we have made to our military families and these retirees gets honored.

With that, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). Without objection, it is so ordered.

OBAMACARE

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I come to the floor today to talk about the damage ObamaCare is doing to our struggling economy.

After months of unrelenting coverage of ObamaCare's many problems and after Friday's release of December's dismal job report, I am sure Democrats in the Senate would prefer we talk about almost anything else. After all, when you have held most of the power here in Washington for the last 5 years, you don't want to mention the fact that your main legacy is a sluggish economy and a disastrous train wreck of a health care program.

This past Friday we found out December marked the weakest month of job growth since January 2011. The economy added just 74,000 jobs in December—less than half of the monthly job growth needed for a real recovery.

Some are saying perhaps this is an aberration, and perhaps it was for a 1-month period. But the one thing we can't get away from is that December's drop in the unemployment rate—the slight drop that we saw as a percentage—was driven by nearly 350,000 Americans dropping out of the workforce altogether, driving the labor participation rate to its lowest level in 36 years. We haven't seen the labor participation rate this low since the Carter administration.

Had millions of Americans not stopped looking for work since January of 2009, the unemployment rate would be a staggering 10.8 percent. What I mean is if the labor participation rate were today what it was in 2009—in other words, the number of Americans actually in the labor force looking for jobs—the unemployment rate would be almost 11 percent, a significantly higher number than what we use as the official unemployment rate today. Even without that, the Wall Street Journal points out that ''the unemployment rate remains near levels previously seen only during recessions.''

Let me repeat that: The Wall Street Journal states that ''the unemployment rate remains near levels previously seen only during recessions.'' That is a pretty damning statement.

The President and his advisers would like us to believe that President Obama's policies are growing our economy and putting Americans back to work. But in the 5 years of his Presidency, all Democrats have been able to accomplish is a recovery that looks a lot like other Presidents' recessions.

In his weekly address on Saturday, the President said he would do ''everything I can to create new jobs and new opportunities for American families.''

How does he propose to do that? By treating the symptoms, not the causes, of economic stagnation. Economic bandaids like the President proposes may temporarily help a few Americans, but they will do nothing to bring about the real long-term job growth our country needs. Unfortunately, the President's policies are actually hurting already struggling middle-class families and making it more difficult for businesses to grow and create jobs.

Chief among the President's failed policies is the massive boondoggle known as the Affordable Care Act. If there is one thing you don't want in an economy where businesses are already struggling, it is legislation that places everything from new taxes to burdensome new regulations on businesses, and yet that is exactly what ObamaCare does.

There is a tax on medical devices, like pacemakers and prosthetics, which is driving medical device jobs overseas and driving medical bills up for American patients. There is a pill tax, which is a tax on prescription drugs. There is a tax on businesses that do not provide a government-approved health care. There are multiple taxes on health insurance companies, and more.

Then there are the scores of new regulations which raise the cost of doing business—regulations like the requirement that any business with 50 or more workers provide ObamaCare-approved health insurance benefits to its full-time employees, which the health care law defines as 30 hours or more per week. That is all very well for some employers, but for many employers in industries with small profit margins, providing Obama-approved health care to full-time workers is the difference

between making a profit and making none at all. For employers in nonprofit fields like education, it can be the difference between staying in operation or closing.

Around the country, school systems, community colleges and universities, restaurants, and other small businesses are being forced to cut workers' hours to avoid the full burden of ObamaCare's mandate. It is no wonder the health care law is so unpopular with the owners of businesses, both large and small.

CBS News reported in December:

> Nearly half of U.S. companies said they are reluctant to hire full-time employees because of the law.

A survey from the National Association of Manufacturers found that more than 75 percent of manufacturers cite soaring health care costs as the biggest issue facing their businesses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. THUNE. I ask unanimous consent for an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. In addition to being bad for business's bottom line, ObamaCare is placing a tremendous financial burden on American families.

The President claimed his health care law would reduce the cost of health care, but the average family has seen a $2,500 premium increase since the law's passage—and now that the law is being fully implemented, that number is set to soar even higher.

One of my constituents, Carrie, emailed me to tell me she may have to take a part-time job to afford the health care premium she was quoted for a family of 6. That is a part-time job on top of the two part-time jobs she already works and the full-time job her husband works.

Another constituent, Matt from Rapid City, SD, emailed to tell me his insurance has gone up 60 percent. Meanwhile, his wife's hours at work have been reduced below the ObamaCare full-time threshold of 30 hours. ''We have had to cut back on basic needs,'' he told me.

Terry contacted me to tell me his insurance policy was cancelled, and that he was offered a replacement policy for twice the cost of his original policy. ''Now ¼ of my salary will go to my insurance.'' That is a quarter of his salary.

Is this the affordable care Americans were promised?

Democrats claim they want to grow the economy, but what do they think happens to the economy when businesses aren't growing and people aren't spending? When Americans have to devote more of their income to paying their health care bills, they cut back on other spending, they go out to fewer restaurants, they keep their old car for a few more years, and they put a bucket under the leak instead of paying for a new roof. That is a lot of money not going to local businesses.

Similarly, when businesses are hit with burdensome taxes and regulations, they cut back on hiring and investment, they cut workers' hours, and they move jobs overseas. That means fewer jobs for the millions of Americans looking for work and lower wages for families already struggling to get by.

If Democrats were really serious about growing the economy and creating jobs, they would stop focusing on economic bandaids and start a long, hard look at the damage ObamaCare is doing to our economy.

As Members of Congress, we need to make it easier to create jobs, not harder. We should be repealing burdensome mandates, not creating them. We should be reducing the tax burden, not increasing it, and we should be creating incentives for businesses to expand, not eliminating them.

Millions of Americans spend too much time wondering how they are going to afford their health care premiums or buy a house or send their kids to college. We need to give them the economic opportunities they need.

Over the past few weeks Republicans in the House and in the Senate have introduced plan after plan to get our economy moving again and help struggling families find better jobs and increased wages.

I recently introduced a plan to exempt long-term unemployed workers from the ObamaCare mandate, an onerous and unpopular provision which will destroy jobs and reduce hours for hard-working Americans. In fact, this mandate is so unpopular and so unworkable that the administration unilaterally delayed it past the next election.

Since even the administration doesn't want to enforce it, I think we can all agree that exempting the long-term unemployed will help break the cycle of extended unemployment that plagues the Obama economy.

We hope Democrats will abandon their short-term cosmetic fixes and join us in talking about the kind of long-term reform which will truly grow the economy and offer economic opportunity to every American. We have lived in the Obama economy long enough.

I yield the floor.

Ms. HIRONO. Madam President, I am here to speak in opposition to the offset in Ayotte amendment No. 2603. The bipartisan budget that passed in December included a Republican provision that changed the annual cost-of-living adjustments, or COLAs, for military retirees. I opposed that provision, and I believe there is bipartisan support for repealing it. The main question that needs to be debated is how to pay for that repeal. Amendment No. 2603 would pay for fixing the military retirement COLA problem by denying the refundable child tax credit to millions of eligible U.S. citizen children. That amendment asks, in effect, whether military retirees are more deserving of help than U.S. citizen children who are on the edge of poverty. That is a false choice. That is not the right approach.

The child tax credit is one of our most important programs to reduce child poverty. Tens of millions of families claim the child tax credit each year—more than 35 million families in 2009—both using Social Security numbers and individual taxpayer identification numbers. According to the Congressional Research Service, the child tax credit reduces child poverty by approximately one-fifth. For such an important and widely used program as this, we should be careful that any changes we make to the program do not harm low-income children and working families. Many of these low-income families are headed by women.

Any large program is susceptible to fraud and misuse. When fraud is alleged, the cases should be investigated and the people who commit fraud should be punished. This means targeted, aggressive auditing and enforcement, not wholesale changes to the program that will deny help to kids who are legally receiving it today.

The proponents of the amendment tell us that individuals are fraudulently claiming the child tax credit for kids who live in Mexico or for kids who do not exist. That is already a violation of the law. This is fraud. I agree with the sponsor that we should take steps to prevent this fraud.

The IRS says this amendment would not solve the fraud problem. In 2012, five Senators wrote to the IRS regarding this matter, and their letter asked:

> Does the fact that the person filing the return has a Social Security number indicate whether the child claimed for the credit met the residency requirements required under the law?

The response from the IRS, in a letter dated July 20, 2012, was:

> The possession of a SSN [Social Security number] by the filer is not relevant in determining whether the child met the residency requirements.

In other words, imposing a Social Security number requirement does not prevent the fraud that the sponsor seeks to prevent. That makes intuitive sense. If a person is going to lie about the existence of a kid, they will lie about the SSN too. This amendment does not solve the problem.

If this amendment does not solve the problem, then what would be the real impact of this amendment? Here is what the amendment would do.

First, it would deny help to roughly 4 million U.S. citizen children from low-income households by making their families ineligible for the child tax credit. The average family claiming the refundable child tax credit earns only about $21,000 a year, and, as I mentioned earlier, many of these families are led by women. Every dollar matters to these families. The child tax credit lifts roughly 1.5 million children out of poverty each year. This amendment would plunge many of these children back into poverty.

I wish to emphasize that because of the way the child tax credit is structured in the Tax Code, only working families are eligible for the refundable portion. These families are working and paying taxes, but in lean years they would be denied help from the child tax credit if this amendment were to become law. They are paying taxes but would be denied help. That is not fair.

Second, this amendment would render these 4 million U.S. children second-class citizens because of who their parents are. That is contrary to the principle of equality on which this country was founded. All citizens should be treated fairly and equally. This amendment says some citizen children will receive help and others will not, depending on who their parents are. That is simply not right.

In closing, there is a better way to pay for repealing the military COLA provision that was included in the budget, and that is to close corporate tax loopholes. The proponents cite a news report from Indiana in which an undocumented worker admitted he had allowed four other undocumented workers to use his address to file tax returns. The four workers did not live there, but he allowed them to use his address anyway. I agree that this is fraud and should be stopped.

This story reminds me of the story of the Ugland House in the Cayman Islands. The Ugland House is a 5-story building that has been identified as the official address for 18,857 companies, all at the same time. Some of the inhabitants of this address are some of the largest publicly traded companies in the United States. As I understand it, this is not a violation of U.S. laws. Tens of thousands of corporations can legally use the same building for their official address. It is not fraud but merely tax planning, I am told.

Offshore mailing addresses and accounting tricks are allowing corporations to shelter enormous profits from U.S. taxes. According to Bloomberg News, 83 of the largest companies in the United States held $1.46 trillion in profits offshore in 2012. Another report, by JPMorgan Chase, estimates that the amount of offshore profits is even higher—nearly $1.7 trillion. How does this work? They funnel their revenues through shell companies to escape taxation. Countries such as Bermuda, Ireland, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and Switzerland—which combined account for less than one-half of 1 percent of the world's population—generated 43 percent of the profits reported by American companies in 2008. Clearly, there is a major tax problem here.

While our colleagues rail against five workers using one address to file taxes, we hear nothing about more than 18,000 companies that have used one address to file their taxes. Talk about egregious. These corporate tax loopholes resulting in the huge amount of taxes companies don't pay are what this Congress should focus on, not on denying a few hundred dollars of help to a U.S. citizen child who is on the edge of poverty.

Senator SHAHEEN has filed an amendment that begins to address these corporate tax problems. Her amendment, No. 2618, of which I am a cosponsor, will prevent more than 18,000 corporations from pretending they are headquartered in a single building in the Cayman Islands. Like the amendment of Senator AYOTTE, the Shaheen amendment will repeal the military retiree COLA provision that was in the budget deal. The difference is that the amendment of Senator SHAHEEN will pay for the repeal by holding corporations accountable for the taxes they owe instead of denying help to U.S. citizen children of working parents, many of whom are women, who are in poverty.

We all recognize that we have a responsibility to our veterans, taxpayers, and to future generations. The amendment of Senator SHAHEEN will allow us to meet all of these commitments at the same time. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this commonsense approach and vote in favor of the Shaheen amendment and not the Ayotte amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I join my colleague from Hawaii in her remarks and her opposition to the Ayotte amendment. I wish to start off by simply saying that when we are talking about extending unemployment insurance benefits to Americans who have played by the rules, done everything right, and through no fault of their own find themselves unemployed, many long-term unemployed, and who are trying to get a job but still, despite an economy that is improving, have not seen the job market increase significantly so that they can attain that job—what they need at this time is not a kick in the pants, they need a helping hand so that they can sustain their families during this period of time and continue to be in a position to do that which the law requires of them: continue to look for a job and eventually find that job.

The reality is that this is not an ideological battle, I hope, in a greater political war. It is about real people and the lives of real people. I don't think we can lose sight of that simple fact. Political ideology doesn't trump faith and family values. It does not trump reason or compassion or the acceptance that we are all in this together.

Having said that, I am encouraged that there is bipartisan support for repealing the military pension cuts. I opposed those. I am committed to ensuring that our brave men and women and their families receive all the care and resources they deserve, both during their service and throughout their lives. They have fought for our freedom and security in the most difficult situations, and our Nation owes them the same level of commitment, and we remain indebted to them for their service.

But I have heard the Senator from New Hampshire declare her support for offsetting the cost to fix that by fixing ''an egregious problem in the Tax Code.'' As someone who sits on the Senate Finance Committee, I can tell you that after years of being stymied by Republican opposition to closing any tax loopholes, to shutting down any abusive tax practices, I would like to have them join us in looking for savings in the Tax Code to achieve a bipartisan goal. But, unfortunately, instead of shutting down the abuses in the code, like the huge amounts of money stripped out of the United States and piling up in tax havens abroad, or instead of ending the wasteful subsidies for very profitable companies, such as the oil industry, or perhaps the myriad tax shelters used by millionaires to avoid paying their fair share, my colleague decided instead to propose legislation that would have a devastating impact on 4 million children who are U.S. citizens and who deserve every right and every protection as any other child under the Constitution, all of whom are deserving of our support.

Instead of working with Democrats, many of whom have spent a great deal of time studying and pointing out waste, fraud, and abuse in the Tax Code to find a bipartisan solution, we are presented with a proposal that would go much further than she claims and hammer over 2 million working and tax-paying families.

What does the child tax credit do, which is the subject of her amendment? The child tax credit is for people who have a qualifying child. That is the fundamental essence of the child tax credit. You are not eligible for it if you do not have a qualifying child. What is a qualifying child under the law? It must be the son, daughter, stepchild, foster child, brother, sister, stepbrother, stepsister, or a descendent of the filer. They must live with the filer for more than half of the year. No. 3, the child must be a U.S. citizen, a U.S. national, or a U.S. resident alien. It is the child who is the determinative factor. It is the child for which these resources ultimately we have decided as a Congress and as a society to support.

We talk about being family-friendly. We talk about the poverty situation in this country. We talk about the consistently growing gap in terms of the haves and the have-nots. This amendment is only going to exacerbate that problem for U.S. children.

To eliminate the ability of a taxpayer to use a taxpayer ID number in order to claim the refundable portion of the child tax credit ignores the fact that the vast majority of these children are U.S. citizens and the child tax credit was enacted to help families financially care for their children. The refundable portion was introduced because children in working families deserve the same support provided by

benefits in the Tax Code as anyone else. That is why we made it refundable—because we wanted to reward work and we wanted to help with the growth of that child and to deal with their challenges.

I agree with the Senator from New Hampshire that the anecdotal stories she included in her remarks amount to fraud, and they should be stopped. Let's be clear: The stories she told of claiming credits for children not in the United States or of 1,000 tax returns linked to 8 addresses, those actions are already illegal by whomever would make such a false filing and commit those actions.

In fact, what the Senator does is cite reports of IRS investigators who did their job shutting down illegal activity. It seems to me the IRS doesn't need her amendment to go after this fraud. They need the resources and the investigators to ultimately make sure all elements of the code that have fraudulent activity being taken need to be dealt with. They need Republicans to stop cutting their funds so they can do their job better. But to use these instances of fraud that were successfully pursued to go after American children is not confronting fraud. It is disadvantaging children—4 million children to be exact.

If we had one computer science company prosecuted for tax evasion, we don't bar all computer science companies from ever taking the research and development tax credit again. If we find one entity, one person or one industry committing fraud, we don't eliminate all of the benefits of the provision in the Tax Code for which they committed fraud because we have decided that provision is of a societal benefit. What we do is make sure we go after the individuals who commit the fraud. It doesn't make any sense, just like hammering 4 million U.S. children because of fraud perpetrated by some other unscrupulous actor doesn't make a whole lot of sense to me.

I believe this amendment creates a clear-cut case of priorities. Surely nobody here would argue that outside of this instance, there is no other part of the Tax Code that allows waste, fraud or abuse. We could sit down and find dozens of wasteful loopholes, fraudulent tax practices, and abusive tax shelters that could be shut down in order to pay for restoring the cuts to military pensions. If my Republican colleagues chose to support these efforts, I think this bill would sail through the Senate.

I say to my friends who are putting up obstacles—because I believe a lot of these false choices that are being put out there are not for the purposes of a legitimate policy goal but to undermine the efforts of achieving the extension of unemployment insurance—I say to them I think you need to stop and think. Think about the people who are hurting. Think about their lives, their hopes, and their struggles. Think about what their conversations are around the kitchen table at night. Every night in New Jersey and all over the country thousands of families who have played by the rules and are looking for work are sitting around the table asking heartwrenching questions: How will we afford the mortgage and keep our home if we cannot get the assistance during this period of time? Do I have to decide between putting food on the table and keeping a place for my family? What if I have a health emergency? These are real-life conversations that are being had by Americans across this country.

How are we not putting aside ideology and looking into our conscience for the obvious answer? This is a simple extension of unemployment benefits for those who need our help. It is a no-brainer at a time when so many need help now and don't care about politics, don't want or deserve to be pawns in a political battle over the role or size of government. They just want help from the very people who represent them.

It isn't a time for political games. It is a time for action. We can always argue deficits. We can argue about debt management, we can argue about politics, but for now it is about the American people, their lives, their hopes, and their dreams for a better life for themselves and their families. It is about the kind of Nation we are and the values we hold dear.

Extending unemployment benefits isn't just the right thing to do morally, it also makes good economic sense. Study after study has shown that unemployment benefits are one of the most effective ways to help our economy grow, so much so that every $1 spent produces a benefit of at least $1.50 in gross domestic product. That is because people receiving benefits spend the money and immediately stimulate the economy in the form of consumer spending, which accounts for 70 percent of our GDP. Leaving 1.3 million Americans in the cold without any assistance would end up costing our economy 240,000 jobs.

Some on the other side say helping people who have been out of work is a crutch. I have to be honest with you. I have never met a person in my State who said they wanted to be on unemployment, who found dignity in being on unemployment or realized their dreams by being on unemployment. They found their dignity by achieving a job that helped them realize their hopes and dreams and aspirations.

The American worker is not lazy, and they don't want handouts. With the job market still recovering, there simply are not enough jobs available for them. As we work to make sure there is an economy that has enough jobs for Americans to be able to realize their hopes and dreams and aspirations, it is incumbent on us to make sure we continue to assist them so those stark choices around the kitchen table aren't as horrible as they are today.

I hope my colleagues will oppose hurting 4 million American children, exacerbating the poverty in our country, and sending a message that goes counter to what the child tax credit is all about. We want to help an American child be able to fulfill their hopes and dreams and aspirations and their God-given potential. The adoption of the Ayotte amendment would go entirely counter to that belief.

With that, I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:36 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION EXTENSION ACT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 2:30 p.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders.

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I wish to share briefly a few thoughts about where we are. We have before us an unemployment bill and the pending business is the Reid amendment that would extend unemployment benefits for a full year, and none of it is paid for effectively. All of it violates the Budget Act. It is unthinkable that we would pass another $17 billion that would add to the debt of the United States—every billion of it, every single dollar of it borrowed, much of it from people around the world who are not friendly to us. So this is not a good way for us to start.

It is subject to a budget point of order because it violates our spending limits and that has been confirmed. I know the Presiding Officer is a member of the Budget Committee. It has been confirmed by Senator MURRAY and her staff, the Democratic leadership on the Budget Committee, that it violates the budget. So that means if it is not fixed—and I understand there is some attempt going on at this time to maybe rewrite it in a way that actually has a legitimate pay-for, to provide assistance to those who are long-term unemployed but paid for without adding to the debt of the United States.

I will remind my colleagues that in December we passed the Murray-Ryan legislation which set limits on spending, and the President signed it into law just 2 weeks ago. As soon as we waltz into the U.S. Senate in January of this year, we have a piece of legislation that bursts the budget entirely. It is an utter violation of the spending agreements we agreed to. So I hope our colleagues can present something to us that would lay out an effective way to handle those who are unemployed and would also pay for the legislation. That is what we have to do.

This is how we go broke. This is what has happened. We made a promise when the legislation passed in December to cap spending and stay within that limit. That is the law that is being violated 1 month later, if this were to pass. Hopefully, it will not pass. I don't believe the House will pass legislation that adds another $17 trillion to the debt and not add—I just don't think that is possible.

This is a process that is not healthy. I urge our colleagues to understand that if this legislation is not fixed—if the Reid amendment is not fixed and paid for—I intend to move to object to it, to raise a budget point of order. It will take 60 votes to override the budget we just agreed to. I don't believe 60 Members of this Senate will so vote.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, what is the issue before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to commit is the pending question.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am going to offer a consent agreement based on the conversations I have had with a number of Republicans, and a long conversation with my caucus just a few minutes ago. I am going to speak for a few minutes because I know everybody has a lot to do, but we have all been working hard to find a way to extend unemployment insurance benefits for 1.4 million Americans who are struggling to get by.

We have a filibuster before us again—another one. First, Republicans complained they were filibustering these essential benefits because the extension was not paid for. So Senator REED of Rhode Island came forward with a pay-for amendment. Then Republicans complained, they were filibustering because they had not been able to offer amendments. So a proposal was made—and I am going to do that in a short time with a unanimous consent request—that would give each side a reasonable number of amendments—five, to be specific. Now Republicans say they want to have their amendments and have a cloture vote to pass the bill too.

Sounds as though Republicans want to, for lack of a better way to describe this, have their cake and eat it too. The question is, are Republicans filibustering unemployment insurance benefits or are they not?

If we have an amendment process, then what we should get in exchange is an up-or-down vote on the bill, and that is what my consent agreement will call for. Republicans who don't like extending unemployment insurance benefits can still vote no on the bill, but we should at least be able to have a vote on the bill. But we can't set up a system where the minority of the Senate, which opposes unemployment insurance benefits, gets both an amendment process where they can offer these poison-pill amendments and then the minority of the Senate, again, that opposes the bill, can still kill the bill. This doesn't make a lot of sense.

I know everybody has worked hard to try to work through this process—to kind of thread the needle. I told a number of Republican Senators I met with a little while ago, as my Democratic Senators know, that we think there should be a new day in the Senate. We think we should start by whatever comes up next—whether it is flood insurance, unemployment compensation, whatever is next—by having a reasonable number of relevant amendments, and see if we, as Senators, can work our way through a bill doing that. If we can do that a few times, maybe we will get better and start having some nonrelevant amendments, but at least let us start someplace so Senators here can have the experience of offering amendments—both us and the Republicans—and try to get some legislation passed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture motions with respect to the Reed of Rhode Island amendment No. 2631 and S. 1845 be vitiated; that the motion to commit and amendment No. 2631 be withdrawn; that a substitute amendment, which is at the desk, be made pending; that there be up to five amendments related to the bill from each side in order to the substitute amendment; further, that each of these amendments be subject to a side-by-side amendment if the opposing side chooses to offer one; amendments under this agreement must be offered no later than 4 p.m. Wednesday, January 15; that no other amendments or motions to commit be in order; that no points of order be in order to the substitute or the underlying bill; that each amendment have up to 1 hour of debate equally divided; that upon the use or yielding back of time on each of the amendments offered, the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the amendments to the substitute in the order offered with any side-by-side amendment vote occurring prior to the amendment to which it was offered; that all of the amendments to the substitute be subject to a 60-affirmative-vote threshold; that upon disposition of the amendments, the bill be read a third time, as amended, if amended, and the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the bill; that if the bill is passed, the Senate immediately proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 192, H.R. 2009; that all after the enacting clause be stricken and the text of S. 1845, as passed by the Senate, be inserted in lieu thereof; that the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; that an amendment to the title be considered and agreed to; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The minority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, we have now been on this bill a week—a week. No amendments have been allowed. It is pretty clear the majority leader is not interested in having an open amendment process. And, of course, the consent request that has just been offered requires that all of the Republican amendments be at a 60-vote threshold and that final passage be at 51—in other words, guaranteed to fix the result in such a way that doesn't give the minority a fair chance.

I mean, who is to say, a number of our amendments might be appealing to Members on the Democratic side. That is probably why the majority leader wants it to be at 60, because he is afraid they may pass.

So this has obviously been fixed to guarantee that you get no outcome. Of course, our Members who voted to get on the bill, who are anxious to try to improve the bill and find a way to get us to final passage, have also found this agreement to be unacceptable. So I am not speaking just for myself but for the Members on my side who have spent a lot of time over the last week trying to figure a way to get this bill across the floor in a bipartisan fashion which would actually achieve the result and try to get us to some reforms as well.

So I ask unanimous consent that once the Senate resumes consideration of S. 1845, the unemployment extension bill, the first amendment in order be a Heller-Collins amendment related to the bill. I further ask unanimous consent that following the disposition of that amendment, it be in order for the majority leader, or his designee, to offer an amendment, and it be in order for the leaders or their designees to continue to offer amendments in an alternating fashion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we have seen in the last little bit a significant number of statements on the floor and op-ed pieces written about process—process.

On this side we have been talking about 1.4 million Americans needing help getting past the real financial crisis they find.

It seems interesting to me the only fix to get no outcome is the Republican strategy to find something to object to no matter what Democrats try. Process—compared to helping in a substantive way people who are in trouble,

process never wins. We need to move forward.

My friend talks about amendments. Democrats have amendments. We have 5 too. Ours would have a 60-vote threshold just like theirs. This is the new target that my Republican colleague the Republican leader has set. We have a new reality around here of 60 votes. This isn't anything I invented. In fact, I wish we would get rid of it and go back to the way we used to do it.

So I repeat. I think this has been constructive. I especially appreciate the junior Senator from Nevada and the senior Senator from Maine working to come up with something. I am disappointed we couldn't work something out. It appears, and I have been told, they are going to object to this consent agreement just as I object to modifying my consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I would like to ask the leader a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHUMER. Objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to the Republican leader's request.

Is there objection to the majority leader's request?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my friend from New York was standing to reserve the right to object.

Mr. SCHUMER. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Let me just say, I think on both sides of the aisle there is a real desire to try to work things out so we can have more debate, more discussion. It seems to me, from the years I have been here—not as long as either leader—there has always been sort of a way the place worked, particularly in the old days when it worked better: The majority sets the agenda. That is their right as majority. The minority has the right to offer amendments—both—amendments that might change that agenda and amendments that, frankly, might be tough to vote for so the minority can capture the majority again. That has been fair.

But it seems to me that what my friend the Republican leader is saying is: We want all the amendments we want, but we are still going to filibuster any bill you bring up. Maybe a few have said: If our amendments pass on the other side, maybe we won't filibuster. But that is not much of a fair deal.

So I would suggest that what the Democratic leader has suggested is eminently fair. It gives the minority—no matter who it is—their time-honored right to offer amendments, difficult amendments. That is part of the deal. But it gives the majority the right to set the agenda and not have the things they bring forward filibustered ipso facto and not be allowed to come to a vote.

It is in fact true, as I understand it, that a couple of those who are offering amendments on the other side of the aisle have stated that if their amendment doesn't pass, they won't allow us to come to a vote.

So I hope we could proceed along the way the majority leader suggests and not to simply offer amendments—relevant, not relevant; germane, not germane—and then make it almost certain the bill will be filibustered and that we won't be able to get an up-or-down vote. All we are asking is an up-or-down vote on employment insurance.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, regular order.

Mr. SCHUMER. So I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I believe I objected to the majority leader's request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator did so.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up the Heller amendment No. 2651.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent to call up the Coburn amendment No. 2606.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. I object.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Parliamentary inquiry: Is it correct that no Senator is permitted to offer an amendment to the unemployment insurance bill while the majority leader's motion to commit with instructions with further amendments is pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Further parliamentary inquiry: If a motion to table the Reid motion to commit with a further amendment is successful, would there still be Reed amendments pending that would prevent anyone from offering an amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have an important amendment that I would like the Senate to debate and vote on. The Reid motion to commit is currently blocking the consideration of those amendments.

In order for the Senate to start considering amendments, including the Coburn amendment No. 2606, I move to table the pending Reid motion to commit with instructions and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I do have a right to object to this; do I not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct, but the question is on the cloture motion. It takes consent for the motion to be tabled.

Mr. REID. I am not objecting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The question is on the motion to table.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 55, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 8 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Alexander	Enzi	McConnell
Ayotte	Fischer	Moran
Barrasso	Flake	Murkowski
Blunt	Graham	Paul
Boozman	Grassley	Portman
Burr	Hatch	Risch
Chambliss	Heller	Roberts
Coats	Hoeven	Rubio
Coburn	Inhofe	Scott
Cochran	Isakson	Sessions
Collins	Johanns	Shelby
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Cornyn	Kirk	Toomey
Crapo	Lee	Vitter
Cruz	McCain	Wicker

NAYS—55

Baldwin	Harkin	Nelson
Baucus	Heinrich	Pryor
Begich	Heitkamp	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Reid
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Booker	Kaine	Sanders
Boxer	King	Schatz
Brown	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cantwell	Landrieu	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Stabenow
Carper	Levin	Tester
Casey	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Coons	Markey	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	Menendez	Warren
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Franken	Mikulski	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murphy	
Hagan	Murray	

The motion was rejected.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the next two votes be 10 minutes in duration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on amendment No. 2631 to S. 1845, a bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Jack Reed, Martin Heinrich, Richard Blumenthal, Michael F. Bennet, Richard J. Durbin, Patty Murray, Max Baucus, Debbie Stabenow, Bill Nelson, Amy Klobuchar, Thomas R. Carper, Edward J. Markey, Benjamin L. Cardin, Sheldon Whitehouse, Charles E. Schumer, Patrick J. Leahy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 2631 to S. 1845, a bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment

benefits, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 9 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Baldwin	Harkin	Nelson
Baucus	Heinrich	Pryor
Begich	Heitkamp	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reid
Booker	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Levin	Stabenow
Casey	Manchin	Tester
Coons	Markey	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	Menendez	Warren
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Franken	Mikulski	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murphy	
Hagan	Murray	

NAYS—48

Alexander	Enzi	McConnell
Ayotte	Fischer	Moran
Barrasso	Flake	Murkowski
Bennet	Graham	Paul
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Burr	Heller	Roberts
Chambliss	Hoeven	Rubio
Coats	Inhofe	Scott
Coburn	Isakson	Sessions
Cochran	Johanns	Shelby
Collins	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Corker	Kirk	Toomey
Cornyn	Landrieu	Udall (CO)
Crapo	Lee	Vitter
Cruz	McCain	Wicker

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 52, the nays are 48. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

CLOTURE MOTION

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on S. 1845, a bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Jack Reed, Amy Klobuchar, Elizabeth Warren, Richard J. Durbin, Sheldon Whitehouse, Edward J. Markey, Tammy Baldwin, Patrick J. Leahy, Christopher A. Coons, Barbara A. Mikulski, Patty Murray, Mark Warner, Mazie K. Hirono, Christopher Murphy, Tom Harkin, Sherrod Brown.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on S. 1845, a bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 55, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 10 Leg.]

YEAS—55

Baldwin	Harkin	Murray
Baucus	Heinrich	Nelson
Begich	Heitkamp	Pryor
Bennet	Heller	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rockefeller
Booker	Johnson (SD)	Sanders
Boxer	Kaine	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Landrieu	Stabenow
Carper	Leahy	Tester
Casey	Levin	Udall (CO)
Coons	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	Markey	Warner
Durbin	McCaskill	Warren
Feinstein	Menendez	Whitehouse
Franken	Merkley	Wyden
Gillibrand	Mikulski	
Hagan	Murphy	

NAYS—45

Alexander	Enzi	Moran
Ayotte	Fischer	Murkowski
Barrasso	Flake	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Reid
Burr	Hatch	Risch
Chambliss	Hoeven	Roberts
Coats	Inhofe	Rubio
Coburn	Isakson	Scott
Cochran	Johanns	Sessions
Collins	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Corker	Kirk	Thune
Cornyn	Lee	Toomey
Crapo	McCain	Vitter
Cruz	McConnell	Wicker

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 55, the nays are 45. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on S. 1845.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I appreciate very much my colleague, the junior Senator from Nevada, voting with us—voting with himself. He is a cosponsor of this legislation. He and JACK REED have done admirably good work for the Senate and for the country.

Everyone should notice on the first matter we tried to invoke cloture on, I did not enter a motion to reconsider. I did on this one. This is a 3-month unpaid-for. I would hope we could get that passed sometime. If we cannot, there is still an effort, I am sure, out there someplace where we could find a way to work together to get these people the desperate help they need. So that is why I did this, leaving the door open for us to work together to try to come up with something.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. I rise to express my extreme disappointment that the Senate has been blocked from moving forward on this critical legislation. There are about 1.5 million Americans who have lost their unemployment insurance since December 28. Every week 70,000 more lose that protection, so my disappointment is severe.

But their situation is much more desperate. We had within our power today the ability to move this Senate forward to help our people, to help people who only qualified for the program because they worked and because they are still looking for work in one of the most difficult job markets we have seen in many decades.

It is extremely urgent that we act and today we failed to act. We have to continue to move forward. The majority leader has procedurally put us in a position so we can call up this measure again very quickly. We have to continue to work toward a solution. We have to keep the economy moving forward and creating jobs. That was what this was about, giving people some modest support each week. But also, as the CBO estimated, this measure, if extended for the full year, would generate 200,000 additional jobs. That is, on average, about what we have been creating each month. In fact, I will remind my colleagues, last year's unemployment insurance benefits were unpaid for and they generated additional jobs, not only providing benefits to people who needed it and were searching for work but increased economic activity in the country, which put people to work.

I hope my colleagues recognize this legislation they filibustered today was the result of significant concessions to many of my Republican colleagues. I worked closely with my Republican colleagues. We worked to find a way through this thicket so we could help Americans who have earned this help.

I think it is important to make clear how much we moved to try to accommodate the major objections and considerations of my colleagues on the other side.

We first proposed—and I proposed—this as emergency spending, unpaid for. We received from the other side: No, we can't accept that. It has to be paid for.

We went ahead, and the in the first proposal we voted on today, we paid for it. We also responded to another significant concern that we not use tax revenues to pay for it, so we avoided tax revenue.

Next, we went ahead and we adopted a provision to pay for it, to provide for many months, 11½ months of benefits, paid for without using revenues.

Let me also note that this is the exception to the rule. The White House, in some of their materials, has noted that "fourteen of the last 17 times in 20 years that it's been extended," UI, "there's been no strings attached," no pay-fors—emergency spending. But yet we listened to the thoughtful comments of our colleagues, we worked together closely with them, and we came up with a way to pay for this extension for 11½ months and not to use tax revenues, even though many on our side—in fact I would be among them—who would say there are egregious loopholes that should be closed regardless of what the revenue is used for but could be used to fund these benefits.

Then we have had this procedural back-and-forth. But today Leader REID offered a series of amendments to the

other side, and they objected to that offer.

Let me reiterate. We have tried, not only in very good faith but very diligently over the last several days particularly, to try to bring something to this floor that could get the 60 votes necessary to help these struggling Americans.

We have incorporated, in fact, in our pay-for, one of the provisions Senator PORTMAN suggested with respect to disability payments—which was controversial in some respects—but it was, again, another attempt to try to look at what my colleagues, on the Republican side as well as the Democratic side, were talking about in terms of how we would responsibly pay for this measure.

We have been debating this extension since December. It is time to act, and regrettably we did not act today. We have made concessions to try to move forward. This was not a take-it-or-leave-it. It has been unpaid for 14 times before—and it would have been 15 times now. We have to do this. And still we are telling people who are in very extreme economic situations, who are depending on this modest $300 a week to help them pay their rent, pay their mortgage, put fuel in their car, have a cell phone so they can look for work, get to a job interview—telling them, no, you are still out in the cold, literally, and it is very cold in parts of the country.

We can't give up. We are not going to give up. I am very encouraged. After talking to some of my colleagues on the Republican side, they still want to work through this with us. We will accept that opportunity to work together.

Let us remember though what is a disappointing moment today for many of us is a dispiriting moment for millions of Americans who do not have the modest support unemployment insurance would provide. We have to work for them, we have to work for our economy, and we can do both. In the weeks ahead and the days ahead we will continue to do that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. As we just heard, the Senate continues to discuss and consider an extension of unemployment benefits. Many Americans certainly do continue to struggle to find work in today's economy. While assistance to those without work serves an important purpose in helping Americans in transition, I am fearful we are failing—in fact, I know we are failing—to address the underlying and important root cause of that unemployment; that is, how do we as Americans grow our economy and create jobs for the citizens of our country?

A growing economy creates new opportunities for Americans to find meaningful work. With meaningful work comes the opportunity for Americans to improve their economic security and advance up the economic ladder.

In 2012 Senator WYDEN and I started the Economic Mobility Caucus that met today for the fifth time, exploring ways we could work together to create the opportunity for every American to work their way up, have a better life, a greater future, more success, and better financial stability.

Unfortunately—again, at the moment, in my view—a lack of leadership and partisan politics have prevented action on measures that could provide an immediate boost to the economy at little or no cost to the American taxpayer.

Data from the Kauffman Foundation in Kansas City makes clear that most new jobs come from the young companies created by entrepreneurs. In fact, since 1980, nearly all of the net new jobs that have been created by companies are less than 5 years old. These new businesses create an average of 3 million jobs each year.

As of December, approximately 20.6 million Americans were unemployed, wanted to work but have stopped searching for a job or are working part time because they can't find full-time unemployment. When we talk about the unemployment rate, it masks the true story of people who have given up looking for a job as well as those who have a part-time job and need and desire a full-time job.

The labor force participation rate has reached its lowest level in 35 years. At a time when only 62 percent of working-age Americans are employed, it is clear we need an economic boost powered by entrepreneurship. To jump-start the economy and create jobs for Americans, we have put together and I authored bipartisan legislation called Startup Act 3.0.

The Senate majority leader is often talking about the need for allowing votes on legislation that has bipartisan support, and this is a perfect example of such a bill that ought to be considered by the Senate.

Working with Senator WARNER—my primary cosponsor of this bill—and Senators COONS, KAINE, KLOBUCHAR, as well as Republican Senators BLUNT and RUBIO, we introduced commonsense legislation that addresses four key factors that influence an entrepreneur's chance for success: taxes, regulations, innovation, and access to talent.

It has become all too common in the Senate that we are denied the opportunity to have a vote on things that many of us find common agreement on, and Startup Act 3.0 is one of those. In fact, I offered, along with Senator WARNER, Startup Act 3.0 as an amendment to the unemployment insurance extension bill. Startup Act 3.0 makes commonsense changes to the Tax Code to encourage investment in startups and reward patient capital. To address the burdensome government regulations, the legislation requires Federal agencies to determine whether the cost of new regulations outweigh the benefits—and encourages Federal agencies to give special consideration to the impact proposed regulations would have upon those startup businesses.

As any entrepreneur knows, a good idea is essential to starting a successful business. To get more ideas out of the laboratory and into the market, this legislation improves the process for commercializing federally funded research so taxpayer-funded innovations can be turned into companies and spur economic growth and job creation.

Finally, Startup Act 3.0 provides new opportunities for highly educated and entrepreneurial immigrants to stay in the United States. They are here legally now but are often told they need to go home to pursue their careers, when we know their talent and their new ideas could fuel economic growth and create American jobs.

While there is meaningful disagreement—we have plenty of disagreement about the immigration issue—there are aspects of immigration in which there is broad agreement. One of the areas of agreement is highly skilled immigration. Highly skilled immigrants not only provide the talent for growing companies needed to fuel further growth and job creation, but those individuals tend to be very entrepreneurial.

Immigrants are now more than twice as likely as native-born Americans to start a business. In 2011 immigrants were responsible for more than one in every four U.S. business founded.

In addition, immigrants are responsible for significant contributions to innovation. According to a recent study by the Partnership for a New American Economy, 76 percent of patents at the top 10 patent-producing U.S. universities had at least one foreign-born inventor.

One of the best things we can do for the American economy is to welcome highly skilled and entrepreneurial immigrants. No matter what Congress does, these individuals will continue to innovate and create jobs. The question is where will they innovate and where will the jobs be created. If Congress makes the right choice, those jobs and that innovation will occur in the United States of America and build the U.S. economy and employ U.S. citizens.

Unfortunately, there are too many people in the Senate and in the Congress in Washington, DC, who say we can't do anything unless we do everything. That has prevented the passage of targeted immigration legislation that would boost the economic growth and create American jobs. That same attitude prevents us from doing many things on the Senate floor, and it is well past time we found ways to do the things we can agree upon and not wait for the opportunity to do everything. Let's do the things we can while we wait and work on the chance to do bigger and broader things.

The STEM visas we talk about seem so important to our economy. American businesses are projected to need

an estimated 800,000 workers with advanced STEM degrees by 2018 but will only find 550,000 American graduates with an advanced STEM education.

We must do more as a nation. We absolutely must do more to prepare Americans for careers in STEM fields so that our country no longer has to rely upon talented foreign labor. But in the short term, as we work to equip Americans with skills for the 21st-century economy, we need to create a pathway for highly educated foreign-born students who are here in the United States legally, going to school, to stay in America where their ideas and talents can fuel great American economic growth.

Startup 3.0 creates visas for foreign students who graduate from an American university with a master's or Ph.D. in science, technology, engineering, or mathematics. These skilled workers would be granted conditional status contingent upon them filling a needed gap in the U.S. workforce.

It may seem counterintuitive that by allowing highly skilled workers to work in the United States, more Americans will find work, but that is exactly what will happen. A study by the Partnership for a New American Economy and the American Enterprise Institute found that every immigrant with a graduate degree in the United States from a U.S. university working in a STEM field creates 2.62 subsequent American jobs.

If American companies are unable to find and hire the qualified, talented workers they need, those businesses will open locations overseas. I have seen examples of that too many times. When this happens, not only are those specific jobs gone—they are lost—but also the many supporting jobs and economic activities associated with them are no longer here.

Even more frustrating to me is that when these highly skilled workers who are now employed in some other country and who are entrepreneurs too have an idea and they found and start a business that may grow and create more jobs because they couldn't find employment here due to lacking the necessary visa and have moved to another country, they use their entrepreneurial skills and talent, and they create the jobs—the company—elsewhere. So the jobs we need in this country are then outside the United States.

This legislation also allows for an entrepreneur's visa. Immigrants to the United States have a long history of creating businesses in America. Today, 1 in every 10 Americans employed at a privately owned U.S. company works at an immigrant-owned firm. Of the current Fortune 500 companies, more than 40 percent were founded by a first- or second-generation American.

So my question to my colleagues is, Why would we want to leave an immigration system in place that discourages entrepreneurs from coming to our country, investing their own money, and creating jobs here and strengthening our economy? I think we should do exactly the opposite and welcome those people who want to create jobs for Americans in America.

Startup 3.0 creates an entrepreneur's visa for foreign-born entrepreneurs currently in the United States legally. Those individuals with a good idea, with capital, and a willingness to hire American workers would be able to stay in the United States and grow their businesses here. Each immigrant entrepreneur would be required to create jobs for Americans. If the business is not successful and jobs are not created, the immigrant would have to go back to his or her home country.

Using conservative estimates, the Kauffman Foundation predicts that the entrepreneur's visa would generate 500,000 to 1.6 million jobs over the next 10 years. These are real jobs with real economic impact that could boost GDP, it is estimated, by more than 1.5 percent. These are jobs for Americans desperately seeking to work here to support their families and follow their dreams.

As the Senate considers extending unemployment insurance in the short term, we must not lose sight of the long-term goal—that ought to be the short-term, intermediate, and long-term goal—of creating an environment for jobs in America. There is no better way to create jobs than to support entrepreneurs and to foster the development of new businesses, which are responsible for all those net new jobs in the economy.

Numerous studies demonstrate that a smarter more strategic immigration policy that supports entrepreneurs and skilled immigrants can grow the economy and help put Americans back to work. Jobless Americans and U.S. businesses searching for the talent they need to expand and create jobs can no longer afford to let the all-or-nothing approach to immigration legislation hold economic growth and opportunity hostage. It has prevented progress on important challenges facing our country for far too long. A far better approach would be to pass the things we can agree upon now and keep working to find agreement on the issues that divide us. First on this list should be the measures outlined in Startup Act 3.0.

Other countries are realizing the value of highly educated and entrepreneurial individuals in starting businesses, and they are changing their laws to welcome then. The United States cannot afford to turn a blind eye to global competition. If we fail to act, we risk losing the next generation of great entrepreneurs, and the jobs they will create will be in foreign countries, not in the United States, and we risk continuing another month in which 20.6 million Americans remain without meaningful work.

Work is an ennobling feature of life. Jobs matter, and this Congress and this President have failed miserably, in my view, to carry out one of our primary responsibilities—to create an environment in which Americans can find work and can pursue that American dream of putting food on their family's table, saving for their kids' education, making sure they have a secure retirement in the future, and knowing every day when they get up and go to work they are doing something good for themselves and for their families and their country.

Mr. President, we desperately need to work together to create an environment in which American jobs are created. No one I know really wants to be the recipient of an unemployment check. It may be necessary, but it is not their goal. The goal is to find an ennobling, meaningful job that supports them and their family.

I thank the Chair for his indulgence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I think it is wonderful to hear the Republican Senator Mr. MORAN talk about job creation. It is really music to my ears, especially when he talks about addressing the importance of immigration, which clearly needs to be addressed and is clearly a job-creation issue. That is why I have been hoping Speaker BOEHNER would take up the Senate's immigration bill, which is comprehensive; and, as President Obama said, if you can't do that, bring up a series of bills and let's get moving.

Believe me, I have seen every report there is, and Senator MORAN is right—immigration reform is necessary for us. It is an economic issue. It would be an economic boon to our country in terms of jobs and GDP.

I also think it very important that we not turn our backs on an American value we have had in this country since the 1950s in which Republicans and Democrats in the Congress and Republicans and Democrats in the White House have agreed that when there is a great recession and people are out of work, they need to have unemployment compensation, which is an insurance program to keep them from falling apart. This is an American value.

We talk about bipartisanship, but sometimes we just can't seem to get there. I have looked back, and since the 1950s, two-thirds of the time we passed an extension of unemployment compensation—many times to help people the Chair has worked so hard to represent, the mine workers and others who were hit with hard times, we did so in a bipartisan way—and two-thirds of the time with no pay-for. Since 1958, two-thirds of the time we extended it with no pay-for.

Under George W. Bush we extended unemployment compensation—the extended unemployment compensation paid for by the Federal Government—three times with no pay-for because it was an emergency. And we did it even though in those days deficits were raging.

Here we have cut the deficit in half, and we don't like that. We want to cut it more. I want to see it balanced. But

we surely should do what we just tried to do, which is to extend unemployment compensation for a long period of time with a pay-for—that is what we tried to do—or for a short period of time without a pay-for and help people keep their lives together.

We have had this American value since the 1950s. Yet, for the first time I can tell, we had one party—with the exception of one person—vote lockstep against extending unemployment compensation to hard-working Americans who are looking for work every week, every day. And I have their stories, which I am going to put in the RECORD. They have turned their backs on 1.5 million Americans—in my State, 250,000 people.

Now, here is the thing—and I don't like to come and make these speeches, but the facts speak for themselves. Leader REID, the majority leader, just offered a very important deal in broad daylight to the Republicans. And I am going to make a parliamentary inquiry, if I might, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Here it is. Is it true that Majority Leader REID offered the Republicans five related amendments to the unemployment compensation bill, those amendments to be of their own choosing? Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mrs. BOXER. Is it further true that he offered Democrats five related amendments of their own choosing?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mrs. BOXER. Is it further correct that he also said each side could offer an additional five amendments as side-by-sides, if they wanted to, of their own choosing? Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mrs. BOXER. Is it also true that he offered time agreements of 1 hour per amendment and then to be followed by passage of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mrs. BOXER. OK. The reason I wanted to put this in the record in a simple way is because sometimes when we have the back-and-forth and the ''I object'' and ''reserving the right to object,'' people lose track of exactly what happened.

We offered the Republicans everything they said they wanted. They wanted amendments. They were offered amendments of their own choosing. Up to 20 amendments could have been voted on under the agreement. They said they wanted pay-fors. We gave them a pay-for that actually came out of PAUL RYAN's budget, a structural change that would have paid for 10½ months of unemployment benefits. The Republicans just can't say yes. They demanded amendments. We gave them amendments. They demanded pay-fors. We gave them pay-fors.

I believe something else is going on, and I have to say what I think is going on. They do not want to extend unemployment compensation to the long-term unemployed. That is a dramatic change that is occurring in the culture of this country, in the compassion of this country, in the consensus in this country, in the values of this country. We are talking about 1.5 million Americans—250,000 Californians. I am frankly stunned.

I know Senator MIKULSKI is here, and I so much want to hear from her, so I will skip some of the other history about how it has been over the years and how we have done this where we have come together, Republicans and Democrats. We have extended unemployment compensation benefits more times under Republican Presidents than under Democratic Presidents, and Democrats didn't stand there and say: Gee, there is a Republican in the White House. Maybe this will help him look good or maybe this will add two-tenths of 1 percent to the GDP. Maybe we better say no.

No. We said yes because we are a party that believes people need to keep hearth and home together.

The long-term unemployment rate is twice as high as it was at any other time when these extended benefits were allowed to expire. There are almost three unemployed people for every job opening nationwide.

I am going to close with a few little stories from my constituents because one has to hear the voices of people. In this Senate, we should be representing the middle class and the working poor of this country. We should be fighting for them because, guess what, everyone else benefits. The billionaires and millionaires are doing fine. They do better when we have a strong middle class.

The Presiding Officer is a fighter for economic justice, and I know this statistic is something the Senator has probably used many times. But the fact is that 450 families are worth more than 150 million Americans. I can guarantee you, those 450 families are just fine and their children and their grandchildren and their children's children's children. And good for them. Fine. But what about the people who are now cut off at the knees because they are not getting $300 a week to live? Here is one of them. One woman wrote to me:

> I am 58 years old and am receiving unemployment benefits for the first time in my life. I am currently receiving my first federal extension.

Which, by the way, she has now been cut off from.

> I was laid off because the non-profit I was working for lost a major portion of its state funding.
>
> Getting unemployment benefits is not preventing me from looking for work. In fact, people getting extended unemployment benefits are required to prove that they're looking for work. I spend hours every week filling out applications and posting my resume without results.

And then she says to me:

> Tell me, how am I, and thousands like me supposed to pay rent and eat? I agree that Washington should ''focus on job creation'' but that should be in addition to, not instead of, extending benefits. I beg you, please extend unemployment benefits.

Then there is Kaitlyn Smith of Twentynine Palms. She lost her benefit when the Federal extension expired. A Marine Corps veteran and the mother of two, Smith says: Work is hard to come by. They can't move because her husband, a vet of the Afghanistan-Iraq wars, must remain near the combat center until he is discharged in July.

Listen to this:

> I have to keep the house at 55 degrees even though I have two little girls, ages 2½ and 1½.

That is what she told the L.A. Times in December.

How do my Republican friends—except for the one who voted with us at the end of the day—look themselves in the mirror and think about this courageous woman whose family put their life on the line for the country and who is freezing in their home, because they are playing parliamentary games on process?

Last, Cindy Snow of Beaumont:

> Why are they using us as pawns? They're playing games with people's lives.

Referring to politicians in Washington. That appeared in Bloomberg News.

> Laura Walker, a 63-year-old paralegal, has been looking for work since January, when she was laid off from a California law firm. She counted on $450 a week in federal unemployment benefits for help that have now run out.
>
> ''Not all of us have savings and a lot of us have to take care of family because of what happened in the economy,'' said Walker, of Santa Clarita, who said she has applied for a least three jobs a week and shares an apartment with her unemployed son, his wife and two children. ''It's going to put my family and me out on the streets.''

That is from the Bloomberg News of December 30, 2013

> Cindy Snow, of Beaumont, CA, lost her job as a social worker in April when the San Bernardino school system terminated the child-care program where she worked. Her husband, employed in the construction industry, has been without a job since 2009. They have been relying on assistance from the California Housing Finance Agency to cover a $1,424-a-month payment on their home.
>
> When she loses her unemployment benefits, she said, the family will no longer qualify for the housing assistance. ''Why are they using us as pawns? They're playing games with people's lives,'' Snow said, referring to politicians in Washington.

This is also from Bloomberg News of December 30, 2013

> Ethelyn Holmes, a software engineer who lives in Mission Hills, is one of 18,720 San Diego County residents about to lose the weekly payments. Holmes said her $450 weekly unemployment payment goes to food, dental insurance and other living necessities.
>
> Holmes, in her 40s, said she's tried zealously to find work. She's joined the Project Management Institute of San Diego, volunteered, attended meetings, cold called and written letters. Now, she said she'd like to find a retraining program to help her become more marketable. ''. . . I have not been sitting here watching soap operas,'' she said. ''I would go to work tomorrow, or today. I really am tired of this.''

That is from the San Diego Union-Tribune dated December 28, 2013.

Steven Swanson of Madera Ranchos, CA, worked for 33 years in wholesale, mostly in beverage sales, before losing his job in 2011. Since then, he estimates that he's submitted resumes for more than 500 positions and in the last six months filled out more than 200 job applications—all to no avail.

''I want a job, I want to work,'' said Swanson whose daughter and son-in-law live with him and pay rent to help him keep up the mortgage on the house he owns. ''As a taxpayer, I paid into the system for a lot of years. For them to just shut it off and say, 'These people need to get weaned off and get a job'—well, yeah, I need to get a job. But for them to suggest that I just go get welfare or go get food stamps—that's why I'm frustrated with the Republican Party. They just don't get it.''

That is from the Fresno Bee of January 2, 2014.

In addition to helping people get by while they look for jobs, extending unemployment insurance will help the economy.

A new study by the Council of Economic Advisers and the U.S. Department of Labor estimates that extending unemployment insurance will prevent the loss of 240,000 jobs in 2014, including 46,441 in California.

CBO has said that another year-long extension would add two-tenths of a percent to our GDP.

CBO has found that when unemployment is high, extending unemployment insurance is one of the most cost-effective ways to grow the economy and create jobs.

This will help us reduce our deficit in the long term. Already, our annual deficit has been cut in half. For 2009, when President Obama took office, it was $1.4 trillion. For 2013 it was $680 billion, and for 2014 the forecast is only $560 billion.

We are making progress, and extending unemployment benefits will help us grow our GDP and reduce our deficit even more.

So I say to my colleagues, the answer is obvious. Stop blocking this bill. It will save jobs, grow the economy, and provide help to our families while they get on their feet.

There are a lot of games played around here, and sometimes it is time to call the bluff of the people who are playing cruel games. Leader REID called the bluff of my friends on the other side. He said: You want amendments? You got them. You want to pay for this extension? We have done it. What did they do? They walked away. And who is suffering? People like the people I just told you about, ordinary folks who want nothing more than to get a decent job, who are caught in a situation where we are recovering from the worst recession since the Great Depression. And this is what we give them, a bunch of gobbledygook about: I wanted more of my amendments so I can be proud and offer amendments.

There is a time and a place for filibusters, even though they do far too many. There is a time and a place to argue about process. This is not the time. This is not the place. This is wrong. I applaud Leader REID for his leadership. I applaud JACK REED for his leadership.

Before Senator MIKULSKI takes the microphone, I wish to thank her publicly. What a hard job she had to sit down and negotiate an appropriations bill, an omnibus bill which covers everything we do. It was so hard. But she did it in the right spirit of bipartisanship. So did her colleague, whom she dealt with and had to deal with, Congressman ROGERS. As a result, we are going to do something good here and give stability to the American people.

Why can't that same spirit of cooperation take over when we have offered the Republicans everything they wanted in order to get them to vote for unemployment compensation? I am distressed about it, and we will keep fighting on this issue.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). The Senator from Maryland.

CONSOLIDATED APPROPRIATIONS ACT OF 2014

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I rise today to speak on the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2014. But before I make those comments, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from California Mrs. BOXER and also the Senator from Rhode Island Mr. JACK REED and also all of those who voted to move forward where we continue to provide an economic safety net for those people who have lost their job and are actively looking for work, and to continue this economic and social contract which has been part of the way Americans respond to help other Americans at a time when they are down but they shouldn't feel as though they are out. I hope we could put party rancor aside and look at commonsense ways to move this bill forward.

In terms of the so-called pay-fors, I have been here a long time. I have never seen this pay-for before on unemployment compensation, particularly for a 90-day bill. We are talking about 90 days, and we are already in the middle of January. I hope the two leaders can come together and we can resolve this.

On another topic, I wish to report to the Senate some very good news. I rise today as the chair of the Appropriations Committee, and I wish to announce that the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2014 has completed all its work in the committee process. We have completed our conference and it has been filed in the House and should be considered in the House and Senate this week. What does that mean?

First of all, our Appropriations Committee has met the test of the Constitution. Article 1, section 9 of the Constitution directs that there be an Appropriations Committee, although it is not referred to by name, and that every year we review the annual spending of the Federal Government and vote upon it.

We also followed the law. By following the law, the law is the bipartisan Budget Act forged by Chairpersons RYAN and MURRAY. We meet the requirements of the Budget Control Act.

The Budget Control Act looks at total spending for the Federal Government—mandatory spending and then discretionary spending. We who are appropriators handle all of the accounts for discretionary spending. Guess what. The Budget Committee puts a cap on us, and that is great. It is a way that we actually have a cap on spending that everybody knows and everybody voted for.

So we have a cap by law on discretionary spending of $1.012 trillion for fiscal year 2014. The work of our 12 committees stayed within that cap, and yet we spent the money to meet certain areas. We met compelling needs. We certainly preserved national security. We looked out for our human capital, particularly our children in terms of education, and also invested in physical capital—improving infrastructure—and also the long-range needs of our country by putting public investments into important research and development by $1 billion more in NIH.

We also met the mandate of the American people who told us: Work together. Be bipartisan. Work across the aisle and work across the dome. And we did it. They also said: When the bill comes up, don't do it with brinkmanship and don't do it with showmanship. Get the job done in a commonsense way which promotes growth in our country but yet at the same time looks at reducing debt.

They said: Don't do showdown politics. And we won't. We will pass it because we have met our deadline.

They said: Don't put government on autopilot with something called those continuing funding resolutions. We don't do that either. Every one of our 12 subcommittees is in this comprehensive bill.

We dealt with difficult and divisive policy issues, but we did it with diligence and determination. And, I must add, we tried to promote an atmosphere of civility as we did it. It was tense and it was intense. But at the end of the day, we did work pinpointing how to do the job rather than finger-pointing at each other. As I said, negotiations were conducted that way.

Our House Appropriations Committee chairman—Mr. HAL ROGERS, the gentleman from Kentucky—and I forged this agreement, along with ranking members, my vice chairman Senator SHELBY of Alabama and in the House Congresswoman LOWEY of New York. We didn't do it alone. There was bipartisan agreement of all the subcommittee chairs and over 50 Members of the House and the Senate.

We met a very stringent deadline. When we left here on December 20, we had to produce a bill by January 15. That is tomorrow. That is when the

continuing resolution expires. We are asking for a 72-hour extension, not to finish the job, but so we can do our deliberations on the floor in both the House and the Senate.

We worked day and night. I jokingly said during the deliberations: I wish I were as thin as I am stretched, because we really worked at it. Over the holidays our staffs and our subcommittee chairmen worked. The only time they took off was Christmas Eve and Christmas Day. So we thank each and every one of them for their dedication.

As I said, this bill required very difficult choices. It meant give and take. It meant more giving on both sides, because there were no big takes.

We worked under a very tight budget, $1 trillion. It sounds like a lot of money, and it is. But of the $1 trillion, $600 billion was in the Department of Defense. The other $300 billion was in discretionary spending for all of the domestic agencies. It comes out to like 620 and 380, but those are the rough numbers.

So we did meet our national security needs, but we also were very mindful. I was particularly mindful of the social contract with the American people. I wanted to have a bill to help create jobs in this country, not make-work but real work, in rebuilding our physical infrastructure on roads and bridges and clean water. I also wanted to look ahead to the long-range needs of our country, in research and discoveries, and not only win the Nobel prizes but win the markets. We expanded our commercial service office to help us promote exports overseas, accelerating manufacturing institutes where government could work with this new emerging dynamic, small-scale manufacturing. I have lost over 12 percent of manufacturing in my State, so manufacturing is important.

We wanted to make sure that families felt they had a government that is on their side—first of all, helping with school safety—and we have a bipartisan program in here to promote school safety—but at the same time to promote quality childcare and early childhood education. We then made those kinds of investments, all with an eye to getting value for taxpayers.

Our colleagues were very clear, and so were the American people: We have to have a more frugal eye. I instructed my colleagues on the Senate side: Let's look at those programs which are dated, duplicative, or dysfunctional. They get a D: dated, duplicative, and dysfunctional. We were able to eliminate many of them, and we will be back at it next year doing a scrub. If you notice, there is no atmosphere of crisis.

The other thing that I am proud of in this bill is that we avoided contentious policy riders. I think we have been able to deal with those in a way where they would not be a problem for the other side of the aisle.

However, there was one item wrong or one technical mistake in the Budget Committee that I am proud that we were able to fix. This was really at the very top of our agenda, when Mr. ROGERS and I met. We were deeply concerned about the cost-of-living issue related to military retirees of working age who were disabled or survivors. Their COLAs were mistakenly reduced by 1 percent in the recent budget agreement. This bill, the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2014, fixes that problem.

It is limited in scope. It is limited to disabled military retirees and survivors of departed servicemembers—the neediest of the needy. We hope, as time moves on, there is a Presidential and DOD commission on pension reform at DOD, and we will have a comprehensive approach and do it. But I want our colleagues to know we were very mindful of these veterans. So we did this fix for military retirees of working age who were disabled or survivors of departed servicemembers, but we also did something else.

If you go to the Web site in the House, which has the most detail because it is pending there—it will come up in the Senate when it moves here tomorrow—we really put money into veterans health care. We put money into fixing the veterans disability backlog. I know the Senator from Massachusetts believes that when you are on the front lines you should not have to wait at the back of the line if you are a wounded warrior to get your disability benefits determined. So we pushed for those reforms, and we put the taxpayers' dollars behind them because we knew that is the way they would want us to spend their money.

We also maintained the veterans education budget because many of our young men and women coming back home who served so well over there need to brush up on education here to move them to jobs here.

I hope in voting for this bill people realize it is a vote to support our most vulnerable patriots, to make sure we keep our promises to our veterans, and that we also look at the comprehensive bill that we have moved ahead without rancor, without roar, and we stayed within the budget parameters given to us on a bipartisan agreement.

The House will consider this agreement this week. They have sent us over a 3-day extension so we could complete our work. I hope we pass it. I would like it to pass tonight or certainly tomorrow. We will be on the floor for ample debate on this bill, and I look forward to answering some questions.

But at the end of the day, when all is said and done—in this institution often more is said rather than done—you will know we did get it done. I will have more to say about it when the bill comes to the floor.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I thank my colleagues from Minnesota and North Dakota who are on the floor. I know they want to enter into a colloquy, but they have been gracious to allow me 1 minute on a separate subject, which is flood insurance. I thank them so much.

Before I start, I congratulate the Chair of the Appropriations Committee, who not only understands the issues in a major piece of legislation, from science to space to technology to defense to homeland security to education, and really keeps so much of that in her mind and her heart, but she also can explain this important bill to us in a way that everyone can understand.

The Senator from Maryland is truly a champion and a treasure in the Senate. Before she leaves the floor I want to acknowledge her extraordinary leadership. It is a very tough time to find common ground, but she has found it with her Republican colleagues. I hope we can get this bill through the floor of the Senate in the next 2 or 3 days.

Let me say for one moment how important it is to pass this extraordinary appropriations bill, which many of us have been working on for over a year, literally, in public hearings and meetings, negotiating with our Republican colleagues. Of course, in the last month these high-level negotiations have been going on. We hope to be on that bill sometime tomorrow. Leader REID has expressed that we will not be leaving for the break next week without getting that work done.

I am prepared—all of us are here—to handle that business. But there is another piece of legislation of which, Madam President, you have been a cosponsor, and Senator HOEVEN, who is on the floor, has been an extraordinary leader on, and that is to fix our well-intended but disastrous flood insurance program referred to as Biggert-Waters, which was passed a year ago with very good intentions, but it has had disastrous consequences in Massachusetts, South Dakota, Louisiana, Texas, Montana, and in Pennsylvania.

This is not a coastal issue. This is an issue that affects millions of Americans owning their own homes, their primary homes, and business owners—solidly middle-class people who do not live anywhere near a beach and people whose homes have never flooded.

They found themselves, because of the unintended consequences of this well-intentioned law, in a terrible circumstance in which they may actually lose their home and lose their business. We can fix that. The great news is we have a bill that is being led by Senator MENENDEZ from New Jersey and Senator ISAKSON from Georgia. It is truly bipartisan. We have almost 30 cosponsors in the Senate. While it has been difficult to find common ground, we have worked very hard to find it. I am here on the floor to say to our knowledge we have pretty much worked out most of the objections on all sides.

We think there might be amendments that are wanted to be offered by Senator TOOMEY, Senator COBURN, Senator CRAPO, and on our side Senator

HAGAN and Senator MERKLEY. We are working through that now.

The amendment of Senator BLUNT we believe can be incorporated into the bill. The amendment of Senator TESTER can be incorporated into the base of the bill with no harm to the underlying balance of the bill.

I come to the floor to say to everyone, we are really making progress. We could work on these few amendments in the next hour, and the leaders might be able to ask unanimous consent for us to get on this bill in the morning and actually finish it before we go on appropriations. If everyone will cooperate just a little bit more on this, we could have several amendments and limit the time to 30 minutes of debate on each amendment. We would end up with about 6 or so amendments, and we could fit this into tomorrow morning's work.

That is my hope. If we do not, then we are going to have to stay here, I think, even after the appropriations bill to get this. I don't know about you, Madam Chair, but I just cannot go home again without getting this fixed. We have been working on this patiently. We have had hearings. We have had meetings. We have had press conferences. We have a coalition of over 200 organizations.

We have worked with the House in strong partnership. They will be ready to act when they get back on our bill. If we can get a strong vote of 70 Senators—which we are hoping for, maybe more—that will send a very strong signal to the House of Representatives. This bill has no score—a zero cost to this bill, zero. It doesn't repeal Biggert-Waters, it postpones it until we can fix it, and it gives us the impetus to fix it.

Let's work hard in the next hour or so. I really thank Senator ISAKSON for working so hard—the Senator from Georgia—for trying to clear the objections that are on his side, and Senator MENENDEZ and his staff for working on our side.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Louisiana for her work on the flood insurance bill. I am pleased to join her in that effort. It is very important. I hope we do have an opportunity to address that this week. We will continue to do all we can to help in that endeavor. Again, I thank her for all her work on that very important legislation.

(The remarks of Mr. HOEVEN and Ms. KLOBUCHAR pertaining to the introduction of S. 1925 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OMNIBUS SPENDING PACKAGE

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I stand before this body today to talk about the omnibus spending package the Senate will be considering over the next few days. I have some concerns related to this omnibus spending package that relate to a program called PILT. It is an acronym with which most Americans and probably even most Members of Congress are not familiar. It stands for payment in lieu of taxes.

The program was developed to help those States, including my home State of Utah, in which the vast majority of the land is owned by the Federal Government. Beside me is a map of the United States. In red we can see all of the land that is owned by the Federal Government. As we can see by looking at the map, most of the land west of the Rocky Mountains—more than 50 percent, in fact—is owned by the Federal Government. Very little of the land east of the Rocky Mountains is, by contrast, owned by the Federal Government.

Being from a public land State presents some interesting, very significant, very substantial challenges. Among those challenges is the fact that the Federal Government has deemed this land, has legislated this land as being beyond the ability, beyond the authority of States and their political subdivisions—including counties and local taxing jurisdictions—beyond the ability of the States and their subdivisions to tax. So we can't collect property tax revenue from any of that land. As a result, a lot of our communities in public land States are impoverished—at least impoverished relative to what they might otherwise face. They are impoverished relative to what their ability would be to collect revenue through property taxes in public land States.

For that reason, this PILT Program was created to try to offset—at least to some degree—the heavy cost, the disproportionate burden that is placed on the shoulders of public land States and communities.

So each year Congress funds this program, and that program then partially offsets the lack of property tax revenue flowing through these public land States and communities.

Here is the problem I wish to focus on today: The omnibus spending package we are considering this week contains no funding for PILT—no funding whatsoever. This is potentially devastating to public land States, including Utah, Wyoming, Alaska, Montana, and many other States, especially those throughout the West. The problem is that America's public land States and counties can't wait any longer. This program must be funded, and it must be funded in this bill.

Here is a letter from a commissioner in Piute County, UT. This commissioner states:

> PILT not being funded in 2014 will have a devastating impact on all counties in the West, but it is particularly devastating to a county the size of Piute. With 74 percent of Piute County under Federal control, $225,000 of our $1 million budget—almost one-fourth—comes in the form of PILT payments from the Federal Government. Without this funding, we will be in the midst of one of the biggest disasters to hit Piute County in years.
>
> We have been scraping and scraping to try to figure out how to fund a fourth deputy sheriff in our county and thought we had it figured out until this $225,000 evaporated from our county's revenue.
>
> At the present time it is virtually impossible to staff all of the police, search and rescue, and emergency services we need. With this cut, it will be impossible.

The Piute County commissioner continues:

> We will be forced to abandon services, including all services on public lands. It will be sad to have our public lands left without police, search and rescue, and emergency services. I think it is critical to understand that the loss of PILT funding cuts clear to the bone and will be devastating to counties such as Piute.

Now, some argue—some insist when faced with arguments such as these—that this is all OK and we can just wait to make PILT funding available, that we will make it available through another legislative vehicle we will supposedly pass later this year. In fact, some of these same people maintain that we will make it better, we will make it automatic, we will make it mandatory spending when we actually do this later this year.

It is true that between 2008 and 2013 PILT was funded through a mandatory spending mechanism. That has now expired. But it is important to remember that there is nothing mutually exclusive about these ideas; no reason why we can't go ahead and fund PILT now with discretionary spending and then adopt something later to restore the mandatory nature of funding for PILT. We can fund PILT now in this bill, and then we can make it mandatory later. We can and we should. This would give States and counties the certainty they need, the certainty they have been waiting for, the certainty that will allow them, finally, to plan their budgets.

Remember, for many of these counties, such as Piute County, UT, PILT is a substantial portion of their annual revenue stream. It is about one-fourth of the money that Piute County, UT, has to spend every single year.

Importantly, I offered an amendment to last year's budget that would build a deficit-neutral reserve fund to make sure PILT continued to be fully funded. That amendment passed. Unfortunately, the fact that it passed has apparently not been enough to make sure it continued to be funded.

Now we have a major funding bill before us. This spending bill occupies no fewer than 1,582 pages. It spends in excess of $1.1 trillion. Yet PILT still isn't funded.

It is important to point out that even if we do the right thing and even if we fully fund PILT in this program this year, the PILT Program is itself still not adequate. It is still in need of reform. PILT payments are quite insufficient.

PILT was intended to soften the economic impact associated with the Federal Government owning so much of the land in the United States. In the case of Piute County, it is about three-fourths of the land. It is about two-thirds of the land throughout the State of Utah. In some counties in Utah, it is well in excess of 90, sometimes 95 percent of the land in a county. PILT was designed to soften that economic impact. But, regrettably, the Federal Government gives States, through the PILT Program, what amounts to in many instances only pennies on the dollar of what the taxing jurisdictions would receive if they were to tax that land, if they were to collect taxes—even if they were to collect those taxes at the lowest property tax rate, let's say the Greenbelt rate in many counties. We must correct that imbalance.

In the coming days I plan to introduce legislation to begin the process of doing precisely that. After all, it makes no sense to have a program that some would argue is deceptively entitled ''Payment In Lieu of Taxes'' if, in fact, the payment in lieu of taxes doesn't even closely approximate the value that counties would receive if they were actually allowed to tax that land and collect that revenue as taxes.

If an American citizen, a U.S. taxpayer, for example, decided to adopt his or her own PILT Program and on April 15 of each year just sent a check to the IRS saying: These are not my taxes, but this is my payment in lieu of taxes; I am just paying what I feel like paying, that would cause problems. The taxpayer in question would probably end up in prison. In any event, it wouldn't end well for the taxpayer. Yet we have allowed the Federal Government to get away with this over and over, often to the detriment of vulnerable communities, of poor communities, of communities that rely on the Federal Government's unsteady stream of revenue—a stream of revenue that, insufficient as it is already, is now being threatened altogether.

In a sense the problem we face with the Federal Government owning all this land is not new. It is a problem that has been around for a long time. In many respects it was a problem envisioned by some of the Founding Fathers. In fact, we can go all the way back to the Constitutional Convention of 1787 and see that it was on the minds of some of the Founding Fathers.

On September 5, 1787, at the Constitutional Convention they were discussing the public land-related authorities in the Constitution, including the authority that has now been included in what is often referred to as the enclave clause—article I, section 8, clause 17.

One of the delegates to the Federal Convention of 1787, Elbridge Gerry, the delegate from Massachusetts, stood before the Convention and made an astute observation. Mr. Gerry said as follows. He expressed concerns that ''this power''—that is, the power of Congress over Federal public lands—''might be made use of to enslave any particular State by buying up its territory, and that the strongholds proposed would be a means of awing the State into an undue obedience to the General Government.''

Then, as now, wise observations often came from the State of Massachusetts. Then, as now, we have a grave risk associated with the fact that when the Federal Government owns this much land, the Federal Government has this much power. It was on the minds of the delegates to the Convention of 1787 that one of the things they needed to protect against was the concentration of too much power in the hands of a few, especially the concentration of too much power within the Federal Government. Each of them had a mission to protect the sovereignty of their respective States. And they understood that if Congress had too much power to simply buy up too much land in any one State—disproportionately in some States—the Federal Government would have too much influence within that State.

I would ask you, when you look at this map I have in the Chamber, does that look equitable? Does that look like an equitable distribution of Federal land ownership? We have to keep in mind that, just as there are benefits associated with some of our public lands, there are also burdens attached to those benefits. When you look at those burdens, it is difficult to say anything other than that they are disproportionately allocated into a certain region of the United States. They are overwhelmingly located within the Rocky Mountains and areas west of the Rocky Mountains.

So to the extent these benefits benefit everyone in the United States, then the burdens ought to be shared by everyone in the United States as well. Yet they are not. PILT, again, is woefully inadequate as it is. But now Congress is trying to withdraw funding for PILT. Even though some may say: Well, we will fund it later this year, we have no guarantee of that, and we should be funding it right now.

As an interesting side note, in response to Elbridge Gerry's concern on September 5, 1787, the Founding Fathers put a qualifying clause into article I, section 8, clause 17. They said that Congress's plenary legislative jurisdiction over Federal public land lying within a sovereign State's boundaries would exist and could be exercised only if that land—the land in question—was acquired by the consent of the host State's legislature.

Some have suggested that this may well mean that when the Federal Government owns land, when it acquires land within a sovereign State's territorial boundaries, that it owns that land just as any other proprietor would own it; that is, subject to the authority of the State and its political subdivisions to tax and regulate that land, unless or until such time as the host State's legislative body parts with that bundle of sovereign rights relative to that land. In other words, the State retains its taxing power over that land unless or until it voluntarily relinquishes it, gives it up, hands it over to the Federal Government. Yet, in nearly all instances where you see red on this map, that has not occurred.

Many of these States have been content with the fact that they have been receiving PILT funds, however inadequate those PILT funds may be. But now even those are going away. Even if there is a promise that they might be restored later—later this year—they are still inadequate, and we still do not have the promise that is going to occur now. There is still a lot of uncertainty in a lot of parts of the country—in places such as Piute County, UT, and elsewhere within my State and elsewhere within the western United States.

In order to protect against this kind of concern, the kind of concern that the delegate from Massachusetts described on September 5, 1787, Congress adopted a practice, when admitting new States into the Union, of incorporating language into the enabling act for each new State, describing what would happen to public land within the new State's boundaries after statehood. They adopted this practice and this language that would be used each time a new State was admitted into the Union.

That language was included in Utah's statehood enabling legislation—legislation that was adopted about 18 months before Utah finally came into the Union in January of 1896.

Section 9 of Utah's enabling legislation says that public land located within the State, lying within the State of Utah, ''shall be sold by the United States subsequent to the admission of said State into the Union. . . . '' Adding to that, section 9 of Utah's enabling legislation said that 5 percent of the proceeds from the sale of that land would be given to the State and would be held in a trust fund by that State for the benefit of the State's public education system.

So, as I mentioned, Utah was not the first State to have that kind of language in its enabling legislation. Many of the States that were admitted into the Union much earlier than Utah had similar language in their enabling acts. Missouri had such language. North Dakota had such language. We could name State after State after State that had such language.

When you look at Missouri, when you look at North Dakota, and when you look at most of the other States that had language such as that in their enabling acts, you see very little Federal

public land. You see because Congress and the Federal Government honored the promises made to those States. Congress followed through with that commitment. Congress did what it was supposed to do. It sold that land subsequent to statehood. Holding on perhaps to a few parcels here and there that it deemed necessary for one reason or another, it made good on that promise. Those States benefited. The Federal Treasury benefited. The American people benefited.

It is important to remember that what we are talking about here—when you see all this red on the map, representing Federal land ownership—is not about national parks. National parks represent a very tiny percentage of Federal land ownership. We are not talking about national monuments, which also represents a very tiny percentage of Federal land ownership. What we are talking about in the context of the PILT program are lands that are managed by the U.S. Bureau of Land Management, an agency that is considered obscure, almost unheard of throughout most of the United States, but an agency that operates with a particularly dominant force in States such as mine, where you see a lot of red on the map.

I remember the first time I showed this map to my children, my daughter Eliza, who was about 8 years old at the time, was just barely old enough to understand what I was explaining to her. I told her that the red indicated ownership of land by our national government. And 8-year-old Eliza looked at that portion of the map that represented our State, and she said: Look, dad, they own Utah. I said: You're right, Eliza, they own Utah. They certainly own the overwhelming majority of it.

Some of us have not forgotten this promise made in the statehood enabling acts of most of the States admitted into the Union, and yet Congress seems to be determined to overlook it. I am determined not to let that happen. Some of my friends back in Utah are likewise determined not to let that happen.

A good friend of mine, Representative Ken Ivory, who serves in the Utah State legislature, has done an amazing job educating people throughout Utah and, in fact, across America on this very subject, on what happened with these statehood enabling acts, and why it is that States in the western United States got left behind when it came to promises made long ago by the Federal Government. I commend Representative Ivory for his work on this issue and pledge to continue working with him on this important project.

You see, this is about much more than land. This is about the ability of local communities not only to thrive, but to survive. This is about communities where it is very difficult for people to get jobs. It is very difficult for people, in some instances, even to access their own property, even to access their own farms because it is impossible to get anywhere without crossing Federal public land and in some instances Federal land managers will block access to the only roads they can use to access their own property. This has to stop.

In the meantime, it is vitally important that we focus on the issues at hand, that we focus, at a bare minimum, on promises that the Federal Government has extended in lieu of the other promises. That is not to say we are going to forget about the promises made in the statehood enabling acts. We are not. But, for the moment, my attention remains focused on making sure we fund the PILT Program. It has to be funded. In fact, it has to be funded even more than it has been in the past. It ought to reflect at least a rough equivalent of the amount of money the taxing jurisdiction could collect if it were taxing that land at its lowest rate. And, at a bare minimum, even below that, we have to make sure the program continues to exist. We have to make sure the program is funded at least at its current levels. This is not asking much. But it is necessary that we do this.

The broken PILT Program is, one could argue, just another example of government applying significant and unnecessary weight to the shoulders of hard-working Americans, many of whom are struggling just to get by, many of whom are barely able to keep food on the table for their families, others of whom are able to provide for the day-to-day needs of their families but they are worried about what happens next. They find that whenever they find a little bit of additional income, no sooner have they earned it than they find it has been swallowed up—swallowed up by increasing taxes, swallowed up by higher prices for goods and for services, and they do not know how to get out of this rut in which they find themselves somewhat trapped. These are the kinds of people who suffer the most as a result of the Federal Government's failed policies relative to its Federal public land.

We have to remember that lifting these weights is not only within the government's power, it is the affirmative obligation of government to lift those weights. In an 1861 address to Congress, President Abraham Lincoln said the ''leading object'' of American government was ''to elevate the condition of men—to lift artificial weights from all shoulders, to clear the paths of laudable pursuit for all, to afford all an unfettered start and a fair chance, in the race of life.''

Current PILT policy imposes government waste that makes it more difficult for communities to provide important services such as schools, police, and fire departments. It hampers the ability of States to budget, plan, and provide for infrastructure improvements, make needed reforms to their tax systems, and attract new businesses and new jobs.

This policy—and the Federal land management policies that accompany the PILT policy more generously—is broken, and it is imposing a heavy burden on our communities, particularly in rural areas where the Federal Government owns much, most or in some cases nearly all of the land and where needs are at their very greatest.

The program is already broken. The program is already causing millions and millions of Americans to suffer. The program is already severely impeding economic opportunity for Americans, deepening the existing crisis of opportunity that we have in this country, which manifests itself on three different levels: immobility among the poor, insecurity among the middle class, and cronyist privilege at the top.

If you live in one of these States, it might be great if you are one of those people who owns one of the few parcels of land that is not owned by the Federal Government. It is not so great if you live in one of the areas where the Federal Government owns basically everything, where you can do very little anywhere around you without permission from the Federal Government, where your local government is barely able to survive because it lacks a property tax base, and the Federal Government fails to adequately fund PILT and threatens—in this circumstance—to withdraw funding from PILT altogether.

I respectfully implore all of my colleagues to consider the inequities inherent in this map, the inequities inherent in the PILT Program, and, for present purposes, to remember we need to fund PILT.

It has to be reformed, absolutely, and we have to examine our Federal land ownership and management policies more broadly. Today we need to focus on making sure PILT is funded.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IRAN

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I come to the floor this evening to discuss an issue of national security, and that is how to prevent a nuclear armed Iran.

I was thinking about our troubled history with Iran and whether more sanctions at this time makes sense for our national security interests, and I asked myself these questions:

Can, in fact, a country like Iran change?

Is it possible for an isolated regime to rejoin the community of nations and change its behavior after several decades?

Must a country and its people be held captive because of the behavior of previous leaders in earlier times?

So I thought back in history. I was a young girl during World War II. I remember when Imperial Japan killed millions in Southeast Asia, and particularly in China, during its brutal wars of expansion. Today, Japan is a peaceful democracy and one of this Nation's strongest allies in Asia.

I remember when Hitler and the German Third Reich committed unspeakable atrocities across Europe, including the murder of 6 million Jewish citizens. Germany is now a close ally, a leader in the European Union, an institution created to ensure a war never again occurs in Europe.

I remember General Franco's Spain, which was so diplomatically and economically isolated that it was actually barred from the United Nations until 1955. Spain is now a close partner of the United States and a fully democratic member of the European Union.

The former Yugoslavia, Vietnam, and South Africa have all experienced tremendous change in recent decades. Independent states have emerged from the painful dissolution of Yugoslavia. Vietnam has opened itself to the international community but still has much progress to make. South Africa has shed apartheid and has emerged as an increasingly stable nation on a much divided continent.

So I believe countries can change. This capacity to change also applies to the pursuit of nuclear weapons. At one time, Sweden, South Korea, and Argentina each pursued nuclear weapons.

Following World War II, Sweden pursued nuclear weapons to deter foreign attack. It mastered nuclear technology and built and tested components for a nuclear weapon. It may have even obtained enough nuclear material to build a bomb. But in 1970, it signed the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, and it ended its nuclear weapon program.

In the early 1970s, South Korea actively sought a nuclear device. The United States heavily pressured South Korea not to go nuclear, and in April 1975, South Korea signed the nonproliferation treaty and halted its nuclear weapons activity.

Throughout the 1980s, when it was ruled by a military junta with an egregious human rights record, Argentina had a covert nuclear weapons program. It built uranium production, enrichment, and reprocessing facilities, and it attempted to develop nuclear-capable ballistic missiles before abandoning its nuclear weapons program and ratifying the NPT in 1995.

So the question comes, is Iran willing to change its past behavior and abandon its pursuit of a nuclear weapon? It may well be, and it is the job of diplomacy to push for that change.

I believe there are positive signs that Iran is interested in such a change, and I would like to explain my reasons.

The election of Hassan Rouhani was a surprise to many long-time observers of Iran because he campaigned in support of repairing Iran's relationship with the West.

Since his inauguration he has tried to do exactly that. For the first time since the Iranian revolution, the leaders of our countries have been in direct communication with each other. Where once direct contact even between senior officials was rare, now Secretary of State John Kerry and Under Secretary of State Wendy Sherman are in near constant contact with their Iranian counterparts. Those conversations produced the historic Geneva agreement which goes into effect in 6 days, on January 20.

Candidate Rouhani also promised to increase nuclear transparency, and he has delivered on that as well. Even before the Geneva interim agreement was reached, Iran slowed uranium enrichment and construction for the Arak heavy water reactor—maybe for technical reasons, maybe not, but it slowed. Iran has also reengaged with the IAEA to resolve questions surrounding its nuclear activities.

So what has been achieved in Geneva? The interim 6-month agreement reached between the P5+1 countries, the United States, China, Russia, the UK, France, Germany, freezes Iran's nuclear program in place while a comprehensive agreement is negotiated in the next 6 months. This agreement caps Iran's stockpile of enriched uranium at 5 percent. It stops the production of 20 percent enriched uranium. It requires the neutralization of Iran's stockpile of 20 percent uranium. It prevents Iran from installing additional centrifuges or operating its most advanced centrifuges. It prohibits it from stockpiling excess centrifuges. It halts all significant work at the Arak heavy water reactor and prevents Iran from constructing a plutonium reprocessing facility.

Most importantly, the interim agreement imposes the most intrusive international inspection regime ever. International inspectors will independently verify whether Iran is complying with the interim agreement. For the first time, the International Atomic Energy Agency inspectors will have uninterrupted access to Iran's enrichment facilities at Natanz and Fordow, centrifuge production plants, centrifuge assembly facilities, and Iran's uranium mines and mills. Finally, Iran is required to declare all planned new nuclear facilities.

In exchange, the P5+1 negotiators offered sanctions relief limited to $7 billion, an aspect of the interim agreement that has been criticized and I wish to talk about it for a moment.

Here are the facts on that sanctions relief which, in my view, does not materially alter the biting sanctions which have devastated Iran's economy. The vast majority of sanctions relief comes in the form of Iranian repatriation of $4.2 billion of its own money. Iran will continue to lose $4 billion to $5 billion a month in lost oil revenue from existing sanctions. Iran will not have access to about $100 billion of its own reserves trapped by sanctions abroad.

For perspective, the total estimated sanctions relief is valued at approximately only 1 percent of the Iranian economy, hardly a significant amount.

I wish to take a moment to detail what is not in the interim agreement.

First, it does not grant Iran a right to enrich. The United States does not recognize such a right for the five nonnuclear weapons states that currently have enrichment programs, and we will make no exception for Iran. But Iran does have a right to peaceful nuclear energy if it fully abides by the terms of its safeguards agreement under the NPT.

Secondly, the agreement does not in any way unravel our core oil and financial sanctions. Others have argued the suspension of any sanctions against Iran will unravel the entire sanctions regime, and that is false. The Obama administration has taken action to ensure that does not happen.

Two days after the interim agreement was reached, the United States settled with a Swiss Oil Services Company over sanctions violations. The settlement was more than $250 million. It was the largest against a foreign firm outside of the banking industry.

On December 12, the administration announced the expansion of Iranian entities subject to sanctions. These entities either helped Tehran evade sanctions or provided support to Iran's nuclear program.

On January 7 of this year, the administration halted the transfer of two Boeing airplane engines from Turkey to Iran. Through these actions, the Obama administration has made it abundantly clear that the United States will continue to enforce our existing sanctions against Iran.

Third, the agreement does not codify the violation of U.N. security resolutions. Critics have attacked the interim agreement for its failure to completely halt all of Iran's nuclear enrichment by noting that six U.N. Security Council Resolutions have called on Tehran to do so and it has not done so.

The purpose of the U.N. Resolutions was not to suspend nuclear enrichment indefinitely. Instead, these resolutions were designed to freeze Iran's nuclear activities until the IAEA could determine whether Iran's activities were for exclusively peaceful purposes.

This is an important point. The interim agreement achieves what the six U.N. Security Council Resolutions could not. It freezes Iran's nuclear progress while a comprehensive, verifiable agreement is being negotiated over the next 6 months.

The interim agreement was only possible because a strong international sanctions regime has worked to convince rank-and-file Iranians, candidly, that enough is enough.

According to the State Department, as a result of the sanctions, Iran's crude oil exports have plummeted from approximately 2.5 million barrels per day in 2011 to around 1 million barrels per day in recent months. This decline

alone costs Iran $3 billion to $5 billion per month in lost revenue.

In total, 23 nations who import Iranian oil have eliminated or significantly reduced purchases from Iran. In fact, Iran currently has only six customers for its oil: China, India, Turkey, South Korea, Japan, and Taiwan.

In the last year, Iran's gross domestic product shrunk by 5.8 percent. Its GDP shrunk in 1 year by 5.8 percent, while inflation is estimated to be 50 percent or more.

Prices for food and consumer goods are doubling and tripling on an annual basis, and estimates put unemployment as high as 35 percent while underemployment is pervasive.

This is why Iran says enough is enough. The sanctions are biting and they are biting deeply, and there is no need to put additional sanctions on the table at this time.

This body may soon consider the Nuclear Weapon Free Iran Act; that is, a bill to do exactly the opposite, to impose additional sanctions against Iran, do it now, and hold it in abeyance.

Before casting a vote, Senators should ask themselves what would happen if the bill passes and a promised veto by the President is not sustained. I would like to give my view.

I sincerely believe the P5+1 negotiations with Iran would end and, with it, the best opportunity in more than 30 years to make a major change in Iranian behavior—a change that could not only open all kinds of economic opportunities for the Iranian people, but help change the course of a nation. Its destiny in fact could be changed.

Passing additional sanctions now would only play into the hands of those in Iran who are most eager to see diplomacy fail. Iranian conservatives, hardliners, will attack President Rouhani and Foreign Minister Zarif for seeking a nuclear compromise.

They will argue that Iran exchanged a freeze of its nuclear program for additional and harsh punitive sanctions. Think about that. They will say that Iran did not achieve anything with this agreement. All we got were more sanctions.

Second, if the United States cannot honor an interim agreement negotiated in Geneva by Russia, China, France, Germany, the UK and ourselves—we are not alone in this—it will never lift sanctions after a final agreement is reached.

Above all, they will argue that the United States is not interested in nuclear diplomacy—we are interested in regime change.

The bottom line: If this body passes S. 1881, diplomatic negotiations will collapse, and there will be no final agreement.

Some might want that result, but I do not.

Iran's nuclear program would once again be unrestrained, and the only remaining option to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon would be military action. I do not want that unless it is absolutely necessary.

To date, the prospect of just considering this bill has prompted Iranian legislators to consider retaliation. There is talk that the legislative branch, called the Majles, may move to increase nuclear enrichment far beyond the 5-percent limit in the interim agreement and much closer to, if not achieving, weapons-grade uranium.

So the authors of additional sanctions in this body and Iranian hardliners in the other body would actually combine to blow up the diplomatic effort of 6 major powers.

The bill's sponsors have argued that sanctions would strengthen the United State's hand in negotiations. They argue that sanctions brought Iran to the negotiating table in the first place. They contend that additional sanctions would force Iran to abandon its nuclear program.

I could not disagree more.

Let me give the views of a few other people who are knowledgeable in the arena: Dr. Paul Pillar, a former U.S. intelligence official and current professor at Georgetown University recently argued:

> It is the prospect of having U.S.-led sanctions removed that will convince Iran to accept severe restrictions on its nuclear program. Threatening Iran with additional sanctions now—after it has agreed to the interim agreement and an interim agreement is about to go into effect—will not convince Tehran to complete a final agreement.

I couldn't agree more.

If this bill would help our negotiators, as its authors contend, they would say so.

I believe this bill is an egregious imposition on the Executive's authority to conduct foreign affairs. In fact, our Secretary of State has formally asked this Congress to give our negotiators and our experts the time and space to do their jobs, including no new sanctions.

What does this body say, sitting here? We are not going to do that? This is a Secretary of State who is of this body, Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who has been absolutely prodigious in his efforts to get this interim agreement, has gotten it, and we are going to run the risk that it is going to break apart during the next 6 months when a final agreement might well be negotiated?

If the Senate imposes its will, if we override the President's veto, and it blows up this very fragile process, some would say: Too bad, what a tragedy.

We know what the Iranian reaction will be. The Iranian Foreign Minister Zarif, who I happen to have known for a substantial period of time, has clearly stated what the result will be in five words, and it is this: ''The entire deal is dead.''

That is his direct quote. Why wouldn't we take him at his word? So far he has been good to his word.

The ambassador of our staunchest ally, the UK, warned this body not to pass more sanctions. Sir Peter Westmacott recently wrote:

> Further sanctions now would only hurt negotiations and risk eroding international support for the sanctions that have brought us this far. The time for additional measures will come if Iran reneges on the deal or negotiations fail. Now is not that time.

I deeply believe that a vote for this legislation will cause negotiations to collapse. The United States, not Iran, then becomes the party that risks fracturing the international coalition that has enabled our sanctions to succeed in the first place.

It says to the UK, China, Russia, France, and Germany that our country cannot be trusted to stand behind our diplomatic commitments. That is a very big statement.

Our allies will question whether their compliance with sanctions and the economic sacrifices they have made are for naught.

Should these negotiations fall apart, the choices are few and the most likely result, in my view, is the eventual and inevitable use of military force.

So I ask this body, Is that the choice we want to make? In 6 days the tentative agreement will go into place. We want to pass this? We don't even want to wait and see what happens?

We don't even want to wait and see what the IAEA finds when they are in there 24–7, 365 days a year?

I think what we ought to do is concentrate on Iranian compliance with the interim agreement.

On January 20, 2014, this agreement comes into effect, 6 days from now, and over the next 6 months the international community will be able to verify whether or not Iran is keeping its commitments to freeze its nuclear progress.

If Iran fails to abide by the terms of the interim agreement, or if a final agreement cannot be negotiated, Congress can immediately consider additional sanctions.

I deeply believe that additional sanctions should only be considered once our diplomatic track has been given the opportunity to forge a final, comprehensive, and binding agreement.

This is what is most distressing. If we had not reached an agreement, with the cooperation and leadership of the big powers of this world, that would be one thing. The fact is we have reached agreement and that action is just about to take place, and we are going to jaundice it, we are going to hurt it, and we are likely to collapse it by passing additional sanctions now which a President of the United States will veto with the aim of overriding that veto.

How does that make any kind of common sense? It defies logic, it threatens instant reverse, and it ends what has been unprecedented diplomacy. Do we want to take that on our shoulders? Candidly, in my view, it is a march toward war.

As Chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, I know the challenges Iran poses to U.S. interests around the world.

I see the majority leader is on the floor.

Would the majority leader like me to cease for a moment?

Mr. REID. Go ahead and finish.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. As I said, as Chairman of the Intelligence Committee, I know the challenges Iran poses to the U.S. interests around the world. Its patronage of the terrorist group Hezbollah, its support for Syria's Bashar Assad through the Revolutionary Guard Corps are two of the most troubling.

I would hope that as a followthrough of diplomacy we might be able to quell some of these activities.

Let me acknowledge Israel's real, well-founded concerns that a nuclear-armed Iran would threaten its very existence. I don't disagree with that. I agree with it, but they are not there yet.

While I recognize and share Israel's concern, we cannot let Israel determine when and where the United States goes to war. By stating that the United States should provide military support to Israel in a formal resolution should it attack Iran, I fear that is how this bill is going to be interpreted.

Let me conclude. The interim agreement with Iran is strong, it is tough, and it is realistic. It represents the first significant opportunity to change a three-decade course in Iran and an opening to improve one of our most poisonous bilateral relationships. It could open the door to a new future which not only considers Israel's national security, but protects our own.

To preserve diplomacy, I strongly oppose the Nuclear Weapon Free Iran Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELLY). The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the courtesy of the Senator from California. She is courteous in everything she does in life. She is a pleasure to serve with.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.J. RES. 106

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 12 noon on Wednesday, January 15, the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.J. Res. 106, which was received from the House and is at the desk; that there be no amendments, motions, or points of order in order to the joint resolution; that there be 15 minutes of debate equally divided on the joint resolution; finally, that upon the use or yielding back of time, the joint resolution be read a third time and the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators allowed to speak therein up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNIZING GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise today, as an alumna of Georgetown University, to recognize the university's 225th anniversary. On January 23, 1789, the first deed was granted to then Bishop John Carroll for land on which Georgetown was built. Those of us whose lives have been shaped, at least in part, by this great institution are proud that it was founded in the same year that the United States was formed. Indeed, the two events were intertwined, and Georgetown's mission statement today continues to reflect that bond by emphasizing that the university ''educates women and men to be reflective lifelong learners, to be responsible and active participants in civil life and to live generously in service to others.''

Over the course of more than two centuries, Georgetown, its students, and alumni have contributed to our country's rich history. The Astronomical Observatory on campus was used to calculate the longitude and latitude of the District of Columbia in 1846. This building stands today and is now listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Buildings on the Georgetown campus were used as hospitals for wounded troops during the Civil War, which nearly closed the university because so many students left to fight, for both the Union and Confederate States. All told, more than 1,000 Georgetown students and alumni served. In 1876, the students selected the colors blue—Union—and gray—Confederate—as the university's official colors to celebrate the end of the war. These colors remain a source of school pride today.

Father Patrick Healy, born a slave, became the first African American to head a major U.S. university, serving as Georgetown's president from 1873 to 1882. With the outbreak of World War I, Georgetown formed a 500-member Cadet Corps in the spring of 1917. In 1918, the U.S. War Department replaced it with the Student Army Training Corps, which became the Reserve Officers Training Corps as we know it today following the end of the war. More than 2,000 Georgetown men served. During World War II, Georgetown was selected by the War Department to house the Army Specialized Training Program. Over 75-percent of students enrolled during the 1943–1944 academic year were military servicemen.

Since Georgetown awarded its first two bachelor's degrees in 1817, the university has educated numerous leaders in business, government, and the nonprofit sector. A President, Cabinet Secretaries, Ambassadors, Governors, and Members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives have studied on ''the Hilltop'' and left to make important contributions to our country and beyond. Likewise, Georgetown alumni have gone on to lead school systems, universities, and businesses, as well as international and charitable organizations that strive to address challenges facing the United States and the world.

A school with an enrollment of 40 students in its first year has now swelled to over 12,000 undergraduate and graduate students, more than 5,000 faculty and staff, and countless alumni. In addition to undergraduate degrees, Georgetown University now includes the McDonough School of Business, Walsh School of Foreign Service, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Law Center, School of Medicine, School of Continuing Studies, School of Nursing and Health Studies, and McCourt School of Public Policy.

I was privileged to have the opportunity to earn a Georgetown degree, and my experience there has played a significant role in the career of public service I have been blessed to live. It is a place that gave me opportunities to be exposed to public service here in the Nation's Capital as a student and impressed on me a set of values reflecting Jesuit tradition that continue to shape my life and work.

Georgetown's history has in many ways tracked the Nation's history. It is a pleasure to recognize the tremendous impact it has had over the last 225 years and to look forward to future centuries of contributions not only to this country but to the world.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the 225th anniversary of the founding of Georgetown University. As a proud member of the Georgetown community, it is an honor to help commemorate the school's 225 years of excellence. This milestone marks a time of celebration for all of Georgetown's students, faculty, board of governors, and alumni.

As the oldest Catholic and Jesuit institution of higher education in the United States, Georgetown has a long and distinguished history. On January 23, 1789, Bishop John Carroll, the first Catholic bishop in the United States, secured the deed to around 60 acres of land overlooking the Potomac River. This hilltop grew to become the campus of Georgetown University. Three years later, in 1791, the first students arrived on campus. At the age of 13, William Gaston was the first student at the university. He went on to serve North Carolina as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives and authored a bill granting a Federal charter to ''the College of Georgetown in the District of Columbia'' in 1815. President James Madison signed that legislation into law on March 1, 1815.

While buildings on Georgetown's campus were temporarily used as a hospital after the Second Battle of Bull Run, it wasn't until 1851 that Georgetown University Medical School, which I attended in the 1970s, was established. It was the first Catholic medical school in our Nation. The medical school first

opened its doors in a vacant warehouse and an adjacent building at 12th and F Streets, NW, before later moving to the university's main campus in 1930.

I received both a bachelor of science degree in biology and a doctor of medicine degree from this great university. The quality education and valuable training I received there has had a lasting impact on my life and helped shape my career. I am grateful for my time at this exceptional institution and the incredible influence Georgetown has had on so many people across the United States and around the world.

Over the years, there have been numerous Members of Congress who were students at Georgetown University. Today, the U.S. Senate is fortunate to have five other Members who hold degrees from Georgetown University. Senator LISA MURKOWSKI of Alaska received her bachelor's degree from Georgetown. Senator PATRICK LEAHY of Vermont, Senator MARK KIRK of Illinois, and Senator MAZIE HIRONO of Hawaii all received their law degrees from Georgetown Law. The Senate majority whip, Senator DICK DURBIN of Illinois, holds both his undergraduate and law degrees from Georgetown.

As shown by the geographic range of States represented by these Senators, students come from all over the Nation to attend this wonderful institution of higher education. Georgetown's student body today includes students from all 50 States as well as from 141 countries around the globe. Georgetown is indeed a national as well as a global university.

The university's mission statement makes the point that ''the university was founded on the principle that serious and sustained discourse among people of different faiths, cultures, and beliefs promotes intellectual, ethical and spiritual understanding.'' It is clear that this founding principle continues to energize Georgetown University 225 years later.

I look forward to all of the great contributions Georgetown will continue to provide in the years ahead through its many areas of academic and research excellence: medicine, law, international affairs, business, public service, and the diverse fields within the arts and sciences.

I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating this significant milestone and wishing Georgetown University continued success in achieving its mission and goals in the future.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:27 p.m., a message from the House, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 230. An act to authorize the Peace Corps Commemorative Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 841. An act to amend the Grand Ronde Reservation Act to make technical corrections, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1513. An act to revise the boundaries of the Gettysburg National Military Park to include the Gettysburg Train Station and certain land along Plum Run in Cumberland Township, to limit the means by which property within such revised boundaries may be acquired, and for other purposes.

At 2:36 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.J. Res. 106. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 5:47 p.m., a message from the House, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 230. An act to authorize the Peace Corps Commemorative Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 841. An act to amend the Grand Ronde Reservation Act to make technical corrections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

S. 1917. A bill to provide for additional enhancements of the sexual assault prevention and response activities of the Armed Forces.

S. 1926. A bill to delay the implementation of certain provisions of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 and to reform the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers, 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–4264. A communication from the Associate General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, (3) three reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–4265. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Importation of Avocados From Continental Spain'' ((RIN0579–AD63) (Docket No. APHIS–2012–0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 7, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–4266. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Importation of Fresh Apricots From Continental Spain'' ((RIN0579–AD62) (Docket No. APHIS–2011–0132)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 7, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–4267. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Dimethyl esters of glutaric acid (i.e., dimethyl glutarate), succinic acid (i.e., dimethyl succinate), and adipic acid (i.e., dimethyl adipate); Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance'' (FRL No. 9904–57) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 8, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–4268. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the continuation of the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13396 on February 7, 2006, with respect to Cote d'Ivoire; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4269. A communication from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Defining Larger Participants of the Student Loan Servicing Market'' ((RIN3170–AA35) (Docket No. CFPB–2013–0005)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 6, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4270. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Suspension of Community Eligibility'' ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA–2013–0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 7, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4271. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Removal of Person from the Entity List Based on a Removal Request'' (RIN0694–AG03) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 7, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4272. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners v. United States Department of Energy; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–4273. A communication from the Administrator, U.S. Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''The Availability and Price of Petroleum and Petroleum Products Produced in Countries Other Than Iran''; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–4274. A communication from the Administrator, U.S. Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''The Availability and Price of Petroleum and Petroleum Products Produced in Countries Other Than Iran''; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–4275. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of

Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for Residential Furnace Fans'' (RIN1904–AC21) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 6, 2014; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–4276. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Energy Conservation Program: Alternative Efficiency Determination Methods, Basic Model Definition, and Compliance for Commercial HVAC, Refrigeration, and WH Equipment'' (RIN1904–AC46) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 2, 2014; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–4277. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Inflation Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties'' (RIN1904–AA43) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 3, 2014; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–4278. A communication from the General Counsel, Peace Corps, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Director of the Peace Corps, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 7, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4279. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report of the Attorney General to the Congress of the United States on the Administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, for the six months ending December 31, 2012''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4280. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report from the Attorney General to Congress relative to the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC–4281. A communication from the Co-Chief Privacy Officers, Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Privacy Report for fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC–4282. A communication from the Director of the Regulation Policy and Management Office of the General Counsel, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Removal of Penalty for Breaking Points'' (RIN2900–AO51) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 7, 2014; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–4283. A communication from the Director of the Regulation Policy and Management Office of the General Counsel, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Community Residential Care'' (RIN2900–AO62) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 7, 2014; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–4284. A communication from the Director of the Regulation Policy and Management Office of the General Counsel, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Duty Periods for Establishing Eligibility for Health Care'' (RIN2900–AO25) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2013; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–4285. A communication from the Deputy Director of the Regulation Policy and Management Office of the General Counsel, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Copayments for Medications in 2014'' (RIN2900–AO91) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 27, 2013; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CARPER for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

*William Ward Nooter, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

*Suzanne Eleanor Spaulding, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary, Department of Homeland Security.

*John Roth, of Michigan, to be Inspector General, Department of Homeland Security.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. PAUL):

S. 1916. A bill to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to provide for an application process for interested parties to apply for a county to be designated as a rural area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL (for herself, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 1917. A bill to provide for additional enhancements of the sexual assault prevention and response activities of the Armed Forces; read the first time.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN:

S. 1918. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a special change in status rule for employees who become eligible for TRICARE; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. LEE, Mr. TESTER, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 1919. A bill to repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Mr. COONS):

S. 1920. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the research and development credit to encourage innovation; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mr. COBURN, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1921. A bill to require a Federal agency to include language in certain educational and advertising materials indicating that such materials are produced and disseminated at taxpayer expense; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 1922. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to prevent the illegal trafficking of supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits by requiring all program beneficiaries to show valid photo identification when purchasing items with program benefits; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mr. VITTER):

S. 1923. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to exempt from registration brokers performing services in connection with the transfer of ownership of smaller privately held companies; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. VITTER, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. JOHANNS):

S. 1924. A bill to require a report on INF Treaty compliance information sharing; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. HATCH, Mr. KING, Mr. BENNET, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. THUNE):

S. 1925. A bill to limit the retrieval of data from vehicle event data recorders; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

S. 1926. A bill to delay the implementation of certain provisions of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 and to reform the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers, and for other purposes; read the first time.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 204

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) 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. 569

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare.

S. 1174

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1174, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 65th

Infantry Regiment, known as the Borinqueneers.

S. 1406

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1406, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1476

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1476, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the denial of deduction for certain excessive employee remuneration, and for other purposes.

S. 1533

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1533, a bill to end offshore tax abuses, to preserve our national defense and protect American families and businesses from devastating cuts, and for other purposes.

S. 1590

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1590, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to require transparency in the operation of American Health Benefit Exchanges.

S. 1697

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1697, a bill to support early learning.

S. 1726

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1726, a bill to prevent a taxpayer bailout of health insurance issuers.

S. 1737

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1737, a bill to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend increased expensing limitations and the treatment of certain real property as section 179 property.

S. 1739

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1739, a bill to modify the efficiency standards for grid-enabled water heaters.

S. 1846

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1846, a bill to delay the implementation of certain provisions of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, and for other purposes.

S. 1848

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1848, a bill to amend section 1303(b)(3) of Public Law 111–148 concerning the notice requirements regarding the extent of health plan coverage of abortion and abortion premium surcharges.

S. 1853

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1853, a bill to amend the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1978 to provide for Scientific Advisory Board member qualifications, public participation, and for other purposes.

S. 1875

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1875, a bill to provide for wildfire suppression operations, and for other purposes.

S. 1902

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) were added as cosponsors of S. 1902, a bill to require notification of individuals of breaches of personally identifiable information through Exchanges under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 1907

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1907, a bill to amend a provision of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 regarding prohibitions on investments in certain funds to clarify that such provision shall not be construed to require the divestiture of certain collateralized debt obligations backed by trust-preferred securities or debt securities of collateralized loan obligations.

S. 1915

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1915, a bill to permit health insurance issuers to offer additional plan options to individuals.

S. RES. 330

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 330, a resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of ''Smoking and Health: Report of the Advisory Committee to the Surgeon General of the United States'' and the significant progress in reducing the public health burden of tobacco use, and supporting an end to tobacco-related death and disease.

AMENDMENT NO. 2603

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2603 intended to be proposed to S. 1845, a bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. PAUL):

S. 1916. A bill to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to provide for an application process for interested parties to apply for a county to be designated as a rural area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have spoken often on the floor about the challenges and opportunities for the future that the people of eastern Kentucky and rural parts of the Commonwealth face. Many of these challenges stem from this administration's regulatory overreach, whether it is a war on coal, ObamaCare or Dodd-Frank. Too many people are out of work, which has placed a drastic burden on the coal mining industry, and harshly cut the number of jobs available in the coal mining industry and related industries.

In spite of the challenges the people of eastern Kentucky face, I have great confidence we can overcome that and succeed. I was pleased to be able to assist the Kentucky Highlands Investment Corporation in receiving a Promise Zone designation, which was awarded just last week. That is why I wrote the administration in support of this designation last year. This economic initiative is just one way to help jump-start the region's journey out of economic distress.

But we need more than that. My friend and colleague in the other Chamber, Representative HAL ROGERS, is leading an effort to identify ways to lift Appalachia out of the cycle of poverty and unemployment through the SOAR Initiative, and I applaud his efforts.

To offer yet another possibility for eastern Kentucky, my friend and colleague Senator RAND PAUL and I introduced the Economic Freedom Zones Act, to further enable eastern Kentucky to lift the burdens of some of the poorest families in the country. Our legislation would roll back government regulations and tax barriers to spur job creation and reform failed educational systems to aid disadvantaged children.

So continuing my efforts to find ways to assist these rural counties and give these communities a voice, I am pleased to introduce today, along with Senator PAUL, the Helping Expand Lending Practices in Rural Communities Act or simply the HELP Rural

Communities Act. My friend and colleague in the House, Representative ANDY BARR, introduced this legislation in that body, and I applaud his efforts to see it passed.

The HELP Rural Communities Act would give rural counties in Kentucky a voice when the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, or CFPB, has incorrectly labeled them as ''nonrural''—just another example of this administration's one-size-fits-all, we-know-best approach to governing. Several counties in Kentucky, such as Bath County, have been labeled as ''nonrural'' and are therefore barred from certain rural lending practices helpful to farmers and small businesses.

If you have ever been to these counties, as I have, you would most certainly disagree with the CFPB's ruling. But current law provides literally no opportunity to challenge the CFPB's decision. My bill would allow counties which have been improperly designated as ''nonrural'' to petition the CFPB with additional local information to reconsider their status in order to ensure that rural communities, such as those in eastern Kentucky, have the access to credit they need to grow their economy.

This is an important step in the effort to renew hope for the future in rural Kentucky, especially eastern Kentucky. Given the bipartisan interest shown in recent weeks to get government out of the way and let the people of the region work, Congress and the President can come together to pass this legislation on behalf of eastern Kentuckians and rural communities. I look forward to working with my colleagues, Senator PAUL and Representative BARR, to see that we get this passed.

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. 1916

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 ''Helping Expand Lending Practices in Rural Communities Act of 2014'' or the ''HELP Rural Communities Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. DESIGNATION OF COUNTY AS A RURAL AREA.

Section 1022 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5512) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) DESIGNATION OF COUNTY AS A RURAL AREA.—

''(1) APPLICATION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Bureau shall establish an application process under which a person who lives or does business in a State may, with respect to a county in such State that has not been designated by the Bureau as a rural area for purposes of a Federal consumer financial law, apply for such county to be so designated.

''(2) EVALUATION CRITERIA.—When evaluating an application submitted under paragraph (1), the Bureau shall take into consideration the following factors:

''(A) Criteria used by the Director of the Bureau of the Census for classifying geographical areas as rural or urban.

''(B) Criteria used by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to designate counties as metropolitan or micropolitan or neither.

''(C) Criteria used by the Secretary of Agriculture to determine property eligibility for rural development programs.

''(D) The Department of Agriculture rural-urban commuting area codes.

''(E) A written opinion provided by the State's banking regulator.

''(F) Population density.

''(3) PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after receiving an application submitted under paragraph (1), the Bureau shall—

''(i) publish such application in the Federal Register; and

''(ii) make such application available for public comment for not fewer than 90 days.

''(B) LIMITATION ON ADDITIONAL APPLICATIONS.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require the Bureau, during the public comment period with respect to an application submitted under paragraph (1), to accept an additional application with respect to the county that is the subject of the initial application.

''(4) INFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE PUBLISHED.—The Bureau shall enter each application submitted under paragraph (1) in a sortable, downloadable database that is publicly accessible through the Web site of the Bureau.

''(5) DECISION ON DESIGNATION.—Not later than 90 days after the end of the public comment period under paragraph (3)(A) for an application, the Bureau shall—

''(A) grant or deny such application; and

''(B) publish such grant or denial in the Federal Register, along with an explanation of what factors the Bureau relied on in making such determination.

''(6) SUBSEQUENT APPLICATIONS.—A decision by the Bureau under paragraph (5) to deny an application for a county to be designated as a rural area shall not preclude the Bureau from accepting a subsequent application submitted under paragraph (1) for such county to be so designated, so long as such subsequent application is made after the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date that the Bureau denies the application under paragraph (5).''.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. HATCH, Mr. KING, Mr. BENNET, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. THUNE):

S. 1925. A bill to limit the retrieval of data from vehicle event data recorders; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota for joining me this afternoon. Today we are introducing the Driver Privacy Act. I am very pleased to sponsor that legislation with the good Senator from Minnesota. We have a great group that has joined us as we introduce this bill today. This is all about protecting people's privacy in regard to their automobile.

Every automobile that will be made going forward, over 90 percent, and something like 96 percent of the automobiles made now have a black box. This is actually silver, but we call it a black box because it is an event data recorder. It records information about your automobile. Ninety-six percent, I think, of automobiles made now have them, but the U.S. Department Of Transportation is requiring this year that every vehicle have an event data recorder in it.

The Senator from Minnesota and I believe that should be the owner's information and that information should not be released without the owner's consent. We already have a good group who have joined us in the endeavor, including an equal number of Republicans and Democrats: Senator JOHANNS from Nebraska, Senator ANGUS KING from Maine, Senator KIRK from Illinois, Senator JOE MANCHIN from West Virginia, Senator SAXBY CHAMBLISS from Georgia, Senator MICHAEL BENNET from Colorado, Senator ROY BLUNT from Missouri, Senator MAZIE HIRONO from Hawaii, Senator JOHNNY ISAKSON from Georgia, Senator MARK BEGICH from Alaska, Senator ORRIN HATCH from Utah, and Senator RON WYDEN from Oregon.

It is absolutely an equal number of Republicans and Democrats from across the United States have joined together, recognizing people are concerned about their privacy and we need to make sure their privacy is protected.

I would like to make a few further introductory comments with the help of these charts and then turn to my colleague from Minnesota for her comments as well. We have seen with the NSA, with the IRS, with the Affordable Care Act, and with a whole range of issues that people believe what is going on, not only in government but with technology, is that their privacy is at risk these days and it is very much a concern. Many people do not realize that this event data recorder is in their car. It records all kinds of information, and in fact the Federal Government is requiring that this device be in their car. Neither is there a limitation on the amount of data that the device can record nor is there a law that protects individuals' privacy to make sure the owner of the car decides who gets that information, other than under very specific circumstances which I will take a minute to go through.

What kind of data gets recorded by your event data recorder, this black box that is included in your car? There are more than 45 different data points that are in fact recorded right now. Again, the manufacturer can change this—add to it. There are no limitations or restrictions or guidelines or requirements on what manufacturers can have the event data recorder do. Right now it records things like speed, braking, engine, seatbelt usage, driver information, passenger information, steering, airbags, and crash details. As

I say, at this point the manufacturer determines what goes into that black box in terms of what its capabilities are.

Just to give a sense, if you delve further, for example, engine—just pick one here: ''Number of times engine was started since being manufactured prior to a crash.'' Obviously the idea here with the event data recorder is that it provides information just like an event data recorder on an airplane. In the event of a crash, it provides information about the accident. It is recording this information in a loop on a continuous basis, and it retains it for a short period of time and constantly updates it.

For example, for your engine, it can record the number of times the engine was started since being manufactured prior to a crash. It can record the number of times the engine was started since being manufactured prior to the EDR data download that is taken in case the box is removed and the information is taken and there isn't a crash. It can record how fast the engine was running. That is just 1 of the 45 data points, but it shows the kind of information that is recorded and can be extracted from the black box.

So what does our legislation do? It is very simple and very straightforward. The Driver Privacy Act provides that the data from your EDR in your car cannot be extracted or taken by another party other than under very specific circumstances, and that means it cannot be done without your consent unless it is authorized by a court of law or the information is retrieved pursuant to NHTSA, which is the National Highway Transportation Safety Administration, recall or the information is needed in the event of a medical emergency, essentially unless there is some kind of recall on the car—and then they can't disclose any data about you as an individual. It is macrodata. But other than that, without your consent, that information can only be taken from you by a court of law or in the event of a medical emergency, and that is done, obviously, for the very reason you have the black box in the car—safety, right?

Law enforcement might be getting it pursuant to a court order. They can't just take it; they have to have a court order. If you are in a car accident and they need that information because of a medical emergency, then there is a special condition to take it.

In developing these, we were very careful to work both with the organizations that advocate privacy as well as the automobile dealers, the insurance industry, and law enforcement. We consulted with stakeholders, such as the Electronic Privacy Information Center, Heritage, AAA, the Auto Alliance, the International Association of Chiefs of Police. Again, we wanted to make sure the law enforcement issues were covered as well as the ACLU. We have a broad and diverse group that has been consulted and that we have worked with in putting together this information.

Fourteen States have their own laws on this issue. I have highlighted the 14 different States that have passed laws that, in fact, assure you that this information is your information and cannot be taken from you without your consent other than through a court order or in the case of a medical emergency. But when you leave your State and you are driving in another State, you are no longer protected. So even though 14 States have stepped up and said: Yes, this is something we need to do—in fact, it was something we did when I was Governor in my State. Not only are the other States not protected, but you are not protected either when you drive outside your State, which all of us do on many occasions. So that is why we need a Federal law.

The reality is this technology is evolving and developing. This technology is going to continue to develop with all kinds of other aspects—obviously now we have GPS—and all the different things that are being done with automobiles. In many cases these are things people want, but they need to know their privacy is protected, and that is what we are doing here. We are doing it in a way that we made sure we continue to assure law enforcement, first responders, and manufacturers that the safety issues are being dealt with, and at the same time assure American citizens and consumers that their privacy rights are being respected and protected as required under the Fourth Amendment of our Constitution.

With that, I will turn to my esteemed colleague from Minnesota and again thank her and her staff for the work they have done on this bill. With her background in law enforcement, she truly understands the issues and has been invaluable in putting this legislation together. Again, I thank her and ask her for her comments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I am introducing this bill today with Senator HOEVEN, who has been a true leader on this issue. When he was Governor, he worked to pass a similar law in North Dakota.

As Senator HOEVEN just described, the Driver Privacy Act will strengthen safety and protect consumer privacy. I think the bipartisan support Senator HOEVEN has gathered for this bill—seven Republicans, seven Democrats, and people all over the country from Hawaii to Georgia to Oregon to Alaska, not to mention the two of us from the middle of the country—demonstrates the strong support and the concerns people have about emerging technology. We want this technology, but I figure our laws have to be as sophisticated as the technology we have out there. Right now our laws are lagging and this information is not protected. There is no roadmap on how it should be protected, and that is why we are introducing this bill.

I have long supported improving safety on the roadways. Too many people die on our highways, and we need to do something about it. In 2010, there were more than 30,000 fatal crashes and more than 1.5 million crashes that resulted in injuries. This is unacceptable. Rural road safety is a critical issue for my State, as well as for Senator HOEVEN's State. Only 23 percent of the country's population lives in rural areas, and yet 57 percent of all traffic fatalities occur in rural America.

As a Member of the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee, I have worked to advance efforts to improve safety for all drivers, especially on rural roads, and we have made some progress. The transportation bill, MAP–21, ensured strong funding for safety improvements at rail-highway grade crossings, and the allocation of Federal funding was improved to put resources into roadways that need attention the most.

My amendment in MAP–21, with Senator SESSIONS, required the Federal Highway Administration to work with State and local transportation officials to collect the best practices from around the country that are also cost-effective ways to increase safety on high-risk rural roads. The report was just released, and I am now looking for opportunities for how we can best address some of the challenges addressed in the study, but it is clear we have more work to do.

Vehicle technologies that assist drivers and prevent crashes have grown tremendously in recent years. From new sensors that identify unsafe conditions, to driverless cars, these emerging technologies could dramatically increase safety for drivers and passengers.

Event data recorders, which are the subject of our discussion today, hold similar promise in improving safety on our roadways. An EDR, as Senator HOEVEN described, is a device that records data on a loop it receives from vehicle sensors and safety systems. The data is constantly being replaced and it only records 5 seconds of technical safety information when a crash occurs, although I am sure that could change when the technology changes.

EDRs can be the only resource available to determine the cause of a crash by providing information about what a driver was doing in the seconds leading up to a crash, such as how fast the vehicle was going, whether the brake was activated in the seconds before the crash, if airbags were deployed, and whether the driver and passengers were wearing seatbelts.

As a former prosecutor, I know how useful this data can be. It can be very useful for investigators to put the pieces back together to more easily determine the cause of a crash for safety reasons and also determine who caused the crash.

The proven benefits to driving safety that EDRs provide are not new. In the summer of 2012, the Senate included in

its version of the Transportation bill, MAP–21, a requirement that the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, NHTSA, initiate a rulemaking to require passenger vehicles and light-duty trucks to include EDRs.

At the same time, there were many legitimate questions regarding what impact expanding EDRs to all passenger vehicles would have on consumer privacy. Who owns the data? Who can access the data? It became clear that an effective EDR provision would need to strengthen driver and vehicle safety while protecting consumer privacy, and the EDR provision was removed from the final transportation bill.

Over the past 2 years, NHTSA has continued to work with law enforcement safety groups and the automobile manufacturers to ensure the safety benefits of EDRs, which could reach the most consumers. The auto manufacturers had already begun expanding the inclusion of EDR technology in more new vehicles each year. EDRs became so commonplace that 96 percent of 2013 cars and trucks had the EDR built in, and NHTSA and the industry it regulates, the automakers, were able to agree that all new cars and trucks should have an EDR in place in September 2014. I am not sure everyone who goes out and buys a car is aware of this, but by 2014 every single car and truck will have this capability.

However, NHTSA does not have the authority to address the consumer privacy concerns related to EDRs that have remained outstanding for 2 entire years. We have seen an enormous increase in new cars and trucks containing the EDRs, and that is where Senator HOEVEN comes in.

Congress does have the authority to clarify ownership of EDR data, and that is why we are introducing the Driver Privacy Act, along with 12 other Senators. Our bill makes crystal clear that the owner of the vehicle is the rightful owner of the data collected by that vehicle's EDR, and it may not be retrieved unless a court authorizes retrieval of the data, the vehicle owner or lessee consents to the data retrieval, the information is retrieved to determine the need for emergency medical response following a crash, or the information is retrieved for traffic safety research, in which case personally identifiable information is not disclosed. So that is where you have it.

We have worked hard with safety groups and law enforcement to make sure this would work for them. You would need a court authorization or you would need a consent or you would need a determination that it is needed to determine the cause of a crash or it is needed for research, and in that case, no identifiable data.

This was really important for me, as a former prosecutor, that we made this work for law enforcement and our safety groups, but, most importantly, our goal was to make it work for the individual consumers, the citizens of the United States of America. We realize while all of this was done for good intentions, no one had taken the broom behind and made sure the American people were protected.

Having just left a judiciary hearing this afternoon about NSA and data collection and privacy and civil liberties, it was very timely that I came over here. While this may not quite have the huge ramifications of that hearing, I do think to myself that maybe if people thought ahead a little bit, we wouldn't have been sitting in that hearing. That is what we are trying to do with this bill. We are trying to think ahead so we can keep up with the technology so it doesn't beat us out and it doesn't beat our constitutional rights out.

I have seen firsthand the devastating effects automobile crashes can have on families as they are forced to say goodbye to a loved one much too early. Oftentimes families just want answers. They want to know what happened and why. EDRs can help provide those answers. Our bill accounts for those needs of law enforcement and these families. You don't have to take my word for it. The International Association of Chiefs of Police has concluded that the Data Privacy Act will not cause any additional burden to law enforcement agencies in accessing the data they need.

Advancements in technology oftentimes force us to take a look at related laws to ensure they remain in sync. Senator HOEVEN and I are introducing the Driver Privacy Act to do just that. Our bill strikes that balance between strengthening consumer privacy protections while recognizing that EDR data will be required to aid law enforcement, advance vehicle safety objectives, or to determine the need for emergency medical response following a crash.

I thank Senator HOEVEN for his leadership. He is a true bipartisan leader. We have worked together on many bills. When we work together, I always say the Red River may technically divide our States, but it actually brings us together, whether it is about flood protection measures or important bills such as this. I appreciate the opportunity to work with him on this bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I thank Senator KLOBUCHAR for joining me on this legislation and working to develop a great group of 14 original cosponsors.

Senator KLOBUCHAR brings such a great background as a prosecutor in the law enforcement industry and truly understands law enforcement issues, safety issues, and the informational benefits there are with not only event data recorders, but also understands the need to protect individual privacy.

As I think we both said very clearly here on the Senate floor, this is a technology that is new and evolving. It is not just that this is a new and evolving technology where new capabilities are being added all the time, we don't know what additional capabilities will be added.

But now the Federal Government is requiring that this device be in every single automobile made. So when the Federal Government—the U.S. Department of Transportation, NHTSA, the safety branch—steps up and says: OK, we are going to require this device to be in every single car, we need to make sure we are also providing the privacy that goes with it that assures our citizens that their Fourth Amendment rights will be protected.

Again, I think the Senator from Minnesota makes a really great point that when we look at some of these areas in terms of whether it is NSA, IRS, or other areas, people feel there wasn't enough work done on the front end to protect their personal privacy, so we are in a catchup situation. Let's not do that when every single citizen across this country owns or their family owns or has access to some type of automobile. That is what we are trying to do.

Again, as the technology develops we need to understand what the ramifications are and how to protect privacy. I think, on behalf of both of us, we are appreciative that we have 14 Senators engaged already, and we look to add, and we are open to ideas on making sure this is the right kind of legislation that addresses safety but ultimately protects the privacy of our citizens.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2649. Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. MCCAIN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BURR, and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2650. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2631 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. REED) to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2651. Mr. HELLER (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. COATS, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2649. Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. MCCAIN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BURR, and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. 10. ENDING UNEMPLOYMENT PAYMENTS TO JOBLESS MILLIONAIRES AND BILLIONAIRES.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no Federal funds may

be used to make payments of unemployment compensation (including such compensation under the Federal-State Extended Compensation Act of 1970 and the emergency unemployment compensation program under title IV of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008) to an individual whose adjusted gross income in the preceding year was equal to or greater than $1,000,000.

(b) COMPLIANCE.—Unemployment Insurance applications shall include a form or procedure for an individual applicant to certify the individual's adjusted gross income was not equal to or greater than $1,000,000 in the preceding year.

(c) AUDITS.—The certifications required by subsection (b) shall be auditable by the U.S. Department of Labor or the U.S. Government Accountability Office.

(d) STATUS OF APPLICANTS.—It is the duty of the states to verify the residency, employment, legal, and income status of applicants for Unemployment Insurance and no Federal funds may be expended for purposes of determining an individual's eligibility under this Act.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The prohibition under subsection (a) shall apply to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 2650. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2631 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. REED) to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE II—WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Careers through Responsive, Efficient, and Effective Retraining Act.''.

SEC. 202. STEERING FEDERAL TRAINING DOLLARS TOWARD SKILLS NEEDED BY INDUSTRY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 101 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(54) CREDENTIAL.—

''(A) INDUSTRY-RECOGNIZED.—The term 'industry-recognized', used with respect to a credential, means a credential that is sought or accepted by employers within the industry sector involved as recognized, preferred, or required for recruitment, screening, hiring, or advancement. If a credential is not yet available for a certain skill that is so sought or accepted, completion of an industry-recognized training program shall be considered to be an industry-recognized credential, for the purposes of this paragraph.

''(B) NATIONALLY PORTABLE.—The term 'nationally portable,' used with respect to credential, means a credential that is sought or accepted as described in subparagraph (A) across multiple States.

''(C) REGIONALLY RELEVANT.—The term 'regionally relevant,' used with respect to a credential, means a credential that is determined by the Governor and the head of the State workforce agency to be sought or accepted as described in subparagraph (A) in that State and neighboring States.

''(55) STATE WORKFORCE AGENCY.—The term 'State workforce agency' means the lead State agency with responsibility for workforce investment activities carried out under subtitle B.''.

(b) YOUTH ACTIVITIES.—Section 129(c)(1)(C) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2854(c)(1)(C)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating clauses (ii) through (iv) as clauses (iii) through (v), respectively; and

(2) inserting after clause (i) the following:

''(ii) training, with priority consideration given, after consultation with the Governor and the head of the State workforce agency and beginning not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of the Careers through Responsive, Efficient, and Effective Retraining Act, to programs that lead to an industry-recognized, nationally portable, and regionally relevant credential, if the local board determines that such programs are available and appropriate;''.

(c) GENERAL EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES.—Section 134(d)(4)(F) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2864(d)(4)(F)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(iv) PRIORITY FOR PROGRAMS THAT PROVIDE AN INDUSTRY-RECOGNIZED, NATIONALLY PORTABLE, AND REGIONALLY RELEVANT CREDENTIAL.—In selecting and approving programs of training services under this section, a one-stop operator and employees of a one-stop center referred to in subsection (c) shall, after consultation with the Governor and the head of the State workforce agency and beginning not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of the Careers through Responsive, Efficient, and Effective Retraining Act, give priority consideration to programs (approved by the appropriate State agency and local board in conjunction with section 122) that lead to an industry-recognized, nationally portable, and regionally relevant credential.

''(v) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in clause (iv) or section 129(c)(1)(C) shall be construed to require an entity with responsibility for selecting or approving a workforce investment activities program to select a program that leads to a credential specified in clause (iv).''.

(d) STATE ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) GENERAL EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES.—Section 122(b)(2)(D) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2842(b)(2)(D)) is amended—

(A) in clause (ii), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in clause (iii), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(iv) in the case of a provider of a program of training services that leads to an industry-recognized, nationally portable, and regionally relevant credential, that the program leading to the credential meets such quality criteria (which may be accreditation by a State-recognized, third party accrediting agency) as the Governor (in consultation with representatives of the relevant industry sectors and labor groups) shall establish not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of the Careers through Responsive, Efficient, and Effective Retraining Act.''.

(2) YOUTH ACTIVITIES.—Section 123 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2843) is amended by inserting ''(including such quality criteria (which may be accreditation by a State-recognized, third party accrediting agency) as the Governor (in consultation with representatives of the relevant industry sectors and labor groups) shall establish not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of the Careers through Responsive, Efficient, and Effective Retraining Act for a training program that leads to an industry-recognized, nationally portable, and regionally relevant credential)'' after ''plan''.

(e) REPORT ON INDUSTRY-RECOGNIZED CREDENTIALS.—Section 122 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2842) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(j) REPORT ON INDUSTRY-RECOGNIZED CREDENTIALS.—

''(1) DATA COLLECTION.—Each State shall submit to the Secretary data on programs determined, under section 129(c)(1)(C) or 134(d)(4)(F)(iv), to lead to industry-recognized and regionally relevant credentials, and on the need of that State for such credentials.

''(2) REPORT.—Based on data provided by the States under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall annually compile the data and prepare a report identifying industry-recognized credentials that are regionally relevant or nationally portable. The report shall include information on the needs of each State and of the Nation for such credentials.

''(3) AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary shall make the report available and easily searchable on a website.

''(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as an official endorsement of a credential by the Department of Labor.''.

SEC. 203. ESTABLISHING INCENTIVES FOR ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) PROGRAM.—Subtitle B of title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 is amended by inserting after section 112 (29 U.S.C. 2822) the following:

''SEC. 112A. PAY FOR PERFORMANCE PILOT PROGRAM.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Careers through Responsive, Efficient, and Effective Retraining Act, the Secretary of Labor shall establish a Pay for Performance pilot program. The Secretary shall select not fewer than 5 States, including at least 1 rural State and at least 1 non-rural State, to participate in the pilot program by carrying out a Pay for Performance State program.

''(2) VOLUNTARY NATURE OF PROGRAM.—Nothing in this subtitle shall be construed to require a State to participate in the pilot program without the State's consent.

''(3) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term 'rural State' means a State that has a population density of 52 or fewer persons per square mile, or a State in which the largest county has fewer than 150,000 people, as determined on the basis of the most recent decennial census of population conducted pursuant to section 141 of title 13, United States Code.

''(b) SUBMISSION OF PLANS.—To be eligible to participate in the pilot program, a State shall submit to the Secretary and obtain approval of a Pay for Performance plan described in section 112(e) as a supplement to the State plan described in section 112. The State shall submit the supplement in accordance with such process as the Secretary may specify after consultation with States.

''(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In a State that carries out a Pay for Performance State program, the State shall reserve and the local areas shall use the amount described in paragraph (2) to provide a portion of the training services authorized under section 134(d)(4) (referred to in this section as 'training services') under the State's Pay for Performance plan, in addition to the other requirements of this Act.

''(2) AMOUNT.—The amount reserved under paragraph (1) shall be—

''(A) a portion of not more than 25 percent, as determined by the State, of the funds available to be allocated under section 133(b) within the State, and estimated by the State to be available for training services, for the fiscal year involved; and

''(B) a portion of not more than 17.5 percent, as determined by the State, of the grant funds awarded under section 211(b) for the State (which portion shall be taken from

the funds described in paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 222(a)) for the fiscal year involved.

''(d) TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall provide, by grant or contract, training and technical assistance to States, and local areas in States, carrying out a Pay for Performance State program.

''(e) STATE REPORTS.—Each State carrying out a Pay for Performance State program shall annually prepare and submit to the Secretary a report regarding the performance of the State on the outcome measures described in section 112(e)(2)(C).

''(f) EVALUATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the conclusion of the transition period described in section 112(e)(2)(H), the Secretary shall enter into an arrangement for an entity to carry out an independent evaluation of Pay for Performance State programs carried out under this subtitle.

''(2) CONTENTS.—For each Pay for Performance State program, the entity shall evaluate the program design and performance on the outcome measures, evaluate (wherever possible) the level of satisfaction with the program among employers and employees benefiting from the program, and estimate public returns on investment, including such returns as reduced dependence on public assistance, reduced unemployment, and increased tax revenue paid by participants exiting the program for employment.

''(3) REPORT.—The entity shall prepare a report containing the results of the evaluation, and submit the report to the Secretary, not later than 18 months after the conclusion of the transition period.

''(g) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 3 months after the submission of the report described in subsection (f)(3), the Secretary shall prepare and submit to Congress a report that contains the results of the evaluations described in subsection (f) and recommendations. The recommendation shall include the Secretary's opinions concerning whether the pilot program should be continued and whether the pay for performance model should be expanded within this Act, and related considerations.

''(h) PERFORMANCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), section 136 of this Act shall not apply to a State, or a local area in a State, with respect to activities carried out through a Pay for Performance State program.

''(2) FISCAL AND MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTABILITY INFORMATION SYSTEMS.—Section 136(f)(1) shall apply with respect to reporting and monitoring of the use of funds under this section for activities described in paragraph (1).''.

(b) PAY FOR PERFORMANCE PLAN.—Section 112 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2822) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) PAY FOR PERFORMANCE PLANS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For a State seeking to carry out a Pay for Performance State program (referred to in this subsection as a 'State program') under the pilot program described in section 112A, the State plan shall include a plan supplement, consisting of a Pay for Performance plan developed by the State and local areas in the State.

''(2) CONTENTS.—The Pay for Performance plan shall, with respect to the State program—

''(A) provide for technical support to local areas and providers in order to carry out a pay for performance model, which shall at a minimum provide assistance with data collection and data entry requirements;

''(B) specify target populations who are eligible to receive training services authorized under section 134(d)(4) (referred to in this subsection as 'training services') through the State program, with appropriate consideration of and participation targets for special participant populations that face multiple barriers to employment, as defined in section 134(d)(4)(G)(iv);

''(C) specify employment placement, employment retention, and earnings outcome measures and timetables for each target population;

''(D) provide for curricula in terms of competencies required for education and career advancement that are, where feasible, tied to industry-recognized credentials and related standards (where the quality of the program leading to the credential or standard is recognized by the State or local area involved), or State licensing requirements;

''(E) describe how the State or local areas will provide information to participants in the State program about appropriate support services, where feasible, including career assessment and counseling, case management, child care, transportation, financial aid, and job placement services;

''(F) specify a fixed amount that, except as provided in subparagraph (H), local areas in the State will pay to providers of training services in the State program, for each eligible participant who achieves the applicable outcome measures or is an excepted participant described in subparagraph (G)(i), according to the timetables described in subparagraph (C), which amount—

''(i) shall represent 115 percent of the historical cost of providing training services to a participant under this subtitle, as established by the State or local area involved; and

''(ii) may vary by target population;

''(G) provide assurances that—

''(i) no funds reserved for the State program will be paid to a provider for a participant who does not achieve the outcome measures according to the timetables, except for a participant who does not achieve the outcome measures through no fault of the provider, as determined by the Governor in consultation with the head of the State board, relevant local boards, and at least 1 representative of the State's providers of training services; and

''(ii) each local area in the State will reallocate funds not paid to a provider, because the achievement described in clause (i) did not occur, for further activities under the State program in the local area; and

''(H) specify a transition period of not more than 1 year during which the reserved funds may be paid to providers of training services based on the previous year's performance on the core indicators of performance described in 136(b)(2)(A)(i), in order to enable the providers to begin to provide services under the State program and adjust to a pay for performance model, including adjusting by—

''(i) developing partnerships with local employers; and

''(ii) seeking financial support and volunteer services from private sector sources.

''(3) APPROVAL.—In determining whether to approve the plan supplement, the Secretary shall consider the quality of the data system the State will use to track performance on outcome measures in carrying out a Pay for Performance plan.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) USE OF FUNDS.—Section 211(b)(2) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (20 U.S.C. 9211(b)(2)) is amended by inserting ''or training services in accordance with section 112A(c)'' before the period at the end.

(2) FUNDING.—Section 223(a) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (20 U.S.C. 9223(a)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (8) as paragraph (12), and moving that paragraph to the end of that section 223(a); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following:

''(8) Providing training services in accordance with section 112A(c).''.

SEC. 204. PROVIDING A JOB TRAINING REORGANIZATION PLAN FOR THE FEDERAL WORKFORCE INVESTMENT SYSTEM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) FEDERAL JOB TRAINING PROGRAM.—The term ''Federal job training program'' means any federally funded employment and training program, including the programs identified in the Government Accountability Office report.

(2) GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REPORT.—The term ''Government Accountability Office report'' means the January 2011 report of the Government Accountability Office entitled ''Multiple Employee and Training Programs: Providing Information on Colocating Services and Consolidating Administrative Structures Could Promote Efficiencies'' (GAO–11–92).

(3) INDIVIDUAL WITH A BARRIER TO EMPLOYMENT.—The term ''individual with a barrier to employment'' means a job seeker who—

(A) is economically disadvantaged;

(B) has limited English proficiency;

(C) requires remedial education;

(D) is an older worker;

(E) is an individual who has completed a sentence for a criminal offense; or

(F) has another barrier to employment, as defined by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(b) REORGANIZATION PLAN.—

(1) PREPARATION.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget (referred to in this section as the ''Director'') shall prepare a plan to reorganize Federal job training programs to increase their efficiency, integration, and alignment. The plan shall include a proposal to decrease the number of Federal job training programs without decreasing services or accessibility to services for eligible job training participants, including individuals with barriers to employment. In preparing the plan, the Director shall demonstrate that the Director considered the findings of the Government Accountability Office report, and input from the States, heads of the affected Federal departments and agencies, local workforce investment boards, businesses, workforce advocates and community organizations, labor organizations, and relevant education-related organizations.

(2) SUBMISSION.—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit the reorganization plan to the appropriate committees of Congress.

SEC. 205. USING THE NATIONAL DIRECTORY OF NEW HIRES INFORMATION TO ASSIST IN ADMINISTRATION OF WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACT OF 1998 PROGRAMS.

Section 453(j) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 653(j)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(12) INFORMATION COMPARISONS AND DISCLOSURE TO ASSIST IN ADMINISTRATION OF WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACT PROGRAMS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If, for purposes of administering a program of workforce investment activities carried out under subtitle B of title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998, a State agency responsible for the administration of such program transmits to the Secretary the names and social security account numbers of individuals, the Secretary shall disclose to such State agency information on such individuals and their employers maintained in the National Directory of New Hires, subject to this paragraph.

''(B) CONDITION ON DISCLOSURE BY THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall make a disclosure under subparagraph (A) only to the extent that the Secretary determines that the disclosure would not interfere with the effective operation of the program under this part.

''(C) USE AND DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION BY STATE AGENCIES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—A State agency may not use or disclose information provided under this paragraph except for purposes of administering a program referred to in subparagraph (A) (including measuring performance under section 136 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 and preparing reports under subsection (d) of such section, subject to this paragraph).

''(ii) INFORMATION SECURITY.—The State agency shall have in effect data security and control policies that the Secretary finds adequate to ensure the security of information obtained under this paragraph and to ensure that access to such information is restricted to authorized persons for purposes of authorized uses and disclosures.

''(iii) PENALTY FOR MISUSE OF INFORMATION.—An officer or employee of the State agency who fails to comply with this subparagraph shall be subject to the sanctions under subsection (l)(2) to the same extent as if such officer or employee was an officer or employee of the United States.

''(D) PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS.—State agencies requesting information under this paragraph shall adhere to uniform procedures established by the Secretary governing information requests and data matching under this paragraph.

''(E) WAIVER OF REQUIREMENT TO REIMBURSE COSTS.—Notwithstanding subsection (k)(3), a State agency shall not be required to reimburse the Secretary for the costs incurred by the Secretary in furnishing information requested under this paragraph to the State agency.''.

SA 2651. Mr. HELLER (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. COATS, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 2 and insert the following:

SEC. 2. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM.

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 4007(a)(2) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended by striking ''January 1, 2014'' and inserting ''April 1, 2014''.

(b) MODIFICATIONS RELATING TO WEEKS OF EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.—

(1) NUMBER OF WEEKS IN FIRST TIER BEGINNING AFTER DECEMBER 28, 2013.—Section 4002(b) of such Act is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4);

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the heading, by inserting '', AND WEEKS ENDING BEFORE DECEMBER 30, 2013'' after ''2012''; and

(ii) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting '', and before December 30, 2013'' after ''2012''; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) SPECIAL RULE RELATING TO AMOUNTS ESTABLISHED IN AN ACCOUNT AS OF A WEEK ENDING AFTER DECEMBER 29, 2013.—Notwithstanding any provision of paragraph (1), in the case of any account established as of a week ending after December 29, 2013—

''(A) paragraph (1)(A) shall be applied by substituting '24 percent' for '80 percent'; and

''(B) paragraph (1)(B) shall be applied by substituting '6 times' for '20 times'.''.

(2) NUMBER OF WEEKS IN SECOND TIER BEGINNING AFTER DECEMBER 28, 2013.—Section 4002(c) of such Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) SPECIAL RULE RELATING TO AMOUNTS ADDED TO AN ACCOUNT AS OF A WEEK ENDING AFTER DECEMBER 29, 2013.—Notwithstanding any provision of paragraph (1), if augmentation under this subsection occurs as of a week ending after December 29, 2013—

''(A) paragraph (1)(A) shall be applied by substituting '24 percent' for '54 percent'; and

''(B) paragraph (1)(B) shall be applied by substituting '6 times' for '14 times'.''.

(c) FUNDING.—Section 4004(e)(1) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (I), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (J), by inserting ''and'' at the end; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (J) the following:

''(K) the amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) of section 2 of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act;''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–240).

SEC. 2A. REPEAL OF REDUCTIONS MADE BY BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2013.

Section 403 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 (Public Law 113–67) is repealed as of the date of the enactment of such Act.

SEC. 2B. REDUCTION IN BENEFITS BASED ON RECEIPT OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 224 the following new section:

''REDUCTION IN BENEFITS BASED ON RECEIPT OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

''SEC. 224A (a)(1) If for any month prior to the month in which an individual attains retirement age (as defined in section 216(l)(1))—

''(A) such individual is entitled to benefits under section 223, and

''(B) such individual is entitled for such month to unemployment compensation,

the total of the individual's benefits under section 223 for such month and of any benefits under section 202 for such month based on the individual's wages and self-employment income shall be reduced (but not below zero) by the total amount of unemployment compensation received by such individual for such month.

''(2) The reduction of benefits under paragraph (1) shall also apply to any past-due benefits under section 223 for any month in which the individual was entitled to—

''(A) benefits under such section, and

''(B) unemployment compensation.

''(3) The reduction of benefits under paragraph (1) shall not apply to any benefits under section 223 for any month, or any benefits under section 202 for such month based on the individual's wages and self-employment income for such month, if the individual is entitled for such month to unemployment compensation following a period of trial work (as described in section 222(c)(1), participation in the Ticket to Work and Self-Sufficiency Program established under section 1148, or participation in any other program that is designed to encourage an individual entitled to benefits under section 223 or 202 to work.

''(b) If any unemployment compensation is payable to an individual on other than a monthly basis (including a benefit payable as a lump sum to the extent that it is a commutation of, or a substitute for, such periodic compensation), the reduction under this section shall be made at such time or times and in such amounts as the Commissioner of Social Security (referred to in this section as the 'Commissioner') determines will approximate as nearly as practicable the reduction prescribed by subsection (a).

''(c) Reduction of benefits under this section shall be made after any applicable reductions under section 203(a) and section 224, but before any other applicable deductions under section 203.

''(d)(1) Subject to paragraph (2), if the Commissioner determines that an individual may be eligible for unemployment compensation which would give rise to a reduction of benefits under this section, the Commissioner may require, as a condition of certification for payment of any benefits under section 223 to any individual for any month and of any benefits under section 202 for such month based on such individual's wages and self-employment income, that such individual certify—

''(A) whether the individual has filed or intends to file any claim for unemployment compensation, and

''(B) if the individual has filed a claim, whether there has been a decision on such claim.

''(2) For purposes of paragraph (1), the Commissioner may, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, rely upon a certification by the individual that the individual has not filed and does not intend to file such a claim, or that the individual has so filed and no final decision thereon has been made, in certifying benefits for payment pursuant to section 205(i).

''(e) Whenever a reduction in total benefits based on an individual's wages and self-employment income is made under this section for any month, each benefit, except the disability insurance benefit, shall first be proportionately decreased, and any excess of such reduction over the sum of all such benefits other than the disability insurance benefit shall then be applied to such disability insurance benefit.

''(f)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the head of any Federal agency shall provide such information within its possession as the Commissioner may require for purposes of making a timely determination of the amount of the reduction, if any, required by this section in benefits payable under this title, or verifying other information necessary in carrying out the provisions of this section.

''(2) The Commissioner is authorized to enter into agreements with States, political subdivisions, and other organizations that administer unemployment compensation, in order to obtain such information as the Commissioner may require to carry out the provisions of this section.

''(g) For purposes of this section, the term 'unemployment compensation' has the meaning given that term in section 85(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and the total amount of unemployment compensation to which an individual is entitled shall be determined prior to any applicable reduction under State law based on the receipt of benefits under section 202 or 223.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 224(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 424a(a)) is amended, in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''the age of 65'' and inserting ''retirement age (as defined in section 216(l)(1))''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply

to benefits payable for months beginning on or after the date that is 12 months after the date of enactment of this section.

SEC. 2C. REDUCTION OF NONMEDICARE, NONDEFENSE DIRECT SPENDING.

Section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(11) ADDITIONAL REDUCTION OF NONMEDICARE, NONDEFENSE DIRECT SPENDING.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For each of fiscal years 2015 through 2023, in addition to the reduction in direct spending under paragraph (6), on the date specified in paragraph (2), OMB shall prepare and the President shall order a sequestration, effective upon issuance, reducing the spending described in subparagraph (B) by the uniform percentage necessary to reduce such spending for the fiscal year by $1,333,000,000.

''(B) SPENDING COVERED.—The spending described in this subparagraph is spending that is—

''(i) nonexempt direct spending;

''(ii) not spending for the Medicare programs specified in section 256(d); and

''(iii) within the revised nonsecurity category.''.

NOTICE OF HEARING

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 business meeting has been scheduled before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The business meeting will be held on Thursday, January 16, 2014, at 9:30 a.m. in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of this business meeting is to consider the following nominations: Mr. Michael L. Connor, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior; Dr. Elizabeth M. Robinson, to be the Under Secretary of Energy; Dr. Franklin M. Orr, Jr., to be the Under Secretary for Science, Department of Energy; Dr. Steven P. Croley, to be General Counsel of the Department of Energy; Ms. Esther P. Kia'aina, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Insular Areas; Mr. Tommy P. Beaudreau, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Policy, Management, and Budget; Mr. Christopher A. Smith, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy, Fossil Energy; Mr. Jonathan Elkind, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy, International Affairs; Mr. Neil G. Kornze, to be Director of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior; Dr. Marc A. Kastner, to be Director of the Office of Science, Department of Energy; and Dr. Ellen D. Williams, to be Director of the Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy, Department of Energy.

Because of the limited time available for the business meeting, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, 304 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510–6150, or by email to abigail__campbell@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Sam Fowler at 202–224–7571 or Abby Campbell at 202–224–4905.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, January 14, 2014, at 10:15 a.m. for a business meeting to consider pending committee business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, January 14, 2014, at 10:30 a.m. in order to conduct a hearing titled ''Examinng Conference and Travel Spending Across the Federal Government.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, January 14, 2014, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Hearing on the Report of the President's Review Group on Intelligence and Communications Technology.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGING THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, January 14, 2014, at 10:15 a.m., in closed session to receive a briefing on department of defense counterterrorism operations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL AND CONTRACTING OVERSIGHT

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Financial and Contracting Oversight of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, January 14, 2014, at 2:30 p.m. in order to conduct a hearing entitled ''Management of Air Traffic Controller Training Contacts.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 3527, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3527) to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the poison center national toll-free number, national media campaign, and grant program, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 3527) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

DESIGNATING THE LIEUTENANT GENERAL RICHARD J. SEITZ COMMUNITY-BASED OUTPATIENT CLINIC

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Veterans' Affairs Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1434, and we proceed to the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1434) to designate the Junction City Community-Based Outpatient Clinic located at 715 Southwind Drive, Junction City, Kansas, as the Lieutenant General Richard J. Seitz Community-Based Outpatient Clinic.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 1434) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1434

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

SECTION 1. LIEUTENANT GENERAL RICHARD J. SEITZ COMMUNITY-BASED OUTPATIENT CLINIC.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) Lieutenant General Richard J. Seitz served as the cadet commander of a unit of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps at Leavenworth High School in Leavenworth, Kansas, where he earned the American Legion Cup as an outstanding cadet;

(2) while attending Kansas State University, Lieutenant General Seitz accepted a commission as a second lieutenant in the Army and was called into active duty in 1940;

(3) Lieutenant General Seitz volunteered to be one of the first paratroopers in the United States;

(4) at age 25, Lieutenant General Seitz as a major, was given command of the 2nd Battalion of the 517th Parachute Infantry Regimental Combat Team, becoming the youngest battalion commander in the Army;

(5) along with the 7th Armored Division, the battalion commanded by Lieutenant General Seitz formed what became known as Task Force Seitz at the Battle of the Bulge with the mission to plug the gaps on the north slope of the Bulge when the Germans attempted to break out;

(6) the service of Lieutenant General Seitz earned him the Silver Star, 2 Bronze Stars, the Purple Heart, and many other acknowledgments during his 37-year career in the Army;

(7) after victory in Europe, Lieutenant General Seitz remained in the Army, commanding the 2nd Airborne Battle Group, 503rd Infantry Regiment, and the 82nd Airborne Division;

(8) on retiring in 1978, Lieutenant General Seitz settled in Junction City, Kansas, near Ft. Riley, where he would greet deploying and returning units from Iraq and Afghanistan at all times of the day;

(9) Lieutenant General Seitz remained active in the wider community, working with the Coronado Area Council of the Boy Scouts of America, the Fort Riley National Bank, Rotary International, and the Association of the United States Army and serving on the board of the Eisenhower Presidential Library and Museum;

(10) Lieutenant General Seitz had a passion for mentoring young officers and noncommissioned officers at Fort Riley, never ceasing to be a soldier, according to his son, Richard M. Seitz;

(11) Lieutenant General Seitz was named an Outstanding Citizen of Kansas;

(12) in 2012 an elementary school at Fort Riley was named in honor of Lieutenant General Seitz, which is meaningful because he believed the fate of the United States relied on young children and the teachers who inspire them;

(13) during visits to the elementary school, Lieutenant General Seitz would talk with the students about what it meant to be a ''proud and great American'' and his message was always to ''respect the teachers and be a learner'';

(14) the family and friends of Lieutenant General Seitz have described him as a gentleman, compassionate, respected, full of integrity, gracious, giving, and a remarkable individual; and

(15) Lieutenant General Seitz lived each day to its fullest and his commitment to his fellow man serves as an inspiration to all the people of the United States.

(b) DESIGNATION.—The Junction City Community-Based Outpatient Clinic located at 715 Southwind Drive, Junction City, Kansas, shall be known and designated as the ''Lieutenant General Richard J. Seitz Community-Based Outpatient Clinic''.

(c) REFERENCES.—Any reference in any law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Junction City Community-Based Outpatient Clinic referred to in subsection (b) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Lieutenant General Richard J. Seitz Community-Based Outpatient Clinic''.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 1917 AND S. 1926

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am told there are two bills at the desk, and I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for the first time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1917) to provide for additional enhancements of the sexual assault prevention and response activities of the Armed Forces;

A bill (S. 1926) to delay the implementation of certain provisions of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 and to reform the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask for a second reading on both of these measures and, 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 bills will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 15, 2014

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Wednesday, January 15, 2014; 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; and that following any leader remarks, the time until 12 noon be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; and, finally, at 12 noon, the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.J. Res. 106, as provided under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. At approximately 12:15 p.m. tomorrow there will be a rollcall vote on passage of the short-term continuing resolution. Tomorrow we will continue to work on an agreement to consider the flood insurance bill and begin consideration of the Omnibus appropriations bill once it is received from the House.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:11 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, January 15, 2014, at 10 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING REV. ARTHUR EVANS, SR.

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a hardworking and self motivated man, Rev. Arthur Evans, Sr.

Mr. Arthur Evans, Sr., a lifelong resident of Crystal Springs, MS was born on December 26, 1940. He is the son of the late Mr. "Jim" Evans and the late Mrs. Mattie Pearl Evans.

Mr. Evans originally started in the pulpwood hauling business in 1955 trading in his personal car for a pulpwood truck. By 1966, he moved into the gravel business. The business was a huge success. However, being a successful black business owner in 1966 in Mississippi did not come without the horrible racial obstacles of that time.

Mr. Evans was faced with unjust stipulations in contracts that would have never been included if he were white. His truck drivers were constantly harassed and even told "they would continue to be pulled over unless they quit driving for this black man".

Despite the ridicule and malice aimed toward him and his business, Mr. Evans continued to press on as he would not be bullied by bigotry and racial hatred. During the apex of his successful trucking business, Mr. Evans had a fleet of up twenty trucks hauling each day. Now, 55 years later, since the purchase of that pulpwood truck, Arthur Lee Evans Trucking is still going strong.

The owner, as strong as ever, is now known as Rev. Arthur Evans, Sr., since being called into ministry in December, 2000.

Rev. Evans has been married to Mrs. Johnnie Mae Evans for 54 years and is the proud father of 5 children, 15 grandchildren, and 4 great grandchildren.

"Do all the good you can, by all the means you can, in all the ways you can, in all the places you can, at all the times you can, to all the people you can, as long as ever you can." by John Wesley, is the sentiments of the heart of Rev. Arthur Evans, Sr.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing a dynamic and dedicated businessman, Rev. Arthur Evans, Sr.

HONORING MR. MARIO MURGADO

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Mario Murgado, an outstanding individual and someone who has become one of the most highly regarded business leaders in Southern Florida.

Mr. Murgado currently serves as President and Chief Executive Officer of Brickell Motors in Miami, FL. He began his career as a sales representative at a different car dealership, but quickly moved up the ranks. Working through sales, management, and finance, he eventually became President and CEO of Braman Imports. Throughout his career Mr. Murgado has been credited with reviving numerous dealerships in and around Miami, and helped transform them into top performers. Additionally, he has served as Chairman of the Florida Automobile Dealers Association and the American Honda National Dealer Advisory Board, and was a member of the General Motors advisory boards for marketing and fixed-operations dealers. Currently, he sits on the board of the South Florida Automobile Dealers Association.

Outside of his business, Mr. Murgado is an active member of numerous civic and community organizations. He served as finance chair for the commissioning of the USS *Gridley*, a guided-missile destroyer in the first naval vessel ever commissioned in Miami. He currently serves as a member of the Board of Trustees for St. Thomas University in Miami, dual role at Miami Children's Hospital Board and Foundation and is Vice Chair, and he is also a member of the World President's Organization.

Throughout the years, Mr. Murgado has been consistently recognized for his achievements. He received the TIME Dealer of the Year award, awarded annually to only 60 dealers nationwide. He has also been awarded the American International Automobile Dealers Impact Award, and was an inductee into the Miami-Dade Hall of Fame. Over the years I have also had the privilege of getting to know Mario, and his wife Bibiana, on a personal level and hold them in the highest regard. They are truly one of the most exceptional, loyal, trustworthy, and caring families I know, and I am lucky to call them my friends. I look forward to many more years of friendship and wish nothing but the best for Mario, Bibiana, and the entire Murgado family.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to Mr. Mario Murgado for his continued service to Southern Florida and I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this remarkable individual.

TRIBUTE TO EMILY HEIN

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Emily Hein of Clive, Iowa for her commitment and enthusiasm as a foreign language student at the University of Rochester.

Emily has been selected for a United States Department of State Critical Language Scholarship to study Advanced Chinese in Qingdao, China. This State Department program is an important component of the federal government's coordinated effort to expand the number of Americans learning foreign languages and to increase cultural competency.

Mr. Speaker, I consider it a great honor to represent future leaders from Iowa like Emily Hein in the United States Congress. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating her on earning this special scholarship. I wish Ms. Hein continued success in her studies, her travel and all her future endeavors.

HONORING THE MEMORY AND SERVICE OF CITY ADMINISTRATOR JAMES G. SCHARRET TO THE CITY OF SOUTHFIELD

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory and service of James G. Scharret, City Administrator for the City of Southfield, who passed away unexpectedly on January 9, 2014.

Mr. Scharret, or Jim as he was known to friends and colleagues, joined the city nearly forty years ago on December 10, 1974, as a research analyst and steadily moved up in the ranks. He became director of management and budget in 1982, deputy city administrator/fiscal services director in November 2004 and acting city administrator in November 2006. He was officially appointed to the post of city administrator in January 2008.

Jim held a Bachelor of Science Degree in Business Administration from Wayne State University and a Master's Degree in Public Administration from Central Michigan University. He was well-known for his work ethic, which included being a constant presence in city hall.

As the city administrator, Jim approached his responsibilities with both pride and professionalism. He was particularly mindful of the need for sound fiscal stewardship and took the city's fiscal responsibility very seriously. Under his leadership, Southfield was recognized on many occasions for its sound financial outlook. Of his many accomplishments, Jim was especially proud of leading Southfield through a period of economic difficulty; the city saw its tax base decline by 40 percent but services were maintained without any city employee being laid off.

In addition to running the day to day operations of the city, Jim served on the boards of the Michigan Municipal Risk Management Authority, Brownfield Redevelopment Authority and Local Development Finance Authority. In each of these roles, he worked hard to further the city's vision of a vibrant and prosperous Southfield—approaching them with the same dedication that has endeared him to Southfield's residents, business leaders and elected officials.

Mr. Speaker, as a former city councilman, I know first-hand how communities benefit from

dedicated administrators. Jim's decades of dedicated service to the residents of Southfield is a testament to his character and I know that his leadership will be missed by all who are connected to the Southfield community. I offer my sincere condolences to his wife, Carolyn and their family. They can be proud of the example Jim set for all those who choose to serve their community.

HONORING 1LT(P) KINA TULANE LEWIS

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor 1LT(P) Kina Tulane Lewis, who is a remarkable soldier and public servant.

1LT(P) Kina Tulane Lewis is a life time resident of Georgetown, MS. She was born in Copiah County on January 6, 1988 to Joe Donell and Carrie Ann Lewis. Ms. Lewis is the sister of three brothers: Ronald Cleve, Joey and Anthony Lewis.

1LT(P) Lewis attended Crystal Springs High School where she graduated and continued her education at Alcorn State University with a major in Business Administration.

1LT(P) Kina Tulane Lewis joined the United States Army in June 7, 2007 and was commissioned as officer in May 21, 2010.

1LT(P) Lewis is stationed at Fort Riley, KS with 1–7 FA as the Battalion S6. Some of 1LT(P) Lewis' duties are being in charge of communication systems, such as computers, radios, satellite systems and phones.

1LT(P) Lewis is still serving in the United States Army and the awards that she has received so far are: ARCOM and AAM.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing a dedicated solider, 1LT(P) Kina Tulane Lewis, for her dedication to serving others and our country.

CONGRATULATING HONDA OF GREENSBURG

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Honda of Greensburg on receiving the EPA's Energy Star Certification for the second year in a row.

This plant, in my home district, has met strict energy efficiency-performance levels set by the EPA and performs in the top 25 percent of similar facilities nationwide for energy efficiency.

The plant provides 2,000 jobs for Hoosiers and has spent more than $16 billion with suppliers in North America since 2008.

This Japanese company thriving in Indiana is a shining example of what a strong trade relationship with international partners can mean for our local economy.

The Asia-Pacific region is the fastest growing region of the world and a robust relationship with this region promotes economic growth, creates jobs and bolsters the American middle class.

As members of Congress we need to continue to promote policies that provide for a strong trade relationship with our partners in Asia and in turn provide much-needed, good-paying jobs for the American people.

TRIBUTE TO LINDA PEARSON

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to an individual whose dedication and contributions to the community are exceptional. Corona has been fortunate to have dynamic and dedicated community leaders who willingly and unselfishly give their time and talent and make their communities a better place to live and work. Linda Pearson is one of these individuals. On January 16, 2014, Linda will be honored as the 2013 "Citizen of the Year" at the Corona Chamber of Commerce Installation and Awards Gala at the Eagle Glen Golf Club.

For over 34 years, Linda has tirelessly dedicated herself to serving the Corona Regional Medical Center. She is currently the Director of Marketing, Patient Relations, and Volunteers and is known for her creative thinking and quick problem solving.

In addition to working with the Corona Regional Medical Center, Linda is a committed member of many other local organizations and serves on multiple boards whose programs help ensure the betterment of our community. Over the years, she has held board member positions with the Circle City Rotary, Corona Chamber of Commerce, Foundation for Community and Family Health, and Crossroads Christian School. Linda Pearson truly is an example of an individual committed to decades of service and outstanding representation within Corona and Riverside County at large.

Linda is known as an effective leader with a natural ability to organize the efforts and goodwill of others. She is an enthusiastic team builder who enjoys the challenge of researching and analyzing to find viable solutions to improve the lives of all community members. In light of this, Linda was awarded the Corona-Norco YMCA Ira D. "Cal" Calvert Distinguished Service Award in May 2009, which honors exceptional community volunteers. She was also honored with the Distinguished Citizen Award by the Temescal District Boy Scouts of America.

Considering all that Linda has done for Corona, the Corona Chamber of Commerce named Linda their 2013 Citizen of the Year. Linda's tireless passion for service has contributed immensely to the betterment of our community. She has been the heart and soul of many organizations and events and I am proud to call her a fellow community member, American and friend. I know that many community members are grateful for her service and salute her as she receives this prestigious award.

HONORING COLONEL JOSEPH F. LAMPERT ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE UNITED STATES ARMY

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a fellow Hoosier, Colonel Joseph F. Lampert, on the occasion of his retirement from the United States Army after 36 years of faithful and dedicated service to his country while also working tirelessly as an educator and leader in his community.

Colonel Lampert, the grandson of hard working immigrant grandparents, was born and raised in Indianapolis and is a graduate of Cardinal Ritter High School. Upon graduation, Colonel Lampert continued his education at Indiana University.

Colonel Lampert put his education on hold to enter military service by enlisting in the United States Army and serving as a Pershing Missile Crewman in Germany. Upon completion of his initial enlistment, Colonel Lampert returned to Indiana University and completed a bachelor's and master's degree in education and began his education career as a teacher and later as an administrator with the Metropolitan School District of Pike Township, in Indianapolis.

In 1984, Colonel Lampert again answered the call of duty for military service by enlisting in the United States Army Reserve. After serving for a year, Colonel Lampert received a direct commission as a Second Lieutenant in the Adjutant General Corps.

During his tenure with the United States Army Reserve, Colonel Lampert served in a number of command, administrative, and operational staff positions with the 123rd Army Reserve Command in Indianapolis; 70th Training Division in Muncie, Indiana; 21st Theater Support Command in Indianapolis and Kaiserslautern, Germany; Eighth United States Army, Indianapolis and Yongsan, South Korea; 377th Theater Support Command, New Orleans; 100th Training Division, Fort Wayne, Indiana and Owensboro, Kentucky; and 78th Training Command, Fort Dix, New Jersey. Colonel Lampert is concluding his exemplarily military career serving as the Deputy Chief of Staff–G1 with the Military Intelligence Readiness Command at Fort Belvoir, Virginia.

While serving as an educational administrator, Colonel Lampert was mobilized on three different occasions to Fort Benning in support of Operation Desert Shield/Storm, to Germany and the Balkans in support of Operation Joint Endeavor/Forge, and to Germany and Turkey in support of the Global War on Terrorism. In each instance, Colonel Lampert served with distinction.

Colonel Lampert's exemplary military service earned him numerous awards and decorations including the Legion of Merit, Meritorious Service Medal with silver oak leaf cluster, Army Commendation Medal with silver oak leaf cluster, and the Army Achievement Medal with three oak leaf clusters. Throughout his illustrious career, Colonel Lampert has worked diligently to implement improved operational training processes and procedures to improve unit readiness and enhance success on the battlefield.

On behalf of the people of the great Hoosier State and a grateful nation, I commend Colonel Joseph F. Lampert for his many years of dedicated service to our country. He has demonstrated exceptional meritorious service during both his educational and United States Army career. I wish the very best to Colonel Lampert, his wife, Jaye, and their two adult children, Joseph E. and Jacqueline.

HONORING CORPORAL EUGENE ROBINSON

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Corporal Eugene Robinson, who is a remarkable Veteran, community and public servant.

Corporal Eugene Robinson was born on July 17, 1949 to L. J. and Lula Bell Robinson. He is the oldest of 8 children. His siblings are: Lula Mae R. Ward, Evelyn R. Roberson, Carolyn R. McCadney, Edward Robinson, Lawrence J. Robinson, Charles Robinson and Patrina R. Dace. He attended Brushy Creek Attendance Center located in the Brushy Creek Community until he graduated from the 8th grade and had to attend William Henry Holtzclaw School in Crystal Springs, MS and graduated in 1967.

Corporal Robinson joined the United States Marines in 1967 and served until 1971. He went to Parris Island, SC for his basic training and he had his Infantry and MOS training at Camp Lejeune. He was deployed from Camp Pendleton, CA, where he spent 19 months in the Vietnam War. His duty there was Motor Transport, which was hauling ammo and supplies to the front line. Afterwards, he was shipped back to Camp Lejeune, where he received an honorable discharge in September 1971.

Corporal Robinson's Medals and Ribbons received are: National Defense Service medal; Good conduct; Navy Unit Commendation; Combat Action Ribbon; Republic of Vietnam Service Medal; and Republic of Vietnam Campaign Medal.

Corporal Robinson is a member of Brushy Creek M. B. Church where he serves as the church secretary, Sunday school teacher and is on the Deacon's ministry for over 30 years.

Corporal Robinson also served his community as Assistant chief of Hopewell Volunteer Fire Dept, when it was first organized in the Hopewell Community and is an active member of Hopewell Lodge #507 F & AM where he currently serves as secretary.

Corporal Robinson is married to Joyce Murry Robinson and they have 3 children: Samantha Murfree, Eugene Robinson, II and Jarvis Robinson. To provide for his family Corporal Robinson followed in his father's footsteps and became a pulp wood hauler. He soon moved on to become a tree length logger being one of the first black loggers in the small community of Brushy Creek. He continued until he owned his own Logging Company and retired in 2012.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing a remarkable servant and Veteran, Corporal Eugene Robinson, for his dedication to serving our country and others.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF AMERICAN JAZZ DRUMMER AND BANDLEADER CHICO HAMILTON

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor legendary American Jazz drummer and composer Chico Hamilton who passed away on November 25, 2013 at the age of 92 in New York. Chico Hamilton was a dear friend and an inspiration to countless of musicians and jazz enthusiasts worldwide. The California-born musician was famous for his unique cool melodic sound that forever revolutionized how jazz drums were played and incorporated into music. Although I speak with grief of such an overwhelming loss, I ascend to rejoice a life well lived and proudly remember the accomplishments of such a remarkable musician and artist.

Mr. Hamilton was born Foreststorn Hamilton in Los Angeles on September 21, 1921. A passionate drummer, he played in high school jazz bands alongside, his good friend and famous saxophonist Dexter Gordon. As a teenager, Mr. Hamilton quickly made a name for himself and earned a place touring with Lionel Hampton's famed big band. Not only was Mr. Hamilton a talented musician, but he also proudly served in the U.S. Army during World War II. Upon his return, his love of music led him to greatness, as he played alongside artists like Count Basie, Jimmy Mundy, and Charlie Barnet. Mr. Hamilton would soon find overwhelming success after starting his own quintet in 1955.

The Chico Hamilton Quintet was celebrated for its distinctive laid-back swing style and fusion of creative sound; it soon became a staple at many major jazz festivals, clubs and college campuses for decades. Even as recently as this past October, Mr. Hamilton performed for passionate music fans regularly at Manhattan's Drom. Throughout his illustrious career, Mr. Hamilton recorded over 60 albums as a leader on several prominent recording labels, including: Columbia, Soul Note, Impulse and Pacific Jazz. His work has been eternalized in many classical films and musicals, including ''Sweet Smell of Success'' and ''You'll Never Get Rich,'' with Fred Astaire.

Most notably, Mr. Hamilton was a dedicated great-grandfather, grandfather, father and husband who is survived by his daughter Denise Hamilton; his brother Don; one granddaughter and two great-granddaughters. He will be forever remembered for his work as a pioneering jazz drummer and his dedication to his family.

Mr. Speaker, rather than mourn his passing, I hope that my colleagues will join me in celebrating the life of my friend Chico Hamilton by remembering that he exemplified greatness in every way.

TRIBUTE TO IOWA REPRESENTATIVE STAN GUSTAFSON

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Iowa's newest State Representative, Stan Gustafson, following his resounding electoral victory on January 7th. Representative Gustafson will represent Iowa House District 25, which includes Madison and Warren Counties, for the remainder of the 85th General Assembly.

Stan's election to the Iowa House of Representatives is a great benefit for our State and yet another example of his lifetime commitment to service. Originally from California, Mr. Gustafson attended the University of California at Berkeley and obtained a bachelor's degree in finance while participating in the Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps. Upon graduation, Stan received his Commission as a 2nd Lieutenant and began a 23-year military career. Stan's patriotic service to our nation placed him in the thick of the Vietnam War where he served as a Forward Artillery Observer. Once his overseas tour had concluded, Stan returned home to attend law school and continue his contribution to our nation as a military reservist for more than two decades. Stan would ultimately retire as a Lieutenant Colonel and remains a staunch advocate for our men and women in uniform. Today, Stan and his wife Betty, a Dallas County native, reside in Cumming and stay busy as active community participants and loving grandparents.

Mr. Speaker, the selflessness and leadership Mr. Gustafson has shown throughout his entire life and career is nothing short of remarkable. At home and abroad, Stan has consistently stepped up to serve his neighbors and his nation. I can attest that he has been, and will continue to be, a true asset to supporting a thriving democracy in our great State. It is a great honor to represent Stan, Betty, and all of Iowa House District 25 in the United States Congress and I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Stan for his efforts. I wish Representative Gustafson nothing but the best as he continues his work to help our State and preserve our freedoms.

BREAST DENSITY AND MAMMOGRAPHY REPORTING ACT

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank one of my constituents, Laura Mason Caldwell of Eugene, Oregon, for her tireless advocacy on behalf of breast cancer patients. In large part thanks to Laura's work, we have a new law in Oregon that requires doctors to inform patients in writing if they have dense breast tissue. This is a small change that could have a major benefit. Dense breast tissue has been associated with increased risk of breast cancer, and routine mammograms are less likely to effectively detect tumors in women who have dense breast tissue. Had Laura been informed about these risk factors early on, she may have been able to catch her cancer before it spread. Oregonians now have that information, but women in many other states do not. For that reason House leadership needs to bring up the bipartisan Breast Density and Mammography Reporting Act, H.R. 3404, for a vote. Passing H.R. 3404 will make sure that women across the country have access to the

information necessary to detect breast cancer early when it is most treatable.

HONORING GREGORY L. YOUNG

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable veteran, Mr. Gregory L. Young. Mr. Young has shown what can be done through hard work, setting goals, and aiming high.

Gregory L. Young was born December 20, 1963 in Yazoo City, Mississippi to Doris and Neal Young. Gregory graduated from Yazoo City High School in May of 1981. He attended University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, MS from August 1981 to May of 1982 when he joined the United States Navy in the spring of 1982. In August of 1982 he began his U.S. Navy career at the Navy Recruit Training Command (NRTC) in Great Lakes, Illinois.

After graduating from his Navy (A) School, Gregory was assigned to the U.S.S. *Estocin* FFG–15 home ported at Naval Station Mayport, Florida. In October 1985 he transferred to the U.S.S. *Charles F. Adams* DDG–2 and served until February 1989. Later in February, 1989, Gregory transferred to Navy Recruiting District (NRD) St. Louis, MO and served as a Navy Recruiter in Columbia, Missouri until March, 1993. While on recruiting duty, he attained the rank of E–6 and ultimately served as the Recruiter in Charge of the local recruiting office.

After a successful tour of recruiting duty, he transferred to the U.S.S. *Wainwright* CG–28 home ported out of Charleston, South Carolina. He served onboard the U.S.S. *Wainwright* from April, 1993 until November, 1993 as a CIC Watch Supervisor.

In November, 1993 Gregory decided to leave the U.S. Navy and was honorably discharged as an Operation Specialist First Class. He served his country honorably for a total of 11 years. During that time, he participated in three six month deployments, two Special Operations deployments and numerous exercises and humanitarian operations. He has also received numerous awards throughout his naval services including: Navy Achievement Medal, National Defense Service Medal, U.S. Coast Guard Meritorious Unit Commendation, Battle "E" Award (3), Sea Service Deployment Ribbon (3), Good Conduct Award (2), the Navy Recruiting Ribbon and Gold Wreath Award (2).

After Gregory's tenure with the U.S. Navy, he was hired by the SkyTel Corp. in May of 1994 as a Customer Service Representative in Jackson, MS. While in this position he was selected along with a few other employees to conduct testing of the Skytel Two Way Paging network through the United States. He was later promoted to Network Operator in the company's Network Operation Center. Gregory enjoyed working for SkyTel and stayed with the company until it was later sold and relocated in December, 2008. After a long period of unemployment due to the economic recession, he went to work for Comcast as a Customer Account Executive in February, 2010 and remained until November, 2010.

In December, 2010 Gregory accepted an offer from the Department of Homeland Security as a Transportation Security Officer (TSO) with the Transportation Security Agency (TSA). Currently, he is a dual certified TSO at the Jackson Municipal Airport. He was selected as TSO of the Quarter (April–June 2012) for the State of Mississippi. In January of 2013 he was selected as the TSO of The Year 2012 for the State of Mississippi.

Gregory is a devout member of North Jackson Baptist Church in Jackson, MS where he serves as a trustee.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Gregory L. Young for his dedication to serving our great Country and his community.

HONORING AMBASSADOR SHANKAR SHARMA FOR HIS DEDICATED SERVICE TO THE FEDERAL DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF NEPAL, AS AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES

HON. ANDER CRENSHAW

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank the Honorable Ambassador of Nepal, Shankar Sharma, on behalf of the Congressional Nepal Caucus for his dedicated service both to his country and to the United States over the past four years.

No doubt due in part to his tireless and committed work for Nepal, the past four years have brought many positive changes to the country and its relations with the United States. Not only has the Congressional Nepal Caucus been established, which will continue to educate Members of Congress on Capitol Hill about Nepal and the benefits of a strong relationship between our two countries, but the Peace Corps has resumed in Nepal after an 8 year hiatus due to a now-resolved conflict. In addition, the Millennium Challenge Corporation has declared Nepal "threshold program eligible," strengthening the dialogue between the two countries and preparing Nepal for a future MCC Compact. And in April of 2011, a Trade and Investment Framework Agreement was signed, which established a framework for trade and resolved outstanding disputes between our nations. Each of these triumphs strengthens our relationship and will continue to help Nepal in their path to development and democracy.

The Congressional Nepal Caucus would also like to acknowledge Ambassador Sharma on his many years of service to Nepal. As Deputy Chairman at the National Planning Commission in Nepal, Chief Advisor in Ministry of Finance, Alternate Governor of Nepal for the International Monetary Fund, and Senior Economist in Institute of South East Asian Studies, Ambassador Sharma has steered Nepal in a viable direction.

I am grateful for the leadership and dedication of Ambassador Sharma; and I thank him for his contribution to strengthen our relationship between Nepal and the United States. He will be missed in Washington, and the Caucus wishes him best of luck in his future endeavors.

IN RECOGNITION OF SARA MILLER MCCUNE

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Sara Miller McCune for a life and career distinguished by tremendous accomplishment, success and generosity.

Mrs. Miller McCune is a prominent business leader, charitable philanthropist and valued member of the Central Coast community. Originally from Queens, New York, Sara and her late husband, George McCune, founded the renowned SAGE Publications in 1965. Since that time, SAGE Publications has flourished as a prestigious institution of academic publishing, employing nearly 1,000 people around the world. The company publishes hundreds of journals and has thousands of academic titles in print. Sara is also the founder of the Miller-McCune Center for Research, Media and Public Policy and the SAGE Center for the Study of the Mind at the University of California Santa Barbara.

Mrs. Miller McCune's philanthropy is far-reaching and has been aimed at improving educational opportunities for all. Her giving represents her commitment to the underprivileged, and fulfilling achievement gaps for students everywhere. Sara and her husband established the McCune Foundation in the 1990s with the goal of empowering underserved populations through targeted grant-making. Today, the Foundation supports a number of community building initiatives that address a wide range of issues up and down the Central Coast. Additionally, Mrs. McCune has endowed a competitive internship program at the University of California, Santa Barbara to provide service-learning opportunities for students to give back to their community.

Sara is also a supporter of Cottage Hospital and the Granada Theater in my hometown of Santa Barbara. These are only a few of the many examples where Sara has proven her benevolent spirit and we cannot thank her enough.

I am pleased to celebrate Sara's countless achievements as she is honored by her friends and colleagues tonight. She is truly a pioneer in the world of publishing and a treasured member of our community.

COMMEMORATING THE 225TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY

HON. MICK MULVANEY

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and pleasure that I rise today to bring to my colleagues' attention the 225th anniversary of the founding of Georgetown University. As a proud alumnus of the Georgetown University School of Foreign Service, I will always know that the University and these United States began together in 1789. The University's founding is tied to the first deed of property from which the current University took shape on January 23, 1789—acquired by

Bishop John Carroll, the first Catholic bishop in the United States and the University's founder.

From that date forward, Georgetown's growth and that of our nation have been intertwined. I am proud that the University's federal charter—the second such charter approved by Congress after that of the U. S. Military Academy—was proposed in legislation introduced by one of the University's first students, Congressman William Gaston of North Carolina. As a Carolinian myself, I have to say, from the beginning, Georgetown was off on the right footing. It is fitting that the University's main lecture hall bears the name Gaston Hall.

Our school colors have roots deep in our nation's history as well. During the Civil War more than 1,000 Georgetown alumni served in both the Union and Confederate armies. The blue and the gray, then, reflect the divided allegiances of both students and alumni during that war.

Today, the student body is comprised of students from every state and from 141 nations around the globe.

I am heartened that Georgetown has remained true to the Roman Catholic and Jesuit values on which it was founded. The University prides itself as a place of vigorous dialogue. It pushes students to pursue lives enriched by research and scholarship. I am happy to say that, since my election to Congress, I have had several opportunities to explore some of the issues we are working on in the House of Representatives with faculty who have deep and valuable knowledge on these topics.

I was lucky to study at Georgetown under professors such as Madeline Albright and Fr. James Reddington. They made me think and challenge my assumptions. They helped me grow and shaped my subsequent career. Certainly, Georgetown's commitment to encouraging students to explore public service is reflected in its Mission Statement which ends with an admonition to those who have studied there "to be reflective lifelong learners, to be responsible and active participants in civic life and to live generously in service to others." It is not surprising then that, since William Gaston entered Congress in 1814, over 150 Georgetown alumni and faculty members have served in the U. S. Congress. Others have served as President, governors, cabinet secretaries, judges and as senior diplomats around the globe. Likewise, the University is equally proud of alumni who have gone on to be leaders in their communities in fields such as business, arts, health care or the law.

It is an honor to recognize Georgetown on this occasion of its 225th "birthday," but, more importantly, to wish my alma mater great progress in the centuries ahead.

HONORING CORPORAL SHERONDRA McGEE BAILEY

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable veteran, Mrs. Sherondra McGee Bailey. Mrs. Bailey has shown what can be done through hard work, dedication and a desire to make a positive difference in serving others.

Sherondra McGee Bailey is a resident of Vicksburg, Mississippi born on August 8, 1982 to Beverly Thomas and Patrick Pope in New Orleans, LA. She is the oldest of eleven children born to Beverly Thomas. She graduated from South Delta High School in 2000.

After High School Sherondra attended the University of Southern Mississippi where she met and married Brandon Bailey and to that union they have one son, Brayden Bailey.

Sherondra enlisted in the United States Air Force in April 2008. She graduated number two in her Meteorologist class. She was later stationed at the Barksdale Air Force Base located in Louisiana.

Sherondra is a devout member of Clark Chapel United Methodist Church in Cary, MS. She enjoys time with family and friends.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mrs. Sherondra McGee Bailey for her dedication to serving our great Country.

CONGRATULATING DONALD "DONNY" BYNUM AS THE 2014 ALABAMA SUPERINTENDENT OF THE YEAR

HON. MARTHA ROBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate an exemplary public servant, Donald "Donny" Bynum, recipient of the distinguished 2014 Alabama Superintendent of the Year award.

A prime example of servant leadership, Superintendent Bynum has served for over 29 years as a teacher, coach, and administrator. He holds an AA Degree in School Administration plus a Master of Science in School Administration, both from Troy University in Dothan, and a Bachelor of Science in Education from Troy University.

Prior to his tenure as the Superintendent of Dale County Schools, Mr. Bynum served as an Education Specialist with the Alabama Department of Education and in various capacities within the Dale County School System. Such positions included the Transportation Supervisor; Principal at G.W. Long Elementary School; and as the Assistant Principal at G.W. Long School.

Almost one year ago, the nation watched a terrifying situation emerge in Dale County, Alabama. The murder of a school bus driver, abduction of a five-year old student, and the prolonged hostage situation that ensued presented a unique challenge for all levels of state and local government. That was especially true for Dale County Schools, which was faced with the murder of an employee and the abduction of a student, all while the need to ensure the safety and stability of the schools was paramount. Superintendent Bynum handled this challenge with strength and grace, helping lead the students, parents, faculty and community through the tragedy. By all accounts, Dale County emerged stronger and more united than ever, thanks in large part to Superintendent Donny Bynum's leadership in this trying time.

Also active in the Dale County community, Superintendent Bynum is involved with the Dale County Children's Policy Council, Dale County United Way Board of Directors, School Superintendents of Alabama Board of Directors District III President, and he and his wife Paula, a retired educator, are members of the Ozark Baptist Church. He and Paula have two children, Mason and Elizabeth.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring Donny Bynum as the 2014 Alabama Superintendent of the Year. His exceptional moral character, experience, and dedication to the Alabama school system render him a qualified recipient of this honor. I am grateful for Bynum's service and proudly recognize his contributions to the betterment of the great State of Alabama.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BRETT GUTHRIE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from votes in the House January 7–10, 2014, due to the death of my mother. Had I been present, I would have voted: rollcall No. 1 (Quorum call): Present; rollcall No. 2 (H.R. 724): "yea"; rollcall No. 3 (H.R. 3527): "yea"; rollcall No. 4 (H.R. 3628): "yea"; rollcall No. 5 (Previous Question): "yea"; rollcall No. 6 (Rule for H.R. 2279 and H.R. 3811): "yea"; rollcall No. 7 (Sinema Amendment to H.R. 2279): "nay"; rollcall No. 8 (Tonko Amendment to H.R. 2279): "nay"; rollcall No. 9 (Motion to Recommit H.R. 2279): "nay"; rollcall No. 10 (Passage of H.R. 2279): "yea"; rollcall No. 11 (Passage of H.R. 3811): "yea."

CONGRATULATING MARY KAY RUMMEL

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize Mary Kay Rummel, a community poet, who was inaugurated on January 10, 2014 as the first Poet Laureate of Ventura County.

Nominated by the Ventura County Arts Council, Mary was ultimately selected as the county's first laureateship for her long and celebrated career as a poet in the region. In conjunction with the title of Poet Laureate, Mary will also serve a two year position as official poet and ambassador to the community, a position that is dedicated to putting a spotlight on poetry and expanding the audiences of the literary arts in the area.

Mary's work has been described as "luminous meditations on the nature of love in which imagery and the beauty of language shine." Her literary work will serve to promote, encourage and inspire community members to develop their own creative interests.

Over the last 35 years, more than 350 of Mary's poems have appeared in national and international literary journals and anthologies. Throughout her career, she has also received over a dozen poetry awards that range from local accolades to multiple nominations for the highly prestigious Pushcart Prize.

Beyond her poetry career, and her duties as a wife, mother of three and a grandmother,

Mary is vigorously involved in the community, including being an active participant in poetry readings throughout the county. She has collaborated with visual artists, sculptors, musicians and dancers. Additionally, she has been a professor at California State University, Channel Islands since it first opened its doors in 2002.

I am confident that Mary's talents and passion for the art will be reflected positively in her new position. I am pleased to join with the Ventura County Arts Council and the people of Ventura County in congratulating our first Poet Laureate, Mary Kay Rummel.

HONORING MASTER SERGEANT JAMES M. SHINARD, SR.

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkably dedicated and ambitious Army veteran, who has over 28 years of service to his country, Master Sergeant James M. Shinard, Sr.

Master Sergeant Shinard was born December 24, 1963 in Bolton, MS. He began his career in the armed forces in July 1985. Advancing through a number of military schools of training, Master Sergeant Shinard quickly advanced in rank from student to Squad Leader by January 1986. While serving as Team Leader, he was a part of the 1/17 Infantry Battalion 2 ID Camp Casey in Korea. As a Squad Leader, he was a part of the 155th Infantry Brigade Mississippi during Desert Storm from 1990 to 1991 and 87th Division Camp Shelby, Mississippi as a soldier during Iraqi Freedom from 2003 to 2010.

In addition to his active duty service with the Army, Master Sergeant Shinard performed with the Mississippi Army National Guard 155th Brigade (Mechanized) in Brookhaven, MS and with the United States Army Reserve as Observer Controller with the 3/346 Regt Battalion, 87th Division at Camp Shelby Mississippi, cumulatively from 1989 to 2003.

Throughout his service, he has been promoted four times to his current rank as Master Sergeant, promoted April 15, 2009 in the Army Reserve.

Throughout his 28 years of service, Master Sergeant Shinard has received numerous decorations and badges. Among those received are; the Humanitarian Service Medal, Combat Action Badge, Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal, National Defense Service Medal (with Bronze Service Star), and Armed Forces Reserve Medal (with ''M'' Device and 20-Year Silver Hourglass). His present assignment is Mobilization/Readiness NCO, 412 Theater Engineer Command (TPU) in Vicksburg, MS. Currently, Master Sergeant Shinard is also pursuing an educational degree at Belhaven University, which he plans to complete in June 2014.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Master Sergeant James M. Shinard, Sr. for his unwavering dedication and service as a respected veteran for his family, local community, and country.

CELEBRATING THE 90TH BIRTHDAY OF EVELYN KEISER

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am truly honored to rise today and recognize Mrs. Evelyn Keiser on the occasion of her 90th birthday, which was on January 12, 2014.

Evelyn was born Evelyn Cahn in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania in 1924. She graduated from Temple University with a bachelor of science degree in Medical Technology, one of only a few women in what was then a predominately male field of study. As a military wife, she traveled throughout the United States where her education and ambition for the medical field led to her employment in several hospitals and medical labs.

After World War II, she returned to Philadelphia and opened her own medical lab, which she operated for more than 12 years. As the demands of motherhood increased, Evelyn sold her medical lab and embarked on a rewarding teaching career. She joined the Franklin School of Sciences and led the Medical Sciences and Lab Technology programs. In 1961, she moved to South Florida to head the medical program at Charron-Williams College in Fort Lauderdale.

In 1977, with her son Dr. Arthur Keiser, she opened the Keiser School on Oakland Park Boulevard in Fort Lauderdale with one student and 2,400 square feet of classrooms.

The Keiser School name progression from Keiser Institute of Technology (1982) to Keiser College (1986) and Keiser University (2006) reflects milestones that include new degree programs, multiple branch campuses, accreditation achievements, and the addition of the Graduate School offering Master's degrees.

In 1981, another dream of hers became a reality when the Medical Laboratory Technician program was added to the Keiser School course offerings. Evelyn assumed the teaching and faculty development responsibilities. Under her direction, the program received accreditation from the National Accrediting Agency for Clinical Laboratory Sciences, confirming the highest quality in medical laboratory academics and training.

More than 25 years later, although no longer teaching, she continues to advise faculty and serve as an advocate for students.

Nearly three decades later, Evelyn is still active in the university, serving as Chairwoman of the Board of Advisors. At 90 years young, and 37 years after co-founding Keiser University, she is often the first on campus each morning.

Throughout her lifelong career in medical labs and in higher education, Evelyn has been awarded honors too numerous to list, including ''Teacher of the Year'' and ''Educator of the Year.'' In February 2004, she was awarded an honorary doctorate from Beijing University, citing her commitment to educational articulation agreements between China and the United States.

To the faculty and administration of Keiser University, Evelyn Keiser sets the example that all students deserve the highest quality of academic instruction. As a result, the University's top teaching honor awarded to faculty members that have excelled in a proactive teaching approach focused on successful learning outcomes is entitled, ''The Evelyn C. Keiser Teaching Excellence Award.''

Today, Keiser University serves 20,000 students on 15 Florida campuses and internationally, as well as offers approximately 90 doctoral through associate degrees, and employs nearly 3,500 staff and faculty.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the great privilege of knowing Evelyn Keiser for over 30 years. She has been a wonderful friend to me. I am so happy to be able to honor her on the occasion of her 90th birthday, and wish her many more years of happiness and success.

CONGRATULATING CHRISTOPHER MILLER FOR STUDIES IN THE CRITICAL LANGUAGE SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Christopher Miller, a constituent of mine from Southlake, TX, on studying the Arabic language in Meknes, Morocco, under the Critical Language Scholarship Program.

The Critical Language Scholarship program was established in 2006 as part of the National Security Language Initiative. This interagency effort was formed with recognition of the need for our future diplomatic and intelligence personnel to learn languages such as Arabic, Farsi, Urdu, and Chinese. It provides an intensive regimen of study at beginner, intermediate, and advanced levels for both undergraduate and graduate students. The program goes beyond just language and provides cultural experiences by immersion in the host country.

It was a pleasure to receive the U.S. State Department's announcement that one of my constituents, Christopher Miller, had successfully participated in the Critical Language Scholarship Program this past summer. Acceptance is highly competitive, and so I commend his studying Advanced Arabic in Meknes. Christopher's success is a testament to dedication, skill, and hard work; and I look forward to his accomplishing great things in any endeavor that he pursues in life.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 24th Congressional District of Texas, I ask all my distinguished colleagues to join me in congratulating Christopher Miller on his studies in the Critical Language Scholarship Program.

TRIBUTE TO CORONA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE LIFETIME ACHIEVEMENT AWARD RECIPIENT BUD GORDON

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to an individual whose dedication and contributions to the community of Corona, California are exceptional. Corona has been fortunate to have dynamic and dedicated community leaders who willingly and unselfishly give their time and talent and make

their communities a better place to live and work. Bud Gordon is one of these individuals. On January 16, 2014, Bud will receive a prestigious honor when the Corona Chamber of Commerce gives him the Lifetime Achievement Award at the organization's annual awards and installation gala at the Eagle Glen Golf Club.

One of Bud's greatest achievements has been bringing immense growth in the region. He is the visionary behind the Gordon Automotive Group which includes several automotive dealerships throughout Riverside County and greater Southern California. Bud's commitment is seen especially at the Gordon Automotives Group's Headquarters, Quality Toyota of Corona, which carries the guiding principle of delivering service that is caring, defect-free, and timely. He has helped add numerous jobs in the area which has strengthened and bettered the economy in a profound way.

Bud is not only an innovative businessman, but also an active community member and has spent his life giving back in any way he can. Bud founded and formed the At Risk Children Angel Foundation in conjunction with members of the Corona Police Department to help supply local at risk children with sports equipment, registration fees, and even basic necessities. He has also been an active supporter of the Happy Hairston Youth Foundation, where he both raised and donated hundreds of thousands of dollars to help disadvantaged youth achieve their goals and pursue their dreams.

Inspired by his daughter, Bud also created a variety of educational programs to motivate and inform students in the community. He recreated the Oval Office at his Corona headquarters, forming the Quality Toyota West Wing, which has served over 195,000 students who have participated in the 2½-hour educational learning experience offered there. Bud also recognized a need for a hands-on trade school training facility, and thus, Uncle Bud's Automotive Museum was born. The Museum offers "A Journey Through Automotive History," where students can both see and feel the history of the automobile and hear from docents regarding the variety of careers offered in the automotive industry.

Bud's passion and leadership are contagious and when it comes to commitment, he makes sure to match his words with his actions. He is a tireless supporter of the Settlement House, which provides food to the needy, the Trauma Intervention Program, the Alternatives to Domestic Violence Program, and various organizations supporting local schools.

In light of all he has done for the community of Corona, the Corona Chamber of Commerce has given him their Lifetime Achievement Award. Bud's tireless passion for service has contributed immensely to the betterment of the community of Corona, California. He has been the heart and soul of many organizations and events and I am proud to call him a fellow community member, American and friend. I know that many community members are grateful for his service and salute him as he receives this prestigious award.

HONORING D.W. JOHNSON

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a veteran, Mr. D.W. Johnson. D.W. has shown what can be done through tenacity, dedication, and a desire to serve others.

Mr. D.W. Johnson, a native of Cary, Mississippi was born May 23, 1947, the third child born to Kate Turner and James Johnson. He graduated in 1966 from Henry Weathers High School.

In May 1968 Mr. Johnson was drafted to the Vietnam War. He went to Vietnam in October of 1968 and he received an honorable discharge from the U.S. Army in 1970. After being discharged from the Army he accepted a job at Miller Transporters, Inc. in 1973 until retirement in 2003. He joined the Mississippi National Guard in 1974. While serving in the National Guard he was deployed to Desert Storm in December, 1990 until May, 1991. In 1995 D.W. retired from the MS National Guard after serving over twenty years.

Mr. Johnson began his political career in November 1995 when he was elected as the Sharkey County Supervisor for District Two for eight years. Then in November 2004 he was elected as the Sharkey County Election Commissioner until he resigned in August 2011.

Mr. Johnson is a deacon at Guiding Star M. B. Church which he joined in 1974. He is thoroughly involved in the community. He transports the elderly and veterans to the doctor. He is a member of the Men's Fellowship which meets every Saturday to discuss community issues. He is a member of the South Delta High School Booster Club.

On October 12, 1968 Mr. Johnson married Dorothy Mae Watley and to that union they have two children: Tonia L. Ross and David L. Johnson. He has three grandchildren, Paris, Paul, and David, II.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. D.W. Johnson for his passion and dedication to serving our great Country and desire to make a difference in the lives of others.

HONORING NICK GOEPPER

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Nick Goepper of Lawrenceburg, Indiana on qualifying to represent the United States in the 22nd Winter Olympic Games in Sochi, Russia in the event of Freeski Slopestyle.

Nick has distinguished himself as one of the world's most premier athletes in Freeski Slopestyle, placing first in an U.S. Olympic selection event in Breckenridge, Colorado and placing second at a separate selection event in Copper Mountain, Colorado. Nick's hard work and dedication has enabled him to excel among his competitors, putting him in the most elite category of athletes.

It brings me great pride knowing that such a hard working athlete will not only be representing the United States, but also Indiana's 6th Congressional District, in one of the most treasured and sacred events in all of sports.

I ask the entire 6th Congressional District to join me in congratulating Nick Goepper in his selection to the United States Olympic team and wishing him continued success and health in the 22nd Winter Olympic Games in Sochi, Russia.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RON BARBER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, due to flight delays beyond my control, I missed one recorded vote on January 7. I would like to indicate at this point how I would have voted had I been present for that vote.

On rollcall No. 1, establishing a quorum in the House of Representatives for the Second Session of the 113th Congress, I would have voted "present."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JIM GERLACH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, on January 13, 2014, I missed two recorded votes on the House floor. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall 12 and "yea" on rollcall 13.

HONORING LT. JUANITA MITCHELL

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a hardworking and self motivated woman, Lt. Juanita Mitchell.

Lt. Juanita Mitchell, a native of Mississippi, was born on May 30, 1972 in Lexington, Mississippi. She is the daughter of Mr. Jerry and Deloris Greer.

Lt. Mitchell is married to Shannon Mitchell and they have three children: Shannon, Ayanna and Tynishiwa. She has taught her kids as well as herself to study hard, pray and to excel for positive things in life to succeed for a promising future.

Lt. Mitchell received her education in the Holmes County Public School Systems, where she received her High School Diploma from Tchula Attendance Center in 1990.

Lt. Mitchell began her Law enforcement Career at the Holmes Humphrey's Correctional Facility in February 2000 and was given the duties as being a Correctional Officer as well as fulfilling the duties of being the Acting Sergeant for that shift. In 2004 she became a part time 911 Dispatcher for the Holmes County Sheriff Department.

Lt. Mitchell received a Promotion to become Holmes County Deputy Sheriff in April 2005. She attended the Mississippi Delta Community

College Law Enforcement Training Academy in October, 2005 where she received her Law Enforcement Certification.

In 2008 Lt. Mitchell became the first female Criminal Investigator and in the year 2012 she became the first female Lieutenant for that Department.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing a dynamic woman, Lt. Juanita Mitchell for her dedication to the community and the law enforcement.

HONORING WILLIE STEVENSON GLANTON

HON. BRUCE L. BRALEY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Willie Stevenson Glanton on her tireless efforts throughout her life to break down race and gender barriers and pave the way for many Americans. Willie Stevenson Glanton has been dedicated to the law, human services, and civil rights.

Willie has been a champion for women and minorities throughout her entire life. She was only the second African American woman admitted to practice law in the State of Iowa, along with becoming the first African American woman to be appointed as a city clerk, assistant county attorney, and the first African American female to be elected to the Iowa State Legislature. In addition to her many achievements, Willie is the first woman and first African American to be elected president of the Iowa Chapter of the Federal Bar Association. She ''wanted to make an impact for black and women's rights, which are historically intertwined,'' and ''felt that our black children needed more black images in politics to stir their interests.''

With all of her achievements, another great success was her 50-year marriage to the love of her life, the late Luther T. Glanton Jr. who was also a pioneer for African Americans by becoming Iowa's first district judge. A thrilling day for my family was when Judge Glanton spoke at my sister's high school graduation in 1973.

As such an important symbol of justice, the Willie Stevenson Glanton Award was established to recognize a lawyer who exemplifies Willie's spirit to help others, reach back, and help his or her community. Recipients are honored for working toward the goal of improving their community, whether through a commitment to public service, legislative initiatives, professional activities, or community activities. They must demonstrate a commitment to advocacy and activism in the spirit of Willie's devotion to ''free up people.''

Willie is an example of a leader who has worked tirelessly to make her community, her state, and her country a better place to live. She is a true example of hard work, determination and a good heart, and shows us that we can achieve so much and improve the lives of so many individuals directly and indirectly. Willie, on behalf of Iowans and Americans, you make us proud.

SUPERFUND REINVESTMENT ACT

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, last week, the House passed legislation to weaken and fragment the already underfunded federal Superfund program. This was a step in the wrong direction. Today, joined by 15 original cosponsors, I am reintroducing legislation to reauthorize Superfund taxes on polluting industries; provide more funds to clean up toxic waste sites; and relieve much of the funding burden currently shouldered by taxpayers through general revenue funds.

Across the country there are 1,321 severely polluted superfund sites, some federal and some private. These sites threaten humans with exposure to toxics such as arsenic, benzene, PCBs, mercury and a wide range of solvents, resulting in health problems such as infertility, low birth weight, birth defects, leukemia and respiratory difficulties.

Passed by Congress in 1980, the Superfund program has resulted in the cleanup of more than 1,000 toxic waste sites in communities all over the U.S., freeing residents from health risks and fears that come from living close to toxic waste. In the majority of cases, EPA works with the parties who have been found responsible for the pollution and they pay for the cleanup. However, at some sites, those responsible for the pollution cannot be found or do not have the ability to pay, and the government pays for the cleanup. Historically, the Superfund trust fund was used for this process, which was supported by taxes on petroleum products and chemicals. Because Congress has not reauthorized these Superfund taxes since 1995, the trust fund was depleted and the funding source for the cleanup of orphan sites has shifted primarily to general funds.

The Superfund Reinvestment Act will reinstate Superfund taxes to their previous levels, including excise taxes of $.097 per barrel on crude oil or refined oil products, excise taxes of $.22 to $4.87 per ton on certain chemicals, and a corporate environmental income tax of .12 percent on a corporation's modified alternative minimum taxable income that exceeds $2 million. This legislation also includes language to guarantee that money from the Trust Fund is only spent on Superfund cleanups.

I urge my colleagues to join me in working to strengthen the Superfund program by ensuring that polluters continue to pay. This will go a long way towards cleaning up America's most toxic waste sites, and helping to keep our communities and our families safe, healthy, and economically secure.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained yesterday and missed roll Nos. 12 and 13. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on roll Nos. 12 and 13.

A RECOGNITION OF MR. CRAIG RAGG

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my friend and longtime Castro Valley Resident, Mr. Craig Ragg. This month, Craig will complete his term serving as the 2013 President of the Bay East Association of Realtors, where he has also served on the Board of Directors since 2008 and as Treasurer in 2011.

Craig has worked since 1977 as a Licensed Real Estate Agent, Broker, and Realtor. Throughout his career, Craig has been actively involved as a leader in the real estate profession, and he has always made time to invest in his community.

A National Association of Realtors Leadership Academy Graduate, Craig is an active member of the real estate community at the national, state, and local level. Craig served as a member of the National Association of Realtors Committees on Land Use and Consumer Communication, as well as the California Association of Realtors Federal Committee, Taxation Committee, and Housing Affordability Fund Committee. Craig also has served on the Board of Directors of the California Association of Realtors since 2010.

Over the course of his career, Craig often has been recognized for his efforts in the community. In 1990 and 2009, Craig was honored as Bay East Realtor of the Year. He also was the recipient of the John Deadrich Distinguished Service Award in 2006, and again in 2008.

Craig also has honorably served his country. Craig served in the United States Air Force from 1968 to 1972. Craig has served on the Eden Medical Foundation Board of Directors since 2004, and he spent 1988 to 1996 giving back to his community by serving on the Castro Valley Municipal Advisory Council.

Mr. Speaker, Realtors are an important part of every community, as they enable the American dream of home ownership. I want to thank Craig for his service and his contributions to the East Bay. I wish him the best of luck as he continues to play an important role in the lives of East Bay residents.

HONORING ROBERT H. QUINN, JR.

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

Mr. Thompson of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Robert H. Quinn, Jr., who is a remarkable investigator and public servant.

Mr. Robert H. Quinn, Jr. was born in Clay County, Mississippi on May 26, 1954 to Nellie Rene and Robert H. Quinn, Sr. At the age of six months, his father was the victim of a swimming accident and at the age of four his mother was the victim of a violent crime. His grandfather and grandmother along with his aunt reared him along with siblings.

Mr. Quinn, Jr. attended Beasley High School and after graduation attended Mississippi Valley State University. Being independent and desiring a more challenging life,

at the age of 21 he joined the United States Army where he remained in service for 20 years. During this period he became proficient working with missile systems. He was selected and attended Drill Sergeant School where he graduated and successfully completed a three year tour. During this time he was selected to attend and graduated Primary Leadership School, Basic Non Commissioned Officer School, Advanced Non Commissioned Officer school and a host of other schools. In 1995 after completion of his military service, Mr. Quinn returned home and began a career in law enforcement.

In 1996 Mr. Quinn was hired and worked for Corrections Corporation of America (CCA) where he quickly rose to rank of captain. After four years of service to Correction Corporations of America Mr. Quinn was hired in 2000 and worked as a campus police at Mississippi Valley State University. After a year of service Mr. Quinn was hired in 2001 by the Leflore County Sheriff Department.

Mr. Quinn worked his way up in rank and in 2006 became the only second African American to hold the position of Investigator for the Leflore County Sheriff Department. Mr. Quinn attended and graduated the Certified Investigator Program (CIP) becoming a certified investigator in the state of Mississippi.

Mr. Quinn is the proud parent of three sons: Travis, Robert, III and D'montre; and three daughters: Tannisha, Emelja and Denita.

Mr. Quinn has worked with the Leflore County Drug Court and the Leflore County Crime Stoppers. Along with his duties of investigator, Mr. Quinn also works with the Mississippi Community Education Center.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing an Investigator Extraordinaire, Mr. Robert H. Quinn, Jr. for his dedication to serving others and giving back to the African American community.

IN OPPOSITION TO CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED RAIL

HON. DEVIN NUNES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to record a few observations about the California high-speed rail project.

It's no surprise that high-speed rail has become a boondoggle even before any track has been installed. This was a political project from the beginning, backed by local politicians who thought it would raise their political fortunes. For example, as noted by Sacramento Bee columnist Dan Walters, a planned route between Merced and Bakersfield was the direct result of President Obama's effort to help an endangered Democrat lawmaker, whose district received $700 million of stimulus funding just before the 2010 elections.

Californians were deceived about the most fundamental aspects of this project, whose price tag has already doubled to $68 billion. With independent estimates routinely exceeding $100 billion, it's hard to believe the initial estimates were put forward in good faith, or that voters would have approved the project if they had known its true cost. Recently, Governor Brown has even proposed raiding the state's cap-and-trade program to help finance the ballooning costs.

Make no mistake, this railway will never operate without massive taxpayer subsidies. To make it appear financially sustainable, planners estimated that the line from San Francisco to Los Angeles will carry more than twice as many riders and cost half the price compared to a trip from Washington to New York on the existing high-speed rail line there. This is a preposterous estimate for a region which, compared to the Northeast Corridor, has a smaller population base, lower population density, and less extensive mass transit system to connect everyone.

Furthermore, nonpartisan reports as well as research by the State Auditor and Legislative Analyst have cast doubt on the project's basic assumptions, and these misgivings were reinforced recently when a state judge found that the state had no valid financial plan for the project.

In light of this stunning level of waste and deception, California high-speed rail has already proved itself to be a monumental failure. Californians are being forcibly evicted from their homes and businesses to make way for an extravagant train to nowhere. The only reasonable course of action is to spare our communities further misfortune by ending this project once and for all.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $17,282,527,565,175.09. We've added $6,655,650,516,262.01 to our debt in 5 years. This is over $6.6 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

CELEBRATING THE CENTENNIAL OF THE MONTCLAIR ART MUSEUM

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Montclair Art Museum, located in the Township of Montclair in Essex, County, New Jersey, as it celebrates its Centennial Anniversary.

When the Montclair Art Museum opened in 1914, it was not only one of the country's first museums to primarily focus on American and Native American art, but also was one of the first museums in the nation to be accredited by the American Association of Museums. The museum's collections began with gifts from Montclair residents, which acted as the foundation of its holdings. The American collection started with a gift of 36 paintings from William T. Evans, while the Native American collection was initiated by Mrs. Henry Lang, both cofounders of the museum. When the museum opened, it dedicated a gallery to America's landscape painter George Innes, who spent the last nine years of his life creating artwork in Montclair, New Jersey.

In 1924, the museum founded its art school, now known as the Yard School of Art. The school has operated continually since then, offering a wide spectrum of artistic courses to children, teenagers, and adults. In 2011, the school added a Ceramics Studio and Digital Media Laboratory. Two additional programs include training for teachers in the arts, and a new contemporary art program. The museum provides programs for seniors and special needs individuals, as well.

Since the opening in 1914, the Museum's collection has grown to over 12,000 works. The American collection includes paintings, drawings, prints, sculptures, and photographs dating from the 18th Century to the present and features works by Benjamin West, Asher B. Durand, John Singer Sargent, Edward Hopper, Georgia O'Keeffe, and Andy Warhol. The Native American Collection contains over 4,000 pieces including basketry, pottery, and jewelry from various cultural areas across the United States. The museum also features young and emerging artists.

The Montclair Art Museum maintains a strong sense of community presence through its public and family programs. Each year, 10,000 students from Kindergarten to twelfth grade visit the museum, coming from 190 school districts. The museum also holds events such as Family Days, Montclair Art Museum Park Bench, Home School Days, Family Learning Laboratory, and birthday parties.

As it celebrates its Centennial, the Montclair Art Museum continues to work towards bettering its education programs, outreach efforts, exhibitions, and informing and inspiring diverse audiences.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Montclair Art Museum, its trustees, staff and many volunteers, as they celebrate their Centennial Anniversary.

HONORING MR. ROY HARPER

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of a Veteran, Mr. Roy Harper (1923–2011), of the United States Army.

Mr. Roy Harper was born July 20, 1923 to the parentage of Vollie & Estella Hartfield Harper in Hopewell in the state of Mississippi. Mr. Harper was the 2nd child of four (4) children. His siblings are: Gussie Harper Phillips, LeAngie Harper Brown and Nathaniel Harper.

Mr. Harper grew up in the Brushy Creek Community where he was a member of Brushy Creek M.B. Church. He joined at the early age of 10 years old and was baptized in the creek in back of Reno's Store. Mr. Harper served as: a trustee at Brushy Creek M.B. Church in 1963; a deacon; choir president; Cemetery section; and was a member of Brushy Creek Building fund committee.

Mr. Harper was married to Beulah Haley Harper and to this union three (3) children were born: Adell Harper, now deceased; Helen Harper Mckenny; and Willie Fred Harper.

Private Roy Harper was drafted in the United States Army on January, 1943 and was sent to Camp Shelby in Mississippi. He was honorably discharged from the United States Military Services in the Army Airbase in Lincoln, Nebraska on November 27, 1943. Private Harper received a Testimonial Certificate of Honest and Faithful Services to his country.

Mr. Roy Harper remained a member of Brushy Creek Church and held various positions throughout the years until his demise on December 17, 2011.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing a dynamic Veteran, Mr. Roy Harper.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF SGT. J. MICHAEL PHILLIPPI

HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Representative ROBERT HURT and I honor the life and service of Sgt. J. Michael Phillippi of Martinsville, Virginia, who passed away while on duty in a tragic auto accident on January 11, 2014.

Born in Kingsport, Tennessee, in 1948, Sgt. Phillippi graduated from Gate City High School in Gate City, Virginia, Hiwassee Junior College in Madisonville, Tennessee, and East Tennessee State University in Johnson City.

Sgt. Phillippi dutifully served the Commonwealth of Virginia as a respected member of the State Police for more than 42 years, spending much of his time with the state police office that covers the Martinsville, Henry County, and Patrick County area. He became a sergeant in 1990.

Known by many as ''Flip,'' his dedication and service earned him much praise. Col. Steven Flaherty, the state police superintendent, said, ''Highly respected for his leadership, strong character, integrity, and dedication to mission, Sgt. Phillippi was totally loyal to the troopers he supervised and mentored, and the community he served,'' and Lt. Paul Watts said, ''To have done this job as long he has, he's the type of veteran we all hope that we can be one day.''

Sgt. Phillippi was also a very active and devoted member of the McCabe Memorial Baptist Church. He served the church as a deacon and a member of the pastor search committee, taught Sunday school, and worked with its youth group. He also was a member of the YMCA and the Elks Club.

We are honored to pay tribute to this great man. Sgt. Phillippi will long be remembered throughout Martinsville, Henry County, and Patrick County as well as the Virginia State law enforcement community. Our continued prayers and blessings are with Sgt. Phillippi's wife Peggy Lawrence Phillippi and his other loved ones as they grieve. May God give them comfort during this time.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S299–S334

Measures Introduced: Eleven bills were introduced, as follows: S. 1916–1926. **Page S325**

Measures Passed:

Poison Center Network Act: Senate passed H.R. 3527, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the poison center national toll-free number, national media campaign, and grant program. **Page S333**

Lieutenant General Richard J. Seitz Community-Based Outpatient Clinic: Committee on Veterans' Affairs was discharged from further consideration of S. 1434, to designate the Junction City Community-Based Outpatient Clinic located at 715 Southwind Drive, Junction City, Kansas, as the Lieutenant General Richard J. Seitz Community-Based Outpatient Clinic, and the bill was then passed. **Pages S333–34**

Measures Considered:

Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1846, to delay the implementation of certain provisions of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012. **Pages S299–S300**

Unemployment Benefits Extension: Senate continued consideration of S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, taking action on the following amendments and motions proposed thereto: **Pages S300–23**

Pending:

Reid (for Reed) Amendment No. 2631, relating to extension and modification of emergency unemployment compensation program. **Page S300**

Reid Amendment No. 2632 (to Amendment No. 2631), to change the enactment date. **Page S300**

Reid motion to commit the bill to the Committee on Finance, with instructions, Reid Amendment No. 2633, to change the enactment date. **Page S300**

Reid Amendment No. 2634 (to (the instructions) Amendment No. 2633), of a perfecting nature. **Page S300**

Reid Amendment No. 2635 (to Amendment No. 2634), of a perfecting nature. **Page S300**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 45 yeas to 55 nays (Vote No. 8), Senate failed to table Reid motion to commit the bill to the Committee on Finance, with instructions, Reid Amendment No. 2633, to change the enactment date. **Page S311**

By 52 yeas to 48 nays (Vote No. 9), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on Reid (for Reed) Amendment No. 2631 (listed above). **Pages S311–12**

By 55 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 10), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on the bill. **Page S312**

Subsequently, Senator Reid entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on the bill. **Page S312**

Further Continuing Appropriations—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at 12 noon, on Wednesday, January 15, 2014, Senate begin consideration of H.J. Res. 106, making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, that there be no amendments, motions or points of order in order to the joint resolution; that there be up to 15 minutes of debate equally divided on the joint resolution; and that upon the use or yielding back of time, Senate vote on passage of the joint resolution. **Page S323**

Messages from the House: **Page S324**

Measures Referred: **Page S324**

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S324, S334**

Executive Communications: **Pages S324–25**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S325**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S325–26**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S326–29**

Additional Statements:

Amendments Submitted: Pages S329–33

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: Page S333

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Page S333

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total—10) Pages S311, S312

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:11 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Wednesday, January 15, 2014. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on Page S334.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

COUNTERTERRORISM OPERATIONS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities received a closed briefing on Department of Defense counterterrorism operations from Michael G. Vickers, Under Secretary for Intelligence, Gary Reid, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict, Lieutenant General William C. Mayville, Jr., USA, Director for Operations, Joint Staff, and Brigadier General Richard C. Gross, JAGC, USA, Legal Counsel, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of John Roth, of Michigan, to be Inspector General, and Suzanne Eleanor Spaulding, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for National Protection and Programs, both of the Department of Homeland Security, and William Ward Nooter, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT CONFERENCE AND TRAVEL SPENDING

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine conference and travel spending across the Federal government, after receiving testimony from Beth F. Cobert, Deputy Director for Management, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President; Dan Tangherlini, Administrator, and Brian D. Miller, Inspector General, both of the General Services Administration; Michael E. Horowitz, Inspector General, Department of Justice; and J. Russell George, Inspector General for Tax Administration, Department of the Treasury.

AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLER TRAINING CONTRACTS

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Financial and Contracting Oversight concluded a hearing to examine management of air traffic controller training contracts, after receiving testimony from Mary Kay Langan-Feirson, Assistant Inspector General for Acquisition and Procurement Audits, Department of Transportation; Pat McNall, Acquisition Executive, Federal Aviation Administration; and Lynn Dugle, Raytheon Company, Washington, D.C.

PRESIDENT'S REVIEW GROUP ON INTELLIGENCE AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the report of the President's Review Group on Intelligence and Communications Technologies, after receiving testimony from Richard A. Clarke, Michael J. Morell, Geoffrey R. Stone, Cass Sunstein, and Peter Swire, all a Member, President's Review Group on Intelligence and Communications Technologies.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 15 public bills, H.R. 3862–3876; and 1 resolution, H.Res. 459 was introduced. **Page H223**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H224–25**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 801, to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to make the shareholder threshold for registration of savings and loan holding companies the same as for bank holding companies (H. Rept. 113–325);

H.R. 2274, to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide for a notice-filing registration procedure for brokers performing services in connection with the transfer of ownership of smaller privately held companies and to provide for regulation appropriate to the limited scope of the activities of such brokers, with amendments (H. Rept. 113–326); and

H. Res. 458, providing for consideration of the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 3547) to extend the application of certain space launch liability provisions through 2014; providing for proceedings during the period from January 17, 2014, through January 24, 2014; and for other purposes (H. Rept. 113–327). **Page H223**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Stewart to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H185**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:22 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H188**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by a yea-and-nay vote of 274 yeas to 138 nays with 3 answering ''present'', Roll No. 16. **Pages H188, H200**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Small Business Mergers, Acquisitions, Sales, and Brokerage Simplification Act: H.R. 2274, amended, to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide for a notice-filing registration procedure for brokers performing services in connection with the transfer of ownership of smaller privately held companies and to provide for regulation appropriate to the limited scope of the activities of such brokers, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 422 yeas with none voting ''nay'', Roll No. 14; **Pages H192–96, H198–99**

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: ''To amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to exempt from registration brokers performing services in connection with the transfer of ownership of smaller privately held companies.'' **Page H199**

Holding Company Registration Threshold Equalization Act: H.R. 801, to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to make the shareholder threshold for registration of savings and loan holding companies the same as for bank holding companies, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 417 yeas to 4 nays, Roll No. 15; **Pages H196–98, H199–H200**

Making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014: H.J. Res. 106, to make further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014; **Page H198**

OPM IG Act: H.R. 2860, to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that the Inspector General of the Office of Personnel Management may use amounts in the revolving fund of the Office to fund audits, investigations, and oversight activities, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 418 yeas with none voting ''nay'', Roll No. 17; and **Pages H200–02, H207**

Presidential and Federal Records Act Amendments: H.R. 1233, amended, to amend chapter 22 of title 44, United States Code, popularly known as the Presidential Records Act, to establish procedures for the consideration of claims of constitutionally based privilege against disclosure of Presidential records, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 420 yeas with none voting ''nay''. Roll No. 18. **Pages H202–07, H207–08**

Recess: The House recessed at 2:43 p.m. and reconvened at 5 p.m. **Page H207**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Five yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H199, H199–H200, H200, H207, H208. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

Committee Meetings

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA MARITIME DISPUTES

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Seapower; and Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific held a joint hearing entitled ''People's Republic of China Maritime Disputes''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy and Power concluded markup on H.R. 3826, the ''Electricity Security and Affordability Act''. The bill was forwarded, without amendment.

HOW PROSPECTIVE AND CURRENT HOMEOWNERS WILL BE HARMED BY THE CFPB'S QUALIFIED MORTGAGE RULE

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit held a hearing entitled ''How Prospective and Current Homeowners Will Be Harmed by the CFPB's Qualified Mortgage Rule''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

SCOPE OF COPYRIGHT PROTECTION

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property and the Internet held a hearing entitled ''The Scope of Copyright Protection''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

OBAMA ADMINISTRATION'S QUESTIONABLE APPLICATION OF SEQUESTRATION TO THE SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS PROGRAM

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Oversight of the Obama Administration's Questionable Application of Sequestration to the Secure Rural Schools Program and the Costs to States, Local Economies, and Rural School Children''. Testimony was heard from Robert Bonnie, Undersecretary for Natural Resources and Environment.

TSA OVERSIGHT: EXAMINING THE SCREENING PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Government Operations held a hearing entitled ''TSA Oversight: Examining the Screening Partnership Program''. Testimony was heard from Kelly C. Hoggan, Assistant Administrator for Security Operations, Transportation Security Administration; Mark Bell, Acting Deputy Inspector General for Audits, Department of Homeland Security; and Jennifer Grover, Acting Director, Homeland Security and Justice, Government Accountability Office.

SENATE AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE BILL TO EXTEND GOVERNMENT LIABILITY, SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION, FOR CERTAIN THIRD PARTY CLAIMS ARISING FROM COMMERCIAL SPACE LAUNCHES

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on Senate amendments to H.R. 3547, a bill to extend Government liability, subject to appropriation, for certain third-party claims arising from commercial space launches. The Committee granted a rule that provides for the consideration of the Senate amendments to H.R. 3547. The rule makes in order a single motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the title and concur in the Senate amendment to the text with an amendment inserting the text of Rules Committee Print 113–32 in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the motion and provides that it shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule provides that the Senate amendments and the motion shall be considered as read. The rule provides one hour of debate on the motion equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. In Section 2, the rule provides that upon adoption of the motion specified in section 1, H. Con. Res. 74 (enrollment correction to the title) shall be considered as adopted. In Section 3, the rule provides that the chair of the Committee on Appropriations may insert in the Congressional Record not later than January 16, 2014, such material as he may deem explanatory of the Senate amendments and the motion specified in section 1. In Section 4, the rule provides that on any legislative day during the period from January 17, 2014, through January 24, 2014: the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment. In Section 5, the rule provides that the Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 4. Testimony was heard from Chairman Rogers (KY); Representatives Lowey; and Gohmert.

SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH AT THE SMITHSONIAN—MORE THAN A MUSEUM

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Research and Technology held a hearing entitled ''Scientific Research at the Smithsonian—More than a Museum''. Testimony was heard from G. Wayne Clough, Secretary, Smithsonian Institution; Eva Pell, Under Secretary for Science, Smithsonian Institution; Kirk Johnson, Director, National Museum of Natural History.

FOUNDATION FOR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION REAUTHORIZATION

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Building the

Foundation for Surface Transportation Reauthorization''. Testimony was heard from Mary Fallin, Governor, State of Oklahoma; and public witnesses.

BUSINESS MEETING; AND ONGOING INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a business meeting on Member access to Benghazi investigation transcripts; member access request; and held a hearing entitled ''Ongoing Intelligence Activities''. This was a closed hearing.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 15, 2014

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: to receive a closed briefing on the situation in Iraq and Syria, 9:30 a.m., SVC–217.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Protection, to hold hearings to examine regulating financial holding companies and physical commodities, 2 p.m., SD–538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: to hold hearings to examine the future of unmanned aviation in the United States economy, focusing on safety and privacy considerations, 2:30 p.m., SR–253.

Committee on Finance: business meeting to consider the nominations of Sarah Bloom Raskin, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary of the Treasury, and Rhonda K. Schmidtlein, of Missouri, to be a Member of the United States International Trade Commission; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine the nomination of R. Gil Kerlikowske, of the District of Columbia, to be Commissioner of Customs, Department of Homeland Security, and L. Paige Marvel, of Maryland, and Tamara Wenda Ashford, of Virginia, both to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: business meeting to consider S. 1901, to authorize the President to extend the term of the nuclear energy agreement with the Republic of Korea until March 19, 2016, and the nominations of Cynthia H. Akuetteh, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Gabonese Republic, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe, Catherine Ann Novelli, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Economic Growth, Energy, and the Environment, Tina S. Kaidanow, of the District of Columbia, to be Coordinator for Counterterrorism, with the rank and status of Ambassador at Large, Michael A. Hammer, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Chile, Kevin Whitaker, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Colombia, Daniel W. Yohannes, of Colorado, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, with the rank of Ambassador, Sarah Sewall, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary for Civilian Security, Democracy, and Human Rights, Helen Meagher La Lime, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Angola, Larry Edward Andre, Jr., of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Islamic Republic of Mauritania, Eric T. Schultz, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Zambia, Puneet Talwar, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary for Political-Military Affairs, Carlos Roberto Moreno, of California, to be Ambassador to Belize, Rose Eilene Gottemoeller, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Arms Control and International Security, Frank A. Rose, of Massachusetts, to be Assistant Secretary for Verification and Compliance, Adam M. Scheinman, of Virginia, to be Special Representative of the President for Nuclear Nonproliferation, Timothy M. Broas, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of the Netherlands, Donald Lu, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Albania, Robert A. Sherman, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to the Portuguese Republic, Karen Clark Stanton, of Michigan, to be Ambassador to the Democratic Republic of Timor-Leste, Amy Jane Hyatt, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Palau, Tomasz P. Malinowski, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, Crystal Nix-Hines, of California, for the rank of Ambassador during her tenure of service as the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, John Hoover, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Sierra Leone, Thomas Frederick Daughton, of Arizona, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Namibia, Dwight L. Bush, Sr., of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Morocco, Matthew T. Harrington, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Lesotho, Charles Hammerman Rivkin, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary for Economic and Business Affairs, Mark Bradley Childress, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the United Republic of Tanzania, Pamela K. Hamamoto, of Hawaii, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Office of the United Nations and Other International Organizations in Geneva, with the rank of Ambassador, Michael Stephen Hoza, of Washington, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Cameroon, Brian A. Nichols, of Rhode Island, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Peru, Eunice S. Reddick, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Niger, Bruce Heyman, of Illinois, to be Ambassador to Canada, Richard Stengel, of New York, to be Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy, and Anthony Luzzatto Gardner, of New York, to be Representative of the United States of America to the European Union, with the rank and status of Ambassador, all of the Department of State, Catherine Ann Novelli, of Virginia, to be United States Alternate Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, United States Alternate Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank, and to be United States Alternate

Governor of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Carolyn Hessler Radelet, of Virginia, to be Director of the Peace Corps, Michael G. Carroll, of New York, to be Inspector General, United States Agency for International Development, Mark E. Lopes, of Arizona, to be United States Executive Director of the Inter-American Development, Janet L. Yellen, of California, to be United States Alternate Governor of the International Monetary Fund, and Dana J. Hyde, of Maryland, to be Chief Executive Officer, Millennium Challenge Corporation; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine implications of the crisis in Ukraine, 2 p.m., SD–419.

Special Committee on Aging: to hold hearings to examine aging in comfort, focusing on assessing the special needs of America's Holocaust survivors, 2:15 p.m., SD–562.

United States Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control: to hold hearings to examine strategies to counter the drug trade as United States troop drawdown continues, focusing on the future of United States counternarcotics efforts in Afghanistan, 3 p.m., SD–138.

House

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, hearing entitled ''#CommActUpdate: Perspectives from Former FCC Chairman'', 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''The Impact of the Volcker Rule on Job Creators, Part I'' 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''South Sudan's Broken Promise?'', 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, hearing entitled ''A Report on the G8 Dementia Summit'', 2 p.m., 2200 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, hearing entitled ''NAFTA at Twenty: Accomplishments, Challenges, and the Way Forward'', 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''A False Narrative Endangers the Homeland'', 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies, markup on H.R. 3696, the ''National Cybersecurity and Critical Infrastructure Protection Act of 2013'', 2 p.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 7, the ''No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act'', 10:15 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Strengthening Agency Oversight: Empowering the Inspectors General Community'', 9:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''The Power of Connection: Peer-to-Peer Businesses'', 1 p.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Railroad, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials, hearing entitled ''A Review of the Challenges Facing California High Speed Rail'', 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled ''Vendors in the OR—VA's Failed Oversight of Surgical Implants'', 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Wednesday, January 15

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: At 12 noon, Senate will begin consideration of H.J. Res. 106, Further Continuing Appropriations, and vote on passage of the joint resolution at approximately 12:15 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, January 15

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of the Senate Amendments to H.R. 3547—Omnibus FY2014 Appropriations Act (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Barber, Ron, Ariz., E67
Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E68
Braley, Bruce L., Iowa, E68
Brooks, Susan W., Ind., E62
Brownley, Julia, Calif., E65
Calvert, Ken, Calif., E62, E66
Capps, Lois, Calif., E64
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E69
Crenshaw, Ander, Fla., E64
DeFazio, Peter A., Ore., E63
Diaz-Balart, Mario, Fla., E61
Frelinghuysen, Rodney P., N.J., E69
Gerlach, Jim, Pa., E67
Griffith, H. Morgan, Va., E70
Guthrie, Brett, Ky., E65
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E66
Latham, Tom, Iowa, E61, E63
Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E66
Messer, Luke, Ind., E62, E67
Miller, George, Calif., E68
Mulvaney, Mick, S.C., E64
Nunes, Devin, Calif., E69
Peters, Gary C., Mich., E61
Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E63
Roby, Martha, Ala., E65
Swalwell, Eric, Calif., E68
Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E61, E62, E63, E64, E65, E66, E67, E67, E68, E69

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.