United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 13, 2014 No. 42

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 13, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN 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.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Madam Speaker, the young lady in the white dress in this picture is a role model for all young people. Her whole family are role models. They are the family you want living on your street.

They always shovel and salt their driveway. Their house is always spotlessly clean, and all of the children are on the honor roll. They make me proud to live in Chicago.

Liz and her three older siblings are all U.S. citizens. When Republicans say to me that President Obama is not enforcing the immigration laws, I think of Liz's face.

When the President says there is nothing more he can do to keep immigrant families together, I think of her face, too. When citizens say to me that it really doesn't matter whether they vote or not, I want them to think of Liz.

Liz has a father who is facing deportation. He has lived in the United States for more than 20 years and raised a beautiful, healthy, upstanding American family.

But LUIS—I hear my Republican colleagues say to me—all of this deportation nonsense is in your head. The administration is fudging the numbers to make it look like they are enforcing the law, the Republicans say.

But hundreds of thousands of American families are being split up. Over a 2-year period, according to Applied Research Center, 200,000 parents of American citizens, like Liz's parents, were deported.

And I hear my colleagues in the Judiciary Committee talk about Latinos—especially immigrant Latinos—that they are all criminals and drug cartel kingpins; and, therefore, we have to arrange our entire immigration system as if they are all violent felons.

But what about Liz and her family? Liz is not a drug kingpin in her fourth grade class. Her parents and her siblings are not meth heads and meth chemists, but the random deportation wheel landed on them; and according to Republicans, they are willing to sue the President in Federal court if he takes action to spare this father of four American citizen children from deportation.

But LUIS—I hear my Democratic colleagues say—for several years, President Obama has instituted programs at Homeland Security to help families, removing noncriminals and parents and DREAMers from the deportation queue.

And, indeed, the President and Homeland Security constantly talk about how many gangbangers and hardened criminals they are removing from the country; but that doesn't change the reality for Liz or her family. That doesn't change the fear that families, like Liz's, face every day.

People who have lived here peacefully and raised a proud American family are just a broken taillight or an unlucky encounter away from losing everything, losing their children.

And what about going out and coming back in ''the right way,'' as the Republicans always suggest? Despite 20 years in the U.S., despite four U.S. citizen children in his family who are willing to petition for their dad, Congress, two decades ago, made it impossible for this family to ever live together in the U.S. legally, unless we change the law again.

But Republicans refuse to allow a vote on immigration reform when they know a majority of Members of the House of Representatives would vote to allow families, like Liz's, to continue living together and prosper.

Sorry, Liz. Politics is more important than an American family or two or 200 American families or even 200,000; and the President has said he cannot do more to alleviate the fear that American kids, like Liz, face.

The political price of helping Americans, like Liz, is too high. It is shameful that the Speaker of the House and the President of the United States are putting politics and election calculations ahead of Liz's family.

To Liz, the solution is clear. If you will not act, she will. She said recently:

> No child should ever have to be separated from their parents. When I grow up, I want to be a U.S. Senator because I want to be in a position to help people when they need it and pass laws that are good for people.

I wish my colleagues felt the same way this young lady, Liz, feels. I don't

Printed on recycled paper.

know if she will ever be a U.S. Senator when she is eligible to run in 20 or 30 years, but I will tell you one thing I am pretty sure of: in less than 10 years, she will be old enough to vote, and her older siblings, even sooner than that.

Madam Speaker, do you think she will remember which party prevented reform or threatened to sue the President if he spared her dad from deportation?

Take a look at the picture. Republicans, they are hoping the dad gets deported and the mom never becomes a citizen; but the poor children are Americans already and will someday have a vote and, from the looks of it, will be voting for decades to come. I suggest, Madam Speaker, you do the math.

JOBS BILLS STYMIED IN THE SENATE

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

Mr. MARINO. Madam Speaker, earlier this week, our friends on the other side of the Capitol, the Democrats, burned the midnight oil in a strange effort to call attention to global warming. Unfortunately, for some of our friends in the Senate, hot air from the Chamber will not bring down the temperature in our atmosphere.

Instead of stoking the rhetorical flames through hours of meaningless grandstanding, I hope the Democrat Senate will use some of its time to hotline the critical job-creating bills that have been put on ice on HARRY REID's desk.

Madam Speaker, our constituents don't want to be left out in the cold. We need action today on bills to create jobs.

Madam Speaker, I hope Members of this body will join me and hold the Democrat Senate's feet to the fire by calling on them to pass bills that will refire America's economic engine.

TRANSPARENCY IN GOVERNMENT ACT

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, nearly 4 years ago, I stood in this Chamber and talked about a deficit that was chipping away at our government. No, it wasn't the fiscal deficit, though that certainly is weighing us down; rather I warned of the deficit of trust that has caused the American people to lose faith in government and, quite simply, give up on Washington.

Back then, stories of scandals and ethics violations led nightly newscasts, and trust in government was at an all-time low of just 19 percent. Now, 4 years later, trust in government is still at 19 percent, though Congress' rating has dropped even lower, to 9 percent in recent polls. I regret to say that little has changed, including our efforts to rebuild that trust.

If Illinois politics has taught me anything, it is very hard to lead without that trust, and the only way to earn it back is to increase transparency and openness throughout our government. As Justice Brandeis said, Sunlight is the best of disinfectants.

That is why I am introducing the Transparency in Government Act, which will shine a light on every branch of the Federal Government, strengthening our democracy, and promoting an efficient, effective, and open government because the fact is that the mission of government matters.

What we do here in this Chamber matters, so much so that it is written in the very bedrock of American Government. We have been sent here to form a more perfect union, to promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, but how we execute this mission matters.

The Transparency in Government Act utilizes 21st century technology to expand access to information, strengthen oversight of Federal spending, increase disclosures from both lawmakers and lobbyists, and improve judicial transparency.

The TGA will bring unprecedented accountability to the Federal Government and empower everyday citizens to be the government's best watchdog.

American taxpayers have a right to know how their hard-earned dollars are being spent, so TGA requires Members of Congress to post their official expenditures online, allowing every constituent to scrutinize their Representative's office budgets and spending reports.

It also requires Members to be up front about their personal finances, providing greater details about foreign travel and gifts; and when it comes to knowing who is working to influence the legislative process, the TGA establishes new definitions for lobbyists and stricter rules governing how and with whom they meet.

This bill also ensures Americans have access to the same expert nonpartisan information that shapes the policy decisions we make every day. It makes taxpayer-funded reports available for free to the public and requires all committees to make public hearing schedules, witness testimony, and even transcripts and recordings available online.

In the executive branch, the TGA requires clear and prominent disclosure when communications and advertising are sponsored using Federal funds; and it improves access to visitor logs for the White House and agency heads, so we know who is meeting with our Nation's highest leaders.

It strengthens the Freedom of Information Act, requiring agencies to put all completed FOIA requests online in a format that is searchable, sortable, and downloadable, and ensures that all agencies utilize the Web site FOIAonline to log, track, and publish requests.

Finally, the TGA calls for the judiciary branch to meet similar financial disclosure requirements that are already applied to the executive and legislative branches and make those disclosure statements publicly available online for anyone to review.

For the first time, this bill inscribes into law the public's right to hear oral arguments in the Supreme Court as they are delivered; and in an effort to use 21st century technologies, this legislation calls for a study on using livestream video to air Supreme Court proceedings.

These are just a few of the bill's many reforms that will pull our government out of the past and modernize public access to information. The Transparency in Government Act has ambitious goals, but these reforms are no less than what our constituents expect and deserve.

It has been 4 years since I first introduced this bill, and we can't waste another minute allowing the status quo to erode Americans' faith in government. The time to act is now.

Let's usher in a new era of open government, win back the people's trust, and prove to our constituents that we are worthy of the responsibility we have been entrusted with.

PRESIDENT OBAMA IS DIFFERENT THAN SENATOR OBAMA

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

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, 2014 started out the exact way President Obama wanted. Over $2 trillion of more debt piled upon our kids and grandkids. President Obama is very different than Senator Obama. These are the Senator's words on the Senate floor March 16, 2006:

> The fact that we are here today to debate raising America's debt limit is a sign of leadership failure. It is a sign that the U.S. Government can't pay its own bills. It is a sign that we now depend on ongoing financial assistance from foreign countries to finance our government's reckless fiscal policies.
>
> Over the past 5 years, our Federal debt has increased by $3.5 trillion to $8.6 trillion. That is trillion with a t. That is money that we have borrowed from the Social Security trust fund, borrowed from China and Japan, borrowed from American taxpayers.
>
> Numbers that large are sometimes hard to understand. Some people may wonder why they matter. Here is why: This year, the Federal Government will spend $220 billion on interest.

□ 1015

Senator Obama later explained:

> That is more money to pay interest on our debt this year than we will spend on education, homeland security, transportation, and veterans' benefits combined.

After talking about Hurricane Katrina, Senator Obama shifted to the debt tax:

> And the cost of our debt is one of the fastest growing expenses in the Federal budget. This rising debt is a hidden domestic enemy, robbing our cities and States of critical investments in infrastructure like bridges,

ports, and levees; robbing our families and our children of critical investments in education and health care reform; robbing our seniors of the retirement and health security they have counted on.

Every dollar we pay in interest is a dollar that is not going to investment in America's priorities. Instead, interest payments are a significant tax on all Americans—a debt tax that Washington doesn't want to talk about.

Senator Obama finally brought up our debt to unfriendly nations:

Now, there is nothing wrong with borrowing from foreign countries. But we must remember that the more we depend on foreign nations to lend us money, the more our economic security is tied to the whims of foreign leaders whose interests might not be aligned with ours.

Increasing America's debt weakens us domestically and internationally. Leadership means that ''the buck stops here.'' Instead, Washington is shifting the burden of bad choices today onto the backs of our children and grandchildren. America has a debt problem and a failure of leadership. Americans deserve better.

I therefore intend to oppose the effort to increase America's debt limit.

Today, America's debt is over $18 trillion—with a t. Clearly, President Obama has forgotten Senator Obama's words. But the American people remember, and on their behalf, I ask President Obama to decrease our debt by working with Congress to end the debt tax by growing our economy and shipping American natural gas to friendly countries like Ukraine, like India, like Japan, and like South Korea.

WELCOMING ENDA KENNY TO CAPITOL HILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MESSER). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, as the world prepares to celebrate St. Patrick's Day and this afternoon we welcome the Irish Prime Minister of the Taoiseach, Enda Kenny, here to the Capitol, I want to pause for a moment to recognize the anniversary of a pivotal event in the peace process in the north of Ireland.

Twenty years ago, against the advice of his own State Department, President Bill Clinton granted a visa to the leader of Sinn Fein and its president, Gerry Adams, to visit the United States. It was at the time an unpopular decision, but history has proven it to be a catalyst for the peace process which, again, has proved to be most durable. It helped to bring an end to the longest standing political dispute in the history of the Western World. Simply put, Bill Clinton took an extraordinary risk that has paid huge dividends.

I was one of a handful of Members of Congress at the time who urged President Clinton to approve the visa. When Gerry Adams arrived in the United States after stopping in Boston, he made his way to my hometown of Springfield, Massachusetts, and addressed a core group of thousands at the John Boyle O'Reilly Club, and he thanked them for their support.

During his campaign for President, we had urged then-candidate Clinton to make peace in the island of Ireland a top foreign policy priority if he was to be elected. After his inauguration, to our great and pleasant surprise, he sent his National Security Adviser at the time, Tony Lake, to Capitol Hill to tell us that they were to elevate Ireland to the same category of priority as the Middle East.

A year later, on January 31 of 1994, the visa was issued to Gerry Adams, and the American dimension to the Irish peace process was born. Fourteen years later, the Good Friday Agreement was signed, and a society in the north of Ireland was transformed overnight.

On the night that Mr. Clinton offered that visa—it was one of the more memorable events in my career—I defended the Clinton administration that night on the BBC's Newsnight Hour, which would be the equivalent of Nightline here in America. I debated the leader of the UUP, Ken Maginnis.

Later today, I am hosting a briefing with Gerry Adams and the Congressional Friends of Ireland, and I urge our friends to visit with him if they can, and later on to meet the Irish Prime Minister at 3:30 this afternoon.

When we contrast where America and Ireland were in this special relationship that dates back three centuries, it is important to recall what it looked like in the north of Ireland 30 years ago. There were 30,000 British soldiers in an area the size of the State of Connecticut. There was a police force that held the position that nationalists need not apply—the Royal Ulster Constabulary. The British soldiers are gone and the Royal Ulster Constabulary are gone today. The watchtowers that monitored the activities largely of the nationalist community have been taken down, and you can cross from Derry to Donegal without knowing that you have moved from the north of Ireland to the Republic of Ireland or through Newry and County Down, as well, without being stopped, searched, and, in some instances, being frisked by British soldiers.

America's role in bringing about this success story provides an argument for the reach and the role of the United States in addressing some of the most difficult issues in the world. Ireland represented the longest standing political dispute in the history of the Western World, and America's role was pivotal to helping make that change. That model has become, today, something that could be emulated worldwide, and, in fact, the people who participated travel the world to talk about how they found common ground and a path forward.

There is a representative democracy in Belfast today in what is known as Stormont, where parties sit some days in disagreement and other days in agreement, but always with the idea that they are in charge of their own destiny and their own future. That is the genius of representative democracy.

I call attention to this issue today because of many of the stubborn problems that plague the world, with the understanding that men and women of good will in the crucible of politics can indeed chart a path forward, and not to miss the fact that it was still the risk-taking of the Clinton administration that took up the notion that the nationalist voice on the island of Ireland and in the north of Ireland and six small counties should be heard, and today the result is all around us.

So as the political parties visit on the eve of St. Patrick's Day all across the island of Ireland, we can satisfy ourselves with this achievement: the notion, once again, that good will and understanding the other side's arguments can, in fact, be heralded in the sense of achievement, but also, again, in the Stormont government that has been duly elected.

So, today, we in America take great satisfaction as to the role our men and women played in bringing about this success story and also to recognize something on a personal basis. I and many others here were allowed to participate in all of these ''it can never happen'' moments. Thanks, America, for help, once again, in leading the way.

CONCERNS OF INADEQUATE CBP STAFFING AT MIAMI INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

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 with a great sense of urgency over the critical need to have more Customs and Border Protection officers at Miami International Airport, known as MIA. MIA, which I humbly represent, is not only the busiest airport in the State of Florida, but it is also the second largest international gateway in the Nation. In fact, international passenger traffic at MIA has steadily grown over the last few years far more than any other U.S. international gateway. However, the insufficient Customs and Border Protection officers, known as CBP, staffing levels at MIA pose a threat to this welcome growth of travel and tourism into our country.

Passengers are experiencing long wait times for immigration and customs processing. For example, just a few days ago, last Wednesday, the 7,681 passengers who arrived at the Federal Inspection Service at MIA's North Terminal were held in line for more than 2 hours. Out of the 72 lanes available to assist passengers, only 20 were open. And there is only one simple explanation for this problem. CBP staffing does not meet the numbers needed for

the safe and efficient processing of passengers and cargo going through our airport.

As time passes by, this endemic problem has only proven to deteriorate. The Miami-Dade congressional delegation and MIA officials have long been focused on how to fix this problem while ensuring a safe and seamless travel experience for our local residents and our many, many visitors.

Earlier this week, I wrote a letter to Secretary Johnson of the Department of Homeland Security asking for his immediate action on alleviating the ongoing shortage of CBP officers, a deficiency that sets back efforts to make Florida competitive; and it hurts our travel and tourism, two vital engines to our Nation's economy.

The entire Miami-Dade congressional delegation, including our Senators, is united on this bipartisan, bicameral effort.

With a strategic location to handle connections between the Americas and Europe, MIA serves as the doorstep to the United States. In 2013, a record 40 million passengers passed through MIA's doors as they made their way to their final destinations. These people come to our port of entry either to visit south Florida or to make connections to other national and international destinations. We need to welcome them with the world-class airport that MIA can be and not with long lines, hassles, and congestion.

Under the leadership of Dr. Emilio Gonzalez, the director of the Miami-Dade Aviation Department, MIA has taken a number of steps to ease the lack of CBP officers. How have they done this? Installing automated passport control self-serve kiosks; also, increasing the Miami-Dade Aviation Department staffing, participating in a reimbursable fee agreement pilot program approved by Congress which allows for needed overtime, and by closing certain gateways in order to concentrate CBP officers in appropriate areas.

However, despite MIA's innovative approach, CBP's insufficient staffing levels continue to pose serious challenges to the airport's daily operations. With the growing number of passengers arriving or transitioning through MIA and with the World Cup in Brazil approaching, MIA will have an even busier summer. We need to be prepared. And that is why we ask for Secretary Johnson's assistance in providing much-needed CBP staffing and to remember that MIA's success is our Nation's success.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot stress enough the pressing need for Federal staffing at MIA, which will only allow for a further streamlining of long lines and will also help in the reduction of wait times for visitors and for residents, alike.

END HUNGER NOW

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this week, as part of my End Hunger Now series, I want to focus on one of the most important and successful Federal antihunger and nutrition programs, the WIC program. The Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children, commonly known as WIC is a fantastic program that is celebrating its 40th anniversary this year. It truly is an amazing program, one that has been a tremendous success for 40 years.

WIC is a short-term intervention program designed to influence nutrition and health behaviors in a targeted high-risk population. What does that mean? Well, Mr. Speaker, it means that it provides nutritious food and nutrition education, among other services, to pregnant women, infants, and young children.

□ 1030

Specifically, WIC provides quality nutrition education and services, breast-feeding promotion and education, a monthly food prescription, and access to maternal, prenatal, and pediatric health care services.

Not only has WIC been around for 40 years, it has served millions of women and children over that time. For example, more than 10,000 clinics served 8.7 million women and children each month in 2013. That figure includes 853,000 pregnant women, 595,000 breast-feeding women, 598,000 postpartum, 2 million infants, and 4.6 million children. Those are monthly figures, Mr. Speaker.

Let's be clear: this is an important antipoverty program. It helps poor pregnant women, postpartum mothers, and their children receive both nutritious food and nutrition education. That's right, this program serves poor people—and does so successfully.

To qualify for WIC, participants' income level must be at or below 185 percent of the poverty level or they must be on Medicaid. That is about $36,000 a year for a family of three. We are not talking about wealthy people here, Mr. Speaker. In fact, nearly three-fourths of all WIC participants live in families with incomes below the Federal poverty level. That means most families of three are making less than $36,000. In fact, according to the latest data available, the average income of a participant was $16,842 a year.

The services WIC provides are critically important, and they are based on sound science. For example, we know how important it is for women to breast-feed their children. Breast milk contains important nutrients infants need to grow and to develop. We know that breast-fed infants tend to be healthier because they receive antibodies from the breast milk, antibodies that protect these young kids against infection. Did you know that breast-feeding has also been proven to save money? That's right. If 90 percent of U.S. mothers exclusively breast-fed their infants for 6 months, the U.S. would save $13 billion annually in medical expenses and prevent 900 deaths a year.

Another important part of WIC that is based on science is the food package that is made available to each client. They are designed specifically for each person, whether you are a pregnant mother, nursing mother, or a child. The foods available are approved by the scientists and the researchers at the Institute of Medicine. That's right, not Members of Congress or non-science-based administrators in a Federal agency that approve or deny certain foods from the WIC package. We know that proper nutrition can make people healthier, reduce instances of illness and disease, and prevent or reduce hospital visits and stays. I guess my mother was right when she said, An apple a day keeps the doctor away.

That is why it is so maddening and so disappointing when special interests try to change the WIC food package just so they can see a little bit more money for their product. Proper nutrition can save money—something I think should be popular in this Congress—and ignoring science because special interests want to make a quick buck is just wrong.

That is why I am so proud of this program. A few years ago, there was an attempt in the House of Representatives to underfund WIC—to deny these important services to poor women and their children. The backlash was fierce. That funding was quickly restored, and we haven't seen an attempt to cut WIC since. I only wish that were true for other Federal antihunger programs.

You see, Mr. Speaker, this program is what is best about America. Ironically, it was a program that was born in the Nixon administration. In fact, it came from the first and only White House conference on hunger, something I wish this President, President Obama, would convene before his term is over.

For 40 years WIC has ensured that poor women and their children have access to nutritious food and nutrition education. It is just that simple. These women and children have a lifeline to making their lives healthier and better. It is safe to say that the millions of people served by WIC would be worse if it weren't for this program.

I am proud of this program. I am proud of the people who work at WIC clinics, and the administrators, and those who administer the program in every State. I am proud of the people who advocate and fight for this program. I look forward to the day when we don't need WIC because we have eradicated poverty once and for all. Until that day comes, I am proud that we have WIC to help make the lives of the women and children they serve just a little bit better.

SUSTAINABLE GROWTH RATE FIX

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

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to discuss the issue of Medicare and Medicare reimbursement payments to doctors who provide health care for our seniors.

Currently, the reimbursement formula for our doctors who provide these services is one that has become so low that many doctors in America aren't providing services and care to our seniors.

It brings me to a bill that is coming up tomorrow in the House. It is the doc fix. It is a fix to the SGR. What that means is, there is on the horizon a 24 percent cut coming to Medicare reimbursements for our doctors who provide care for our seniors.

If that cut goes into effect, it is going to have a devastating impact on the care that our seniors can receive. So tomorrow we are going to have a fix on the floor that takes away the threat of the 24 percent cut, and we pay for it. What we do is we bring certainty to the doctors who provide this care for our seniors and stability to the payment system.

Now, this isn't the first time this issue has been brought up. This has been an ongoing problem, and so today, on throwback Thursday, we are going to take a trip down memory lane. Four years ago, during the ObamaCare debate, House Republicans brought up this very issue and said: Listen, let's not hold our seniors hostage. Let's actually come forward together and have a doc fix that is paid for to make sure our seniors don't get cut in regard to reimbursements. My colleagues across the aisle said ''no'' to this fix that was paid for, and in the end we have had to have short-term fixes that I think threaten the care for our seniors.

I hope all my colleagues tomorrow will stand with us to have a long-term fix to this program, to make sure our seniors aren't held vulnerable to potential inaction by Congress.

I also want to talk about what happened in regard to our seniors in the ObamaCare debate. Instead of fixing payment in Medicare to our doctors for our seniors, instead of shoring up a plan that helps our seniors, instead of doing that, what my friends across the aisle did in ObamaCare is they looked for a pay-for, and they saw a pot of money in Medicare, and they took almost a trillion dollars out of Medicare to use for ObamaCare.

News flash: the CBO, and the President, everybody acknowledges that Medicare is on a pathway to going broke. Twelve years from now it runs out of money. So instead of shoring up the fund, making sure that we meet the promise to our seniors, my friends across the aisle took almost a trillion dollars out of it, making it more vulnerable.

Then, a program that works well, especially for my seniors back in Wisconsin, Medicare Advantage—taking money out of Medicare Advantage, a program that actually works, giving some choice and control to our seniors. I think our seniors deserve better than this. The war on the seniors should stop, and is going to stop hopefully tomorrow with a bipartisan effort that does what we should have done in the ObamaCare debate but fixes payments to doctors so they can continue to provide lifesaving health care to our seniors.

Let's stand together as a House. Let's stand with our seniors. Let's get this done tomorrow.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this morning we are now in the midst of Women's History Month. I want to associate myself with the women's history Special Order that was on the floor last evening. I look forward through the rest of the month of March to continue or to acknowledge women from my own congressional district.

This morning, however, I wish to comment on a woman who has loomed large in our political eyes, and I thought out of fairness to give the record of former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton a fair shot. The reason I chose to do that, Mr. Speaker, is over the weekend, as many occurrences occur, political meetings abound in this Nation, and the Conservative Political Action Conference met.

Interestingly enough in the reporting, the newspaper noted that Hillary Rodham Clinton had a presence at the Nation's largest gathering of conservative activists. Interestingly enough, former Secretary Clinton was not there, obviously not invited. I think it is important to take note of some of the comments that were made that really require some kind of addressing.

One comment was that women should not be used. Another came from the former Speaker and charged that if Secretary Clinton decided to run for President, it would be like a prison guard for the past. Words I think that may be political rhetoric but really do a great disservice to a woman with a very strong historical record.

Early in her life, former Secretary Clinton met Dr. Martin Luther King, born in Chicago to parents whose political beliefs, or part of their political beliefs, were different from Secretary Clinton's today. She was an active young woman and through her church had the opportunity to meet Dr. Martin Luther King. You can imagine her thoughts a few years later when Dr. King was assassinated. It may have had a major impact on her belief in serving her country and helping America.

Hillary Clinton is a graduate of Wellesley College and Yale Law School. She worked on migrant worker issues for Walter Mondale's staff. Also, she was on the law editorial board—I would suggest, at that time, certainly one of the pioneering women at Yale Law School.

Of course many of us know that she worked for the Children's Legal Defense Fund and really honed her skills of concern about making children our number one priority. I would offer to say that when I came to the United States Congress, former Secretary Clinton was First Lady. At that time I organized and founded the Congressional Children's Caucus. During the 1990s it was very clear that the First Lady at that time was very concerned still with children's issues and held one of the first conferences on 0 to 3 months, and how a baby could learn and how we should be nurturing that infant. It was a very major conference to focus our legislative agenda on that issue. It was during that time that Marian Wright Edelman continued to work with the former Secretary of State on the issues of dealing with the whole comprehensive child, what a child needs from 0 on to adulthood. Even today I would argue that we do not have a children's agenda.

I will soon be offering a briefing promoting a children's budget that came out of the efforts and collaboration with the former Secretary of State during her tenure in the White House as First Lady. As First Lady she traveled to emphasize the importance of freedom for women around the world. She was not yet Secretary. One of the first acts that we remember, among the acts that we remember, is her going to China and declaring that women's rights are human rights.

I would venture to say that the words at the CPAC convention do not in any way characterize the leadership of Hillary Rodham Clinton. Certainly she has gone on to many other successes, which include her leadership as Secretary of State, the constant work of freeing women, women's rights. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that she is a fine example of a mother, a wife, a leading national figure, a historic figure who represents Women's History Month.

USA CAN'T POLICE THE WORLD

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy, in a 1961 speech at the University of Washington, said:

> We must face the fact that the United States is neither omnipotent or omniscient—that we are only 6 percent of the world's population—that we cannot impose our will upon the other 94 percent of mankind—that we cannot right every wrong or reverse each adversity—and that therefore there cannot be an American solution to every world problem.

□ 1045

The major difference now than when he spoke in 1961 is that we are only 4 percent of the world's population, and

we are over $17 trillion in debt. President Kennedy was right then, and we should carefully listen to his words today.

Many people are trying to prove that they are great world statesmen and are supporting policies that will commit us to spend billions we do not have on Ukraine. We don't need to be sending billions to Ukraine, and we especially should not escalate this situation into some type of military confrontation.

We should have trade and tourism and cultural and educational exchanges with other countries and help, to a limited extent, during humanitarian crisis; but we cannot be the policemen of the world.

The Ukrainians are going to have to solve most of their problems on their own, and we need to start taking better care of our own country and our own people. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we are long past the time when we need to start putting our own people first and stop trying to run the whole world, creating a lot of resentment toward the U.S. in the process.

REMEMBERING OAKLAND OFFICERS MURDERED

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, for the Bay Area law enforcement community, few days are sadder and more tragically memorable than Saturday, March 21, 2009.

It is a day that everyone in the community will always recall where they were when they heard the news. March 21 will always be remembered as the day that four brave police officers of the Oakland Police Department were killed in the line of duty, in service to the people they swore an oath to protect.

I rise to recognize four men who died 5 years ago the same way they lived—as heroes. I rise to recognize Sergeant Mark Dunakin, Sergeant Ervin ''Erv'' Romans, Sergeant Daniel Sakai, and Officer John Hege. We lost these officers on the same day at the hands of the same murderer, but we make sure today that they were not taken in vain and that this killer did not extinguish their memories.

Sergeant Mark Dunakin was devoted to the East Bay. Raised in Pleasanton, he graduated from Chabot College in Hayward and served the Oakland Police Department for 18 years. He worked in the patrol division, the homicide unit, and the traffic operations section.

He loved driving through the streets of Oakland on his Harley-Davidson, making sure the East Bay was safe. He was even a part of the Oakland Police Department's motorcycle drill team, which went all over the State of California.

Not only was Sergeant Dunakin a terrific officer, he was a loving husband to his wife Angela, who also served as a Dublin police officer for the Alameda County Sheriff's Office. He was a father and a friend. He also was an avid sports fan, rooting for his Ohio State Buckeyes and Pittsburgh Steelers.

Officer John Hege had been with the Oakland Police Department for 10 years. Before joining the force, he taught at Tennyson High School in Hayward. Even after he became a police officer, he continued to serve his community by working with kids as a high school baseball umpire.

John always wanted to work as a motorcycle officer. A few months before his tragic murder, he reached that goal.

A great neighbor and friend, John was willing to help someone in need. This continued even in death, for as an organ donor, his organs were used to save the lives of four other people.

Sergeant Ervin Romans' life was full of service. For 9 years, he served our country and kept us safe as a distinguished member of the United States Marines.

Erv continued his service with the Oakland Police Department, a dream job for him, for 13 years. He was a dedicated member of the SWAT team, always striving to improve and keep up with the latest training. In 1999, after helping residents escape a fire, he was awarded the Medal of Valor.

Sergeant Dan Sakai spent his career serving the public. Following graduation from the University of California at Berkeley, he worked as a community service officer with the UC Berkeley Police Department. After 5 years there, he joined the Oakland Police Department in 2000.

Described as a rising star, Dan quickly progressed in the Oakland Police Department, including serving as a patrol officer in the K9 unit and eventually as a SWAT team entry leader. It is not surprising that he was the valedictorian of his police academy class.

Besides being a terrific member of the Oakland Police Department, Dan was devoted to his family and friends. As a resident of Castro Valley in the 15th Congressional District, he enjoyed all kinds of outdoor activities.

It is hard to believe that it has already been 5 years since that fateful day when these four heroes were taken from us.

I was working that day as an Alameda County prosecutor when we lost Mark, Erv, Dan, and John; and I, like so many, was shocked and shaken by the news. The magnitude of loss that the murder of these four officers caused was unmeasurable and hit everyone in the community. Equally unmeasurable was the community's response.

In the hours and days after the news, the law enforcement community came together to support the families of the officers and the colleagues they served with.

Immediately after the news, hundreds of Bay Area law enforcement community members held an informal vigil at the only place they knew to gather, The Warehouse, a grill around the corner from the Oakland Police Department.

In the following days, the Oakland Police Officers' Association, with the support of brothers and sisters from neighboring Bay Area police agencies, grieved together and put on a funeral at the Oakland Arena worthy of the officers' bravery.

I attended that funeral and was stunned to see officers from not just the Bay Area, but across the United States. I will never forget the Boston police officers who crossed the country to attend and lifted the spirits of the mourners.

In the House Chamber today, representing the Police Officers' Association of California, is John Rudolph, President of the Alameda County Deputy Sheriffs' Association. He is in town to support the Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund.

The following year, I had the opportunity to attend the 2010 Law Enforcement Officers Memorial in Washington, D.C., to witness each officer's name permanently placed on the marble wall with 19,000 other officers who have given their life across our country in service to the public.

Their names are etched into that wall, their memories are deep in our mind, and their courage is stitched forever into our hearts.

Mark, Erv, Dan, and John, you were taken too young, but forever we will remember your service.

SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to a critical issue that is hurting our communities, it is hurting our economy and our environment, and that issue is climate change.

Climate change is already having real impacts, affecting real people and real communities with more extreme storms, severe droughts, heat waves, and more. We are beginning to see long-term and serious impacts on public health, on agriculture, and natural resources.

Of course, climate change not only impacts us here onshore, but offshore as well. Ocean acidification, one of the most serious impacts of climate change, is changing the chemistry of our oceans and threatening the economic future of our coastal communities.

As our oceans absorb more and more carbon from the atmosphere, they grow more and more acidic, threatening many marine organisms and the communities that depend upon them.

Experts are telling us that today's rate of ocean acidification may be unprecedented in the Earth's history. It is estimated to be increasing 10 to 100 times faster than any time in the past 50 million years.

Ocean acidification threatens everything from the tiny plankton to form the foundation of marine food webs, to the larger shellfish that we all enjoy. These impacts will not only hurt our ocean ecosystems and environment, but they will significantly hurt our economy as well.

The oceans support one in every six American jobs; so without healthy oceans, we stand to lose a lot of American jobs and economic opportunities, not to mention the cultural, ecological, and recreational losses to our coastal communities.

In my district, there is a diverse array of fishermen, scientists, and nongovernmental organizations who are all seriously concerned about this issue. They are coming together to find ways to better understand and mitigate the effects of ocean acidification on key fisheries and ecosystems.

While the initial costs may be felt locally, the long-term costs of ocean acidification will be felt around this globe. We simply can't afford to continue ignoring this critical problem. While we certainly must cut the greenhouse gas emissions that are driving climate change and ocean acidification, we must also prepare for the inevitable impacts.

That is why I am working with my colleagues to find bipartisan solutions to increase our understanding of ocean acidification and to develop adaptation strategies.

That means supporting efforts to increase research and to monitor a better understanding of the problem, and it means coordinating and planning on a local level to prepare communities for changing coastal landscape. That means forming strategic partnerships to increase our capacity to find creative solutions.

There are many things we can do to help, but there is one thing we must all agree upon: inaction is not an option.

Mr. Speaker, we have a responsibility to help prepare our communities and our economy from the impacts of climate change. We cannot afford to sit on our hands and do nothing.

I urge my colleagues to join me in taking action to save our oceans to combat global climate change.

JOSH HARDY'S STRUGGLE WITH CANCER

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge a story of hardship and compassion. Josh Hardy, a young boy from Fredericksburg, Virginia, survived a battle with cancer when he was just 9 months old. Today, at the age of 7, he is currently suffering from a life-threatening infection acquired during his cancer treatment at St. Jude Children's Hospital.

A pharmaceutical company, Chimerix, produces the medication Josh's doctors believe could help save his life. Unfortunately, the drug was still in trial testing, and the company has been unable to provide access due to the number of requests for the drug and the rate of its production in the testing stage.

Physicians at St. Jude's Hospital and members of Josh's family pleaded for Josh to obtain access to the drug. Last Friday, Matt Hardy, Josh's uncle, of Lock Haven, Pennsylvania, a constituent of mine, contacted my office to request our support in seeing if the drug could get approved.

Josh's story has become widely known across the country. Yesterday, Chimerix agreed to provide Josh access to their environmental antiviral drug for his treatment. This small business should be commended for their compassion and making tough decisions. We hope they can continue with expedience to bring their product to market in order to help others like Josh.

Mr. Speaker, through these tough times, our thoughts and prayers remain with Josh, his family, and the countless individuals committed to making lives better through cutting edge medical research.

SEXUAL ASSAULT

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to tell a story of a 17-year-old Catholic school girl from the Seattle suburbs whose dreams to join the Marine Corps were destroyed by a sexual predator.

The girl's recruiter, after discussing sexual harassment policy with her, decided to give her a big hug, then lifted her on his lap and fondled her breasts. He then tried to get her to perform oral sex on him at another visit to the Marine recruiting office; and on a third occasion, he had her fondle his genitals while the girl was riding in his car.

She told the King County District Attorney's Office that she felt pressured into the sexual contact to get a position within the Corps.

While King County investigators found the girl's claims to be credible, the recruiter's chain of command within the Marine Corps did not and returned him to his job after a brief suspension, while the high school student was denied justice and denied the job of her dreams.

Just Google ''Marines sex scandal,'' and you will find this article and several other scandalous stories about soldiers who hold these positions of trust.

These are exactly the type of stories that prompted Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel to issue a directive last May to require the screening of sexual assault counselors, recruiters, and drill sergeants in all the services, looking for any criminal wrongdoing or unethical behavior.

It appears the Army took Secretary Hagel's directive seriously, as it screened 20,000 soldiers, disqualified 588, and is moving to get rid of at least 79 soldiers in these sensitive posts for offenses that include sexual assault.

□ 1100

Between the Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, however, only a handful of servicemembers were disqualified. The Navy, after screening more than 10,000 soldiers, first said it only disqualified five, but just yesterday, we learned that the number has skyrocketed as the Navy has actually disqualified 151 sailors from these positions of trust. The Air Force just revealed Tuesday it disqualified two soldiers after at first initially reporting none were disqualified, and the Marine Corps so far has disqualified absolutely no one.

We all know, without question, that sexual assault in the military is a crisis and that it is not simply limited to the Army. It appears to be quite clear that the services used widely divergent methodology in assessing the suitability for these servicemembers and that the different services interpreted Hagel's directive very differently. It is my understanding that one of the service's interpreted Hagel's directive so narrowly that it simply checked the civilian sexual predator registry. Hagel has, apparently, discussed with top brass in the Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps the 588 disqualifications in the Army and whether the other services will pursue a follow-up review. He has reportedly stopped short, however, of issuing another directive.

I believe Secretary Hagel should issue a directive to rescreen the officers in the other services, and I sent him a letter Tuesday urging him to do so because choosing the wrong people for these positions of trust is a betrayal for our troops. The numbers of those disqualified, by the way, were not voluntarily made public. They continue almost weekly to be unearthed by an enterprising reporter at USA Today. The DOD also hasn't revealed what actions it has taken against those who were disqualified. The public has a right to know.

I do salute the Army for scrubbing what has been a cancerous culture, evidenced by the pending court-martial of Sergeant Gregory McQueen, whose job it was to help prevent sexual assault but who, instead, was allegedly running a prostitution ring at Fort Hood.

Until the Marine Corps, Air Force, and Navy follow the Army's path, however, I have little faith that the Department of Defense is capable of stamping out military sexual assault by weeding out sexual predators and other criminals in these highly important positions of trust.

WORLD WATER DAY

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today, on Capitol Hill, we are watching several hundred dedicated volunteers fan out to share their vision of the United States' providing leadership for safe drinking water and sanitation around the globe.

They will point out that, today, women will spend 200 million hours gathering water for their families—200 million hours that will not be spent farming or in economic enterprise, 200 million hours that will not be spent in school, 200 million hours that too often take them away from the village and put them at risk for physical sexual assault. They will be talking to our colleagues on Capitol Hill about some critical legislation that my colleague TED POE and I have introduced, H.R. 2901, the Paul Simon Water for the World Act, which will, in a deficit-neutral fashion, help refine the approach that the United States, the USAID, and the State Department take in providing water assistance around the globe.

I must say, this morning I heard, in an eloquent fashion, Congressman POE lay out the need, the vision, and the solution. I cannot say enough about the bipartisan leadership of my colleague from Texas. He points out that, as a Democrat from the Northwest, I don't have all that much in common with my Republican friend from Texas, but this is an area in which we are united. The United States must do all it can to prevent unnecessary disease and death from contaminated water, but it goes beyond issues of disease and sanitation.

Look at what has happened in Syria. Between 2006 and 2011, nearly 60 percent of Syria's landmass was ravaged by a severe drought. The water table was already too low because of irresponsible farming practices. It wiped out the livelihoods of almost a million Syrian farmers, and it created a massive population of drought refugees that flooded into the cities and added to the instability of that tragic country.

It did not cause the civil war, but the failure of the government to respond to the drought played a huge role in fueling the uprising, made possible by that sad, tragic consequence of events. Now the fourth largest city in Jordan is a refugee camp where men and women and children are fighting for survival and water as they cross the border to escape the violence. And this is a growing problem. The global population has now passed 7 billion people, and much of that growth has taken place in Sub-Saharan Africa and Asia, two regions of the world in greatest need when it comes to water and sanitation.

Mr. Speaker, we have within our capacity the ability to make a difference, and I am pleased to have worked with volunteers from coast to coast—from churches and rotary clubs and students—who are making a difference in their own communities. It is important for Congress to pass the Water for the World Act and to support the terrific work of Congresswomen GRANGER and LOWEY, on the Appropriations Committee, that has protected and has actually enhanced a little bit this important money that the United States provides—a small amount in the overall scheme of things but one that has a tremendous impact on lives around the world.

I urge my colleagues to take the time to listen to these dedicated volunteers. They have a message we should take to heart and act upon.

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 11 o'clock and 7 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:

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

In this Chamber where the people's House gathers, we pause to offer You gratitude for the gift of this good land on which we live and for this great Nation which You have inspired in developing over so many years. Continue to inspire the American people, that through the difficulties of these days we might keep liberty and justice alive in our Nation and in the world.

Bless the Members of this assembly with the wisdom they need to conduct the Nation's business with an eye toward the benefit of all, especially those most in need.

Bless as well the citizens of Ukraine, whose Prime Minister visits the Congress today. May our Nation be a good friend to that nation during these turbulent times, and may peace prevail in that part of the world.

May all that is done 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.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California 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.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF CAPTAIN JAMES HENRY CULLEN

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Captain James Henry Cullen. Captain Cullen was born in my hometown of Cincinnati, Ohio, on January 9, 1923, and died in Springfield, Virginia, on September 9 last year. He grew up in Price Hill, attended Elder High School, and was a graduate of Xavier University.

Captain Cullen led a distinguished life and an honorable one as a devoted husband and father and as an accomplished naval officer.

As executive officer of the USS *Guadalcanal*, he oversaw the recovery of the *Apollo 9* space capsule in the Atlantic Ocean. He also served as director of operations, Pearl Harbor, and chief of staff Third Fleet, with responsibility for antisubmarine warfare in the Pacific and Indian Oceans, and was awarded the Gold Star.

Captain Cullen epitomized the term ''America's Greatest Generation.'' Our country has benefited greatly from his service, and as Americans, we owe him a debt of gratitude.

Full military honors at Arlington National Cemetery for Captain Cullen will take place on March 24.

Well done, Captain Cullen, and may you rest in peace.

FREEDOM OF THE INDIVIDUAL

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

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, today, I want to speak about a case the Supreme Court is going to hear in a week, the Hobby Lobby case.

As a doctor, I took an oath to provide my patients with the best medical advice possible and empower them to make the decisions that impact their lives and to put them in charge. Women should be free to make the health care decisions that work best for them and respect their own faith and personal circumstances.

Allowing bosses to pick and choose the health care their employees receive sets a very dangerous precedent that could have far-reaching consequences. That is why the Hobby Lobby case that will be argued before the Supreme Court later this month is so important.

CEO David Green may oppose birth control—and that is his personal decision—but individual Hobby Lobby employees have their own moral and religious views, and they shouldn't have to subscribe to his.

This case isn't about the rights of corporate CEOs. It is about the rights of workers and patients everywhere. It is about the individual freedom to choose and make your own health care decisions.

We need to stop bosses and out-of-touch politicians who want to come into our exam room and make those health care decisions. Let's keep these bosses out of the exam room and allow women to make the health care decisions that impact their own lives.

OBAMACARE ENROLLMENT

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. When the Federal Government intervenes in the private sector, like ObamaCare, we end up with a celebrity in chief who chooses to spend valuable time marketing his product—ObamaCare—on comedy shows rather than focusing on our wavering economy, jobs, and crises in Ukraine, Syria, Venezuela, Israel, and North Korea.

This week, the administration released its number for total enrollment in the President's health care law—4.2 million. This falls miserably short of the President's goal to enroll 7 million people by the end of this month. And what is worse is that health care experts estimate that the majority of the 4.2 who have enrolled already had insurance. The White House won't admit this, even though they know exactly how many previously insured are part of the 4.2 million.

Mr. Speaker, this law was designed to insure the uninsured, but it is failing in every single way. It is not helping those it was supposed to help, and it is hurting those with coverage they wanted to keep in the first place. The President needs to put the will of Americans ahead of his own agenda and fix this mess he has created.

ObamaCare has turned into ObamaScare.

May God bless America, and in God we trust.

WOMEN'S UNEMPLOYMENT

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, this Women's History Month, we learned that women continue to struggle with long-term unemployment. In fact, long-term unemployment among women increased from 34.8 percent in January to 37.7 percent in February.

According to a recent Pew Research Center study, women are the sole or primary breadwinner in 4 in every 10 American households with children. When women who have jobs only receive 77 cents to every dollar a man makes, when 70 percent of Americans in poverty are women and children, in a country where women, out of the gate, start out behind, refusing to extend long-term unemployment compensation to those who have looked for a job but cannot find one is particularly hurtful.

For all these reasons, we must renew emergency unemployment compensation—because when women succeed, then Ventura County succeeds; and when Ventura County succeeds, America succeeds.

ACKNOWLEDGING THE WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY MEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

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

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Speaker, I am here this morning to acknowledge the Wichita State University men's basketball team and its unparalleled success this year. The number 2 ranked Shockers are the only team in the Nation that remains undefeated. At 34–0, the Wichita State Shockers are taking more wins into the NCAA basketball tournament than any team in the history of Division I basketball in the NCAA.

Our Shockers' head coach this year, Gregg Marshall, was just named the National Coach of the Year. The players on the court say proudly they have not played a single game that is tougher than any of their practices, and their play proves that team trumps individual every time.

It is said that some of these players were not five-star recruits, and that may be true, but I know them, and I can tell you they are five-star human beings. They come from places like Rockford, Illinois; Scott City, Kansas; Middletown, New York; and right in Wichita, Kansas. They come with no silver spoons. They are grinders; they are hard workers; they are scrappy; and they are fighters with big hearts.

They reflect our town and the best of America, and we love them. Godspeed to them.

Go Shocks.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

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

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, as our economy continues to experience high levels of unemployment and a flat labor participation rate, now is not the time to further decimate vital assistance to those who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own. I will not abandon 2 million Americans, including 200,000 veterans. We must give them a hand up.

Yesterday, I signed a discharge petition to force action on extending unemployment insurance benefits, a move supported by more than three-fourths of the American people.

Additionally, nationally, there are three unemployed people for each job created. For the long-term unemployed, there is just a 12 percent chance of finding a new job in any given month.

Congress must extend unemployment benefits to help keep American families out of poverty as they seek jobs. Each week we fail to act, another 72,000 people lose their benefits. We must act now.

FREEDOM OF RELIGION MEANS FREEDOM TO PRACTICE YOUR FAITH

(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, when a family runs a business by the principles of their faith—which used to be protected in America—can a President step in and say: I disagree with your faith, so I will pass a regulation that says you can no longer practice your faith at work—you can at home, but not at work?

Hobby Lobby is a family-owned business that doesn't want Washington to be their boss. They believe that abortion takes the life of a child and that every child deserves a chance at life. What is wrong with that?

If a Federal employee disagrees with the faith practice of someone in a company, does that business have to change to the faith of the Federal employee, or can they keep their own faith?

It is now the rule that to open a company, work in a job, or get health care, you have to have the same religious convictions as the President of the United States. If you don't, you will be fined until you change your faith practice.

Just days ago, the President spoke at the National Prayer Breakfast about the cornerstone right of the free expression of religion. Does that include Americans who believe that children are a gift of God and they should be nurtured and cared for, not discarded as tissue?

Washington is not the boss of every American. Our Constitution matters; freedom of religion matters; and, quite frankly, children matter.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, on December 28, emergency unemployment benefits for Americans were cut off; and since then, 2 million Americans have lost their essential lifeline and have been missing their rent payments, missing their mortgage payments, trying to keep the house warm and put

food on the table. Congress has failed to act.

What is particularly concerning to me is some of the rhetoric that I hear would imply that those unemployed Americans are seeking benefits because they don't want to work. And, in fact, yesterday, I read a quote from the Budget Committee chairman—and I will try to get this correct—saying that, in America, there is a culture in our inner cities of men not even thinking about working or learning the value and the culture of work.

That is not the problem. The problem is a lack of opportunity. So I will take the chairman at his word that he was intending to say: so, therefore, we need to fully fund after-school programs, we need to fully fund pre-K programs, and we need to fully fund summer youth employment so that those young people do have a chance to experience the benefit and value of work, and that we provide a safety net to make sure that when they are not working, they don't lose their house, their car, and their family.

RECOGNIZING THE COLORADO FLOOD RESPONDERS

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the dedicated men and women who have assisted the State of Colorado in our effort to recover from the devastating floods last September.

On September 11, Colorado experienced a major flood event which took the lives of beloved neighbors, destroyed over 2,000 homes and damaged 17,000 others. Our communities, friends, and neighbors had their lives changed forever and are still putting the pieces back together and rebuilding.

In the wake of the flood, local and State officials, private businesses and individuals, first responders, National Guard, FEMA personnel, and dedicated volunteers worked tirelessly to help Coloradans get life back to normal. While the recovery effort remains unfinished and won't be complete for some time, we are on a positive path forward. If it hadn't been for the committed and devoted people on the ground, Colorado would not be on that path today.

As with all natural disasters and tragedies of this magnitude, Coloradans rallied together and helped in the recovery effort. We still have more work to do. But I want to recognize on the House floor all those who joined together in these recovery efforts and helped Colorado in a desperate time of need.

As a fifth-generation Coloradan, I offer my deep appreciation on behalf of the State.

□ 1215

HONORING OFFICER NICHOLAS CHOUNG LEE

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Nicholas Choung Lee, a Los Angeles police officer who selflessly served his community.

Nicholas served for years in the LAPD, first in the Van Nuys division and later in the Hollywood division, assigned to a patrol car. He had worked as both a field training officer and vice officer in Wilshire before returning to patrol in the Hollywood division in 2008. In his 16 years of service he received more than 70 commendations.

Even as a police officer, family came first for Nicholas, who had a wife, Cathy, and two young daughters, Jalen and Kendall.

Tragically, and much too soon, Nicholas passed away on April 6 when a truck hit his patrol car in Beverly Hills.

We depend upon the bravery and dedication of police officers every moment of every day, and we often forget the dangers and challenges they face on our behalf. I ask all members to join me in expressing our condolences to the Lee family and the entire LAPD.

HONORING AMOS ROJAS, JR.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, Amos Rojas, Jr., was sworn in yesterday as the U.S. Marshal for our southern district of Florida.

A consummate public servant, Marshal Rojas served 24 years of his career with the Florida Department of Law Enforcement, including 8 years as a special agent in charge of the Miami region's operations center.

Marshal Rojas was most recently deputy director of the South Florida Money Laundering Strike Force within the Miami-Dade County State Attorney's Office.

The U.S. Marshal Service traces its roots back to the Judiciary Act of 1789 under President George Washington and has played many important roles throughout our Nation's history.

I am proud to see Marshal Rojas join this elite and storied law enforcement agency.

Congratulations, again, to south Florida's new top cop.

HOBBY LOBBY V. SEBELIUS

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court will soon hear oral arguments in the case commonly referred to as Hobby Lobby v. Sebelius. The outcome of this case will determine whether or not a for-profit company has the right to limit a female employee's access to health care under the guise of religious freedom.

Already the Supreme Court has wrongly declared that corporations have a right to ''freedom of speech,'' as determined in the case of Citizens United. In just a few short years, this ruling has led to a flood of undisclosed money into our elections and corrupted our political system. Corporations' latest attempts to secure the constitutionally-protected rights of citizens is equally as dangerous.

Only a living, breathing woman should have the right to decide how and when she wants to have a family. Regardless of her decision, that choice belongs to her and not to the corporation for which she works.

Millions of women depend upon birth control pills for reasons beyond preventing unintended pregnancies, including a 13-year-old girl in my district, who would rather be in her classroom learning but who spends lots of time in a doctor's office trying to control uncontrollable bleeding. Yet, through no fault of her own, she finds herself at her doctor's office often, and then just recently had to have a blood transfusion.

This young woman relies upon birth control medication to control her bleeding, a medication that her family can only afford because her mother's access to contraceptive care is not violated by her employer.

If the Supreme Court once again interprets our Federal law to grant citizen freedoms to a corporation, it will directly threaten the rights of this young girl and millions of women around the country. We cannot allow that to happen.

HONORING LIEUTENANT NATE KING

(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 in honor of Lieutenant Nate King of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department.

Just a few days ago, Lieutenant King was conducting routine police business when a frantic mother drove up and placed a seemingly lifeless baby into his arms. Six-month-old Lily was choking to death. Without losing his cool, Lieutenant King quickly began life-saving measures, and soon little Lily started screaming and crying. Thanks to Lieutenant King's efforts, little Lily is alive today.

Even better, the doctors who examined Lily that day at the hospital determined she was fine and had made a full recovery.

On behalf of Congress and the people of North Carolina's Ninth Congressional District, thank you to Lieutenant King for your exceptional service. You make us all proud.

Thank you to all the brave men and women of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department who face diverse difficult challenges, even placing their lives on the line to serve us each day.

CONGRESSIONAL DIGITAL DAY OF ACTION

(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, I rise on behalf of the millions of women who now have access to essential preventive health services, including birth control, without financial barriers.

Nearly every American woman will choose to use birth control at some time in her life. It helps women plan for the time they are healthy enough and financially ready to start a family. That is better for her and for her family.

That is why the Institute of Medicine deemed it an essential preventive health service for women. Women across the Nation support it being available to them with no copay.

Now, some women have found that their bosses think they know better than they do, that their CEO has more at stake in her health care decisions than her doctor. This is not right. Every woman has the right to be in charge of her body and her health. Suggesting otherwise is offensive, out of touch, and out of bounds.

KEYSTONE XL

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

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my support for the approval of the Keystone XL pipeline.

As many Americans know, this pipeline will provide an immediate boost to our economy and strengthen national security. That is important. Ask the Ukrainians. This pipeline will create over 40,000 jobs, foster a more energy independent North America, bolster our Nation's weakened infrastructure system, contribute approximately $3.4 billion to our GDP, and generate needed tax revenues in several States.

After a thorough review of the pipeline proposal, the State Department determined it would have no significant negative environmental impact.

The Department's inspector general also concluded that the pipeline's environmental impact study was sound. This is the latest in a slew of reports rejecting the administration's excuses on Keystone.

Mr. Speaker, this President has vowed that this will be a year of action. House Republicans urge him to act. He should immediately approve the Keystone XL pipeline and put Americans back to work.

I am RANDY WEBER, and there you have it.

INSURANCE-COVERED CONTRACEPTION

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the congressional digital day of action on the Hobby Lobby Supreme Court case. Thanks to the Affordable Care Act, 27 million women have access to insurance-covered contraceptives. Nearly 2 million of those women come from my home State of Texas.

Unfortunately, Hobby Lobby, the largest importer in my district, asserts that employers should control the choices of women to have access to contraception and preventive care. However, 70 percent of Americans disagree with that heinous assertion.

While individuals have their own religious beliefs and consciences, businesses that employ thousands of hardworking Americans do not. The implication that a boss could potentially decide what health care treatments any employee can receive are more far-reaching than just contraceptive care.

What can be next? An employer denying coverage of routine immunizations or vaccinations because of religious belief?

It is offensive that an employer believes they have the right to make these personal decisions for their employees. I urge my colleagues to stand up and fight against this discriminatory action taken by Hobby Lobby.

THE IMPERIAL PRESIDENCY

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

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, a headline in today's Roll Call reads:

White House, Democrats cry foul over GOP push to enforce immigration and other laws.

Really? The Constitution is clear about how our government is supposed to work. Congress makes the laws; the President enforces them. President Obama should know that, since he used to lecture about constitutional law.

The President isn't the first to stretch the bounds of executive authority, but the proper constitutional limits on the President's power are long in this administration's rearview mirror. He has disregarded laws that he disagrees with, even when they are his own.

The American people are demanding respect for the rule of law. They want our system of checks and balances restored so that their government reflects the will of all, not just one. That is why we passed the ENFORCE the Law Act yesterday, and that is why we will continue to demand the President do his job, not ours.

FALLING UNEMPLOYMENT AND FAIR PAY

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight an issue impacting constituents in my district and all across the Nation. Recently, statistics were published lauding Texas' falling unemployment rate. Articles say that Texans are finding good jobs.

I want to rise today to speak on behalf of those that have a hard time making it each month. Many of these so-called good paying jobs, after working 40 hours a week, pay about $15,000 a year. Sometimes these hardworking Americans have to work two or three jobs just to make it at the end of the month.

Mr. Speaker, the truth is that Texas families are hurting and struggling every day just to put food on the table and to put clothes on their kids' backs.

I was talking to a lady at Luby's just the other day that asked me, What are we going to do about the minimum wage? We need to vote on the minimum wage—H.R. 1010, that would raise the minimum wage and bring over 5 million Americans out of poverty.

I have signed the discharge petition and urge you to bring this bill up for a vote.

REMEMBERING PHILIP WOOD

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

Mr BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, last weekend 239 passengers on a Malaysian airplane were lost. As of this morning, I don't think we yet know their fate. According to the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, one of those residents used to call Keller, Texas, home. I want to share with the body what his family had put out as a public statement:

> Philip Wood was a man of God, a man of honor and integrity. His word was gold. Incredibly generous, creative, and intelligent, Phil cared about people, his family, and above all, Christ. Though our hearts are hurting, we know so many families around the world are affected, just as much as us, by this terrible tragedy. We ask for your prayers, not only for ourselves but for all involved during this difficult time.
>
> As a family, we are sticking together through Christ to get through this. Thank you for your understanding.

Words I think we can all take to heart while we ponder the fate of those individuals lost on that plane.

EXTENDING EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart. I ran for Congress to help people. It is

past time to extend emergency unemployment insurance, and I am ready to vote to do so today.

Unfortunately, this Republican Congress is denying more than 2 million people across the country the opportunity to support their families and get back on their feet.

Extending emergency unemployment insurance is simply the right thing to do. Have Republicans lost their compassion or have they simply lost touch with reality? Every week, another 72,000 Americans run out of unemployment insurance. In Georgia, 75,000 people have already been cut off. This is supposed to be a lifeline for people who are involuntarily unemployed. No one wants to be unemployed.

It is essential we show the compassion our forefathers displayed when America was rebuilding itself after the Great Depression. We must come to compromise when it comes to helping those looking for work.

□ 1230

PROTECTION OF WOMEN'S RIGHTS

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

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, I stood here to advocate for better economic policies for women because what this Congress takes up week after week doesn't reflect the priorities of the women I talk to at home.

When I talk to the women in my district, the common thread is clear. Women just want a fair shot. They want to know, if they work hard and play by the rules, they will succeed and their families will succeed.

Unfortunately, there are some that just don't get it. Just last month, we had to fight against an unconscionable bill attacking a woman's right to choose her own health care decisions. The Hobby Lobby case the Supreme Court will hear in a few weeks will decide if a woman's boss can choose what type of care and medicine she can access.

When it comes to ensuring that women get a fair shot, we have to protect a woman's right to make her own health care decisions and her ability to plan for her family and her future.

That is why I am proud to stand with my colleagues from the Pro-Choice Caucus in signing the amicus brief to ask our Supreme Court to protect this critical right for women and their families.

EMPOWERING FAMILIES TO CHOOSE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, just as the storied competition between the New York Yankees and the Boston Red Sox works to improve both teams, so does school choice and empowering families to choose the public school that best fits their kids to improve all of our public schools.

Our Education and the Workforce Committee this week had an excellent hearing on charter schools, which I encourage my colleagues to look at the record of. We heard testimony from across the country about the tremendous role that charter schools are playing as part of our public education system in ensuring that all students have access to a quality education.

In addition to charter schools, making sure that States have policies like Colorado does for open enrollment within a district and between districts, parents should be empowered to choose their neighborhood school, a magnet school, a charter school, another public school, with an educational model that fits the unique learning needs of their kid.

In this way, we can ensure that the next generation of American children are prepared to succeed in the 21st century.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK.
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 13, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 13, 2014 at 9:39 a.m.: that the Senate passed S. 611.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR THE REAPPOINTMENT OF JOHN W. McCARTER AS A CITIZEN REGENT OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 32) providing for the reappointment of John W. McCarter as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S.J. RES. 32

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in accordance with section 5581 of the Revised Statutes (20 U.S.C. 43), the vacancy on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in the class other than Members of Congress, occurring by reason of the expiration of the term of John W. McCarter of Illinois on March 14, 2014, is filled by the reappointment of the incumbent. The reappointment is for a term of 6 years, beginning on March 15, 2014, or the date of enactment of this joint resolution, whichever occurs later.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3189, WATER RIGHTS PROTECTION ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4015, SGR REPEAL AND MEDICARE PROVIDER PAYMENT MODERNIZATION ACT Of 2014; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM MARCH 17, 2014, THROUGH MARCH 21, 2014

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 515 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 515

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3189) to prohibit the conditioning of any permit, lease, or other use agreement on the transfer, relinquishment, or other impairment of any water right to the United States by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such

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

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4015) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare sustainable growth rate and improve Medicare payments for physicians and other professionals, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. On any legislative day during the period from March 17, 2014, through March 21, 2014—

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 515 provides for consideration of H.R. 3189, the Water Rights Protection Act, under a structured amendment process, making in order three amendments and providing for extra time for debate for the substitute amendment, which will be offered by Mr. POLIS.

The rule also provides for the consideration of H.R. 4015, the SGR Repeal and Medicare Provider Payment Modernization Act of 2014 with one amendment, offered by Chairman CAMP from the Ways and Means Committee, being self-executed in order to ensure that the legislation has a valid pay-for.

This is necessary so that the bill before us does not run afoul with the majority's rule on CutGo. As is customary, the rule allows the minority to offer a motion to recommit on each bill. Finally, the rule provides for the customary district work period authority.

H.R. 3189, the Water Rights Protection Act, addresses a concern of a number of our Western State colleagues who have experienced the Federal Government threatening to take over the private water rights of businesses and private citizens held on public lands.

The bill, sponsored by Representative SCOTT TIPTON from Colorado, is a bipartisan effort to protect water supplies and property rights designated for recreation, agriculture, local conservation, and municipal use from Federal Government overreach.

The bill protects water users and upholds State water laws by prohibiting Federal agencies from extorting water rights through their use of permits, leases, and other land management arrangements.

If the floor debate on this bill is anything like the debate which members of the Rules Committee observed last night, this discussion will be spirited, as this issue deeply affects Western States, where so much of their land is controlled by the Federal Government.

The second bill, H.R. 4015, the SGR repeal legislation, is an issue that I have worked on my entire congressional career. It reflects years of bipartisan, multicommittee, bicameral discussions and negotiations, bringing together Members of all ideological stripes, as well as those from the outside, to coalesce around a policy to help patients and to help their care providers get out from under the constant threat of payment cuts under the current sustainable growth rate structure for Medicare payments.

Everyone agrees, Mr. Speaker, that the Medicare sustainable growth rate has got to go; but today, we are considering an actual framework to realistically accomplish that goal.

This formula—the sustainable growth rate formula—was enacted as part of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 in an ultimately misguided means by which to restrain Federal spending in Medicare Part B.

The formula consists of expenditure targets, which are established by applying a growth rate, which is designed to bring spending in line with the expenditure targets over time.

Since 2002, this formula has called for a reduction to physician reimbursement rates. However, every Congress has consistently passed legislation to override this formula. This has led this body to find over $150 billion with no solution out of this annual mess.

If Congress were to let the SGR go into effect, physicians would face a 24 percent reduction in reimbursement rates in just a few weeks' time. This unrealistic assumption of spending and efficiency have plagued the health care profession and our Nation's seniors.

The bill before us repeals the SGR—let me repeat that because it is so important—this bill repeals the sustainable growth rate formula, avoiding potentially devastating across-the-board cuts slated for 2014 and does so at a cost far lower than what Congress has already spent or would likely spend over the next 10 years' time.

The bill provides for 5 years of payment transition, essential to allow us to ensure continued beneficiary access, to allow medicine to concentrate on moving to a broad adoption of quality reporting, and allow Congress to move past the distraction of this formula to identify Medicare reforms that can further benefit beneficiaries.

This bill will also allow providers the time to develop and the time to test quality measures and clinical practice improvement activities, which will be used for performance assessment during other phases of this bill. During the 5-year stability period, physicians will receive annual increases of ½ of 1 percent.

I know, I can hear it already. That is not very much. Correct, it is not; but it is more in aggregate than what has been provided over the last several years. More importantly, it provides that stability so physician offices can plan and plan ahead on how to take care of their patients.

□ 1245

The quality measures implemented in what is called the Merit-Based Incentive Payment System will be evidence-based and developed through a transparent process that will seek input from provider groups, from patient groups, and from other stakeholders.

Quality reporting will involve a provider's being judged against its practice rather than a one-size-fits-all, generic standard of care that does not take into account the unique practices of various specialty providers.

Providers will also self-determine their measures. We consolidate three reporting programs into the Merit-Based Incentive Payment System, easing the administrative burden on doctors while retaining the congressionally established goals of quality, resource use, and meaningful use.

The new reimbursement structure ensures continued access to high-quality care while providing physicians with certainty and security in their reimbursements. Physicians will be aware of the benchmarks they are competing against, and unlike current law, all penalties assessed from those not meeting the benchmarks will go to those who are. This keeps the dollars

in the Medicare system, and that, ultimately, drives the quality, which benefits Medicare patients.

Standards against which providers will be measured will be developed by professional organizations in conjunction with existing programs and will incorporate ongoing feedback to doctors, thus further ensuring that optimal care is ultimately provided to the patient.

Realtime feedback will be gained through registries and performance data, and doctors are encouraged to participate in the process through data reporting. For eligible professionals who choose to opt out of the fee-for-service program, alternative payment models will be available. These alternative models may include patient-centered medical homes, whether they are primary or specialty models, and bundles or episodes of care. By encouraging alternative payment models, care coordination, and disease management, our proposed solution will inspire innovation. Qualifying practices that move a significant number of their patients into one of these alternative payment methods will see a 5 percent quality bonus. The bill will also take affirmative steps to improve the accuracy of relative values and misvalued services.

But even though we are taking these important steps toward ensuring quality care, the bill specifically states that these quality measures are not creating a Federal right of action or a legal standard of care or a duty of care owed by the health care provider to the patient.

Mr. Speaker, we have had a lot of discussion. I know my friends on the other side of the dais may disagree with having to pay for new spending, but this is an important reform that Republicans put in place when they reclaimed the majority after the 2010 elections. If you want to increase mandatory spending, you should reduce mandatory spending elsewhere. This is a simple concept, and I know that my constituents and many Americans agree with this.

The Democrats' substitute highlights the difference between the parties on this issue. Democrats have embraced a budget gimmick to offset their bill, a gimmick that even the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has said is not scorable. There is no way that it will pay for anything, because the score is zero.

Republicans want to reform Medicare and the payment system in a responsible way and do so in a way that is paid for. If my colleagues on the other side can find a legitimate offset, I am happy to review it. In fact, this is exactly what we are asking of the United States Senate. You don't like our offset. Offer one of your own, and let's work together to pass these much-needed reforms.

This bill is consistent in its themes throughout. We provide payment stability, reduce and streamline the administrative burden, increase predictability in doctors' interactions with the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, build transparency into systems, encourage innovation and the delivery of services, and keep providers in the driver's seat.

I encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the rule and ''yes'' on the underlying bills.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have two bills before us under this rule, which I will briefly discuss before getting into the more important topic of what bills are not being considered on the floor of the House this week.

Notably, despite comprehensive immigration reform's having passed the Senate with more than two-thirds support, despite the fact that there are more than 10 million people here in this country illegally, despite the fact that our borders are porous and that people are sneaking across, as well as illicit goods, despite the fact that we have no meaningful workplace enforcement, despite the fact that farmers and the faith-based community are crying out for reform—the business community, the tech community, labor—there is no immigration bill on the floor of the House today. Instead, we are discussing two bills.

We are discussing one SGR fix. Now, that sounds obscure to people, ''SGR fix.'' What is that? This is the reimbursement rate for doctors under Medicare, and there is a budgetary fiction that long predates me in this place. I assume that, at the time, Republicans and Democrats created this elaborate budgetary fiction together as this degree of budgetary fiction requires both parties' most creative thoughts to possibly put it together. So we pretend every year that there are going to be large cuts to Medicare. I think Republicans and Democrats know that that is not likely to happen. Those cuts would completely gut Medicare. Doctors would drop Medicare patients if those cuts were to occur.

So each year and sometimes shorter than a year—sometimes 6 months, sometimes 3 months, sometimes 2 years—Democrats and Republicans have to come together to figure out how to avoid those automatic cuts that otherwise occur. That discussion is about how to pay for avoiding those cuts each time.

Democrats have suggestions to pay for it—let's eliminate oil and gas loopholes; let's use the overseas contingency fund. Republicans have ideas about how they want to pay for it—in this case, the 52nd repeal of ObamaCare. By the way, they want to keep all of the taxes from ObamaCare; they just want to get rid of some of the benefits. So they are going to keep all of the taxes from ObamaCare—those Republicans love those taxes—but they are getting rid of some of the benefits. That is the secret of what they are using to pay for it, just so you know.

The real discussion is how to do it, but in this case, the Republicans are presumably so embarrassed about their pay-for—the fact that they are using the ObamaCare taxes to pay for Medicare—that they are slipping it into the rule in what is called the ''deem and pass'' language, or what is characterized by some as the ''demon pass'' language.

This rule says:

> The amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted.

That means there is not even going to be a vote on the actual way to pay for avoiding the Medicare cuts. It is in the rule, itself. This is the most costly rule I have ever seen. This rule costs $138 billion of ObamaCare taxes that the Republicans want to use. This is an expensive rule, Mr. Speaker. If there is a real desire to talk with Democrats about ways to pay for the Medicare SGR fix, also called the ''doc fix,'' we are happy to do it. We were hoping that you would allow a Democratic pay-for sponsored by Mr. TIERNEY, who will talk about the previous question. Our idea is to use the Overseas Contingency Fund to avoid any cut to Medicare beneficiaries, but this rule does not allow us to do that. This rule doesn't even allow the House to vote on using ObamaCare taxes to pay for SGR. It includes the ''deem and pass'' language in the rule, itself—a rule, itself, that includes self-executing language that costs $138 billion. That is one expensive rule, Mr. Speaker, and I certainly hope my colleagues vote ''no.''

This rule also includes H.R. 3189, the Water Rights Protection Act. As my colleague said, those of us in the West feel that whiskey is for drinking and water is for fighting about. I think the debate on the Rules Committee last night and the upcoming debate here on the floor will probably reflect that old adage. The genesis of this particular bill is something that Mr. TIPTON and I and, I think, many Members of this body agree on. We wanted to address a narrow dispute between the U.S. Forest Service and ski permit holders that directly impacts my district and impacts Mr. TIPTON's district.

I support Mr. TIPTON's efforts in that regard, and I was hoping we could have gotten the bill to a point where it would have passed near unanimously or unanimously. Instead, this bill has become a job-killing Republican water grab that even the counties that it was designed to help oppose. The counties in my district that have ski resorts—Eagle, Rand, Summit County, famous resorts like Winter Park, Vail, Arapahoe Basin, Breckenridge, among others—now oppose this bill because it will destroy jobs in their counties by destroying recreational opportunities like white-water rafting, fishing, year-round tourism opportunities, which are

critical to the economic success of my district.

These changes to this job-killing Republican water grab have caused this bill to snowball into an effort that will hurt our rivers' health, destroy recreational opportunities, and the underlying bill jeopardizes the agreements that leave waters in streams and rivers, which allow our tourism industry to be so vibrant. Even some of the counties, as we mentioned in the Rules Committee yesterday—certainly not all of those counties—like Pitkin County and the home of Aspen and Mr. TIPTON's district, also oppose this bill. Again, there was an overreaching decision by the U.S. Forest Service that required ski area permittees to transfer the ownership of water rights to the Federal Government. In 2012, that water directive was overturned by a U.S. District Court judge.

It is important to note that I believe in the purpose of this bill, and I hope that we can address it through the amendment that I have offered, which allows for 20 minutes of floor debate under this bill. This bill can still be saved by this body's endorsing the amendment that I have offered as part of this bill, which is also supported by ski area representatives from across the Mountain West, along with my colleagues from Colorado Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

Unfortunately, this job-killing Republican water grab bill uses the ski area directive as a pretense for making wholesale job-killing changes. Look, ski areas have been a punching bag for U.S. Forest Service's misguided policies for the last decade. I think we can find common cause around a narrow solution. In that time, the Forest Service has changed the ski area water policies four times. It has inconsistently enforced others' water clauses. It has left ski areas subject to the agency's whim. They are very capital-intense ski areas. They are the major economic driver of the mountain areas of my district, but they have been at the whim of sometimes arbitrary Federal actions. Ski areas collectively hold water rights worth hundreds of millions of dollars that are critical for their businesses.

Now, my colleagues might wonder what kind of improvements a ski area might want to make. In 2011, this body unanimously voted to support the Ski Area Recreational Opportunity Enhancement Act, which allowed ski areas to expand summertime activities, like zip lines and mountain biking. Amongst some of those other summertime activities that ski resorts benefit from are white-water rafting, fishing—the very kinds of recreational opportunities that will be impacted by this job-killing Republican water grab.

I entered several pieces of testimony into the record in the Rules Committee yesterday—statements from water districts and from counties—with regard to how this bill will impact recreational opportunities in Colorado. Along with Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. HUFFMAN, I was proud to offer an amendment that would fix and address the issues in H.R. 3189 and return the bill to its original purpose.

The amendment ensures that any U.S. Forest Service directive will not condition ski area permits on the transfer title of any water right or require any ski area permittee to acquire a water right in the name of the United States. The amendment ensures the long-term viability of ski areas, and it makes sure that this bill is not the job-killing Republican water grab that it has become.

It is important to note that the narrow dispute that was the genesis of this bill could have been solved with a suspension measure. We have offered language repeatedly to Mr. TIPTON and his staff, to the committee and its staff, but we were not taken up on that offer, sadly. Instead, we have before us a job-killing Republican water grab bill that would devastate my district.

□ 1300

Instead, the manager's amendment was offered, as well as additional language in committee.

This bill is riddled with problems that are not addressed. The bypass flows issue is not solved in the manager's amendment, which does address the Endangered Species Act component but does nothing to address the issues around the Forest Service, BLM, Interior, and Agriculture agencies that also have relevant authority under a number of statutes, including the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, Forest Service and Park Service Organic Act, and Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, to impose bypass flows.

Simply put, the manager's amendment doesn't make the necessary improvements to make this a bipartisan measure—they are simply window dressing for a job-killing Republican water grab.

Let's talk about some of the issues in the underlying legislation.

In the West, water rights are State-based, and any challenge to a right or to the system itself is a very delicate proposition to years of precedence and claims, subordinate and senior, with regard to water.

As a result, this legislation only serves to cast doubt on the complicated laws and authorities that make up our Nation's and State water laws, and that companies, individuals, and counties have made decisions on and already have economic investments in.

In addition, this bill, absent my amendment, muddles the message of disapproval over the 2011 decision.

What exactly are we saying with regard to this bill? A bill that was meant to address the needs of ski areas because of the 2011 directive instead has become an all-encompassing, job-killing Republican water grab, which is not even a clear signal of our unhappiness with the original directive.

I think not only would there be a much cleaner path to actually become the law of the land if we were to consider a targeted approach encompassed by the amendment that I have offered, but it also, even absent becoming law, would send a clear and unambiguous message to the U.S. Forest Service of congressional disapproval of the directive.

Instead, I think they will just shrug their shoulders and say, That is that crazy House of Representatives.

This bill is not going to become law. This bill will not have any impact—and the message is lost with regard to the 2011 directive.

If they think this is the House's reaction—muddled, job-killing, water-grabbing—to this sort of thing, what is to stop them from doing this again? What is to stop them from targeting ranchers? What is to stop them from targeting recreation areas?

When this kind of thing occurs, we need a targeted reaction that can become law or a clear and unambiguous message that the House will not stand for it.

In summary, this rule contains $183 billion in ObamaCare taxes that are spent for another purpose and allows two bills to come to the floor, both of which could be negotiated in good faith with the Democrats, and both of which have not.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to respond to some of this, just to put things in context on a timeline.

H.R. 4015 was introduced on February 6, 2014. The bill has been available to all Members and the public for more than a month. The bill is cosponsored by the bipartisan chairs and ranking members of the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and the Senate Finance Committee.

We are recommending no changes to the underlying substance of H.R. 4015, which has been negotiated on a bipartisan basis.

I do believe that providing offsets for new spending is an appropriate course of action. Therefore, the Camp amendment saves almost $170 billion over the next 10 years, and this rule ensures that we aren't making future generations foot the bill.

I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON).

Mr. TIPTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is with some dismay that I have to address some of the comments that have been made by my good friend and colleague from Colorado.

Unfortunately, through their own words, they are willing to throw farmers and ranchers—hardworking Americans—under the bus, for an ideological cause, something that we simply cannot accept in the West. In the Western United States, water is the lifeblood of our communities. H.R. 3189 codifies that existing right.

The water grab that is taking place is not by this legislation but by the

very Federal Government that our opponents seem to want to be able to protect and put in a position of authority over State rights and the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution.

As a sponsor of this bipartisan legislation, I support the rule on H.R. 3189, and I encourage an open debate because I believe the merits of this bill will truly speak for themselves.

Federal attempts to be able to manipulate Federal permit, lease, and land management processes to circumvent long-established State water law and hijack privately held water rights have sounded the alarm bell for all non-Federal water users that rely on these water rights for their livelihood.

The most recent case of the Federal Government's overreach and infringement on private property rights involves a U.S. Forest Service attempt to require the transfer of privately held water rights to the Federal Government as a permit condition on National Forest System lands. There is no just compensation for the transfer of these privately held rights, despite the facts that many stakeholders have invested millions of their own capital in developing them and, in many cases, rely on them for their livelihoods.

This Forest Service permit condition has hurt a number of stakeholders in my home State of Colorado, including the Powderhorn ski area near Grand Junction. The Aspen ski area in my district, which he cited, supports this legislation.

Despite having been excellent stewards of the environment and their water rights, the Forest Service has demanded the relinquishment of State-granted water rights from these ski areas in order to continue their operations.

The same tactics have been used in Utah, Nevada, and other Western States where agencies have required the surrender of possession of water rights in exchange for approving the conditional use of grazing allotments.

This water grab has broad implications that have begun to extend beyond the recreation and farming and ranching community, and are now threatening municipalities and other businesses.

As a result of efforts that began in 2011 and encompass testimony from several hearings by the Natural Resources Committee, conversations with numerous stakeholders across Colorado and the West, and close collaboration with my friends on the committee, I introduced this bipartisan Water Rights Protection Act.

This legislation provides critical protection for water rights holders from Federal takings by ensuring that Federal agencies cannot extort private property rights through uneven-handed negotiations. The Water Rights Protection Act offers a sensible approach that preserves water rights and the ability to develop water requisite to living in the arid West without interfering with water allocations for non-Federal parties or allocations that protect the environment that is cherished by all Westerners.

To this end, the bill prohibits Federal agencies from pilfering water rights through the use of permits, lease, and other land management arrangements for which it would otherwise have to pay just compensation under the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution. The bill also prohibits Federal land management agencies from forcing water users to apply for or acquire water rights from the United States rather than for the water users themselves.

Finally, this commonsense legislation provides certainty by upholding longstanding Federal deference to State water law in which countless water users rely.

As the American Farm Bureau states in their letter of support:

> H.R. 3189 grants no new rights to any party, nor does it in any way infringe on existing rights of individuals, States, or the Federal Government. This legislation simply reaffirms what has been existing law for generations in the West.

I am proud that this important piece of legislation that is supported by a broad coalition of stakeholders is now present. Water is our most precious resource in the West, and long-held private property rights to it must be protected from uncompensated Federal takings.

I urge adoption of the rule.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), to further discuss the rule that allows for the debate of the job-killing Republican water grab and the bill to keep ObamaCare taxes and remove the benefits.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman very much.

Might I make a March plea in this March madness?

Can't we all get along and work together on important items such as water rights and the SGR?

I rise, first of all, to make it very clear that I am a strong supporter of providing adequate compensation to our physicians who serve Medicare patients. It is important for our seniors to know that Medicare will be there when they need it. But it is equally important that there are physicians who are willing to attend to them without going broke.

Let it be very clear that I believe my record has been extremely strong on the idea of making sure the benefits for seniors are not cut.

The misrepresentation that the Affordable Care Act cuts Medicare benefits is not true. Now we have the sustainable growth rate, which we had bipartisan support for, and all of a sudden we have a poison pill of a self-executing rule, which was challenged in the Rules Committee, to take money from the Affordable Care Act to allegedly help the doctors.

Every doctor I speak to wants a permanent fix for the SGR. There are a number of suggestions made in the other body, somewhat unpleasant, but we were willing to look at those particular suggestions.

As with any business, medical clinics and physician offices have payrolls to meet, bills to pay, and expenses to meet as they become due. Why are we playing with them when, in essence, we know that this is not going anywhere? Why are we not taking care of these physicians who spend 8 years and hundreds of thousands of dollars to work to gain a degree because they are healers, they believe in it, they want to serve the public. Now, rather than have a bipartisan bill—in the spirit of St. Patrick's Day—and be able to come together and work together, no, we have a bill that poses a serious problem.

I oppose the rule because it corrupts what would otherwise be a strongly supported bipartisan bill to sustain physician reimbursement rates, and it is another attempt, again by our friends on the other side, to disregard and mislead the public about the Affordable Care Act.

Let me clearly say that 11 groups representing the Nation's seniors—doctors and advocates—sent a letter to congressional leaders urging the House to reject the Republicans' toxic doc fix, the GOP's 51st vote to repeal.

From the letter:

> The undersigned organizations representing Medicare beneficiaries and providers appreciate the bipartisan, bicameral work done to repeal the Sustainable Growth Rate, SGR, and reform the Medicare reimbursement system. The current effort to link, however, SGR reform with changes to the Affordable Care Act injects partisan politics in bipartisan legislation.

Access to health care for more than 50 million Americans with Medicare is a serious matter. We should not schedule a vote that does not take seriously the idea of making sure our doctors get sufficient compensation.

The other wrongheaded approach to this is there are no amendments being allowed. No amendments, Mr. Speaker. A closed rule. I just saw some documentation of how many closed rules we have had in this House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman.

The Jackson Lee amendment that was not allowed would have ensured that, notwithstanding any provision of this act, no delay in the application of any provision of the Affordable Care Act would have occurred. It would have called for some studies about Medicare providers. It would have given us real information.

Jackson Lee amendment No. 2 would have required the Secretary to submit a report on cost savings.

The real point is, between skewing the water rights of people and the SGR, this rule should be opposed. We should get back to the drawing board.

Can't we all get along and work together on the right kind of legislation for water rights? More importantly, Mr. Speaker, our doctors deserve better, and I will say to them, you will get better from us.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in strong opposition to the Rule for H.R. 4015, the SGR Repeal and Medicare Provider Payment Modernization Act of 2014.

Let me say first that I am a strong supporter of providing adequate compensation to our physicians who serve Medicare patients. It is important for our seniors to know that Medicare will be there when they need it. But it is equally important that there are physicians who are willing to attend to them without going broke.

That is why we have a Sustainable Growth Rate or ''SGR.'' Medicare reimbursement enables rural physicians and hospitals to remain open for business.

As with any business, medical clinics and physician offices have payrolls to meet, bills to pay, and expenses to meet as they become due. If revenues are not sufficient to cover costs, the business will not long survive.

Thus, it is critical that we not disrupt timely and adequate payment to Medicare providers.

The problem with H.R. 4015 is what happened in the Rules Committee.

The Rules Committee, on a party line vote, added language to the Rule for H.R. 4015 that would delay the Affordable Care Act's implementation of the individual mandate.

I oppose the Rule for two reasons:

It corrupts what would otherwise be a strongly supported bipartisan bill to sustain physician reimbursement rates for medical services approved under Medicare, and

It is another attempt by the Republicans to mislead the public regarding the Affordable Care Act.

The Jackson Lee Amendments offered to the Rules Committee for H.R. 4015 would have improved the bill by removing the uncertainty that physicians would not keep the reimbursement rates they now have for treating patients under Medicare.

Jackson Lee Amendment #1 would have ensured that notwithstanding any provision of this Act, no delay in the application of any provisions of the Affordable Care Act's individual mandate can take effect before January 21, 2017.

Jackson Lee Amendment #2 would have required the Secretary of Health and Human Services to submit a report to Congress on the impact of the Medicare provider payments on the diversity and availability of physicians and hospitals to underserved rural and urban communities.

Jackson Lee Amendment #3 would have required the Secretary of Health and Human Services to submit a report to Congress on the cost savings associated with people no longer using emergency rooms or acute care facilities as their primary means of obtaining health care.

Jackson Lee Amendment #4 would ensure that the bill cannot be construed or interpreted to permit or require a delay in the application of the Affordable Care Act's individual mandate.

I know that many predicted that the Affordable Care Act would cause havoc on the nation's health care system. But it is not the ACA that is causing havoc—it is the 50 desperate but futile attempts by the Tea Party to scuttle a law that has been passed by Congress, signed by the President, upheld by the Supreme Court.

The most threatening actions to our nation's healthcare system by Tea Party Republicans are their attacks on Medicare.

In 2014, according to the Kaiser Foundation 16% of the nation's people have medical insurance under Medicare:

Texas has 12% of its residents insured under Medicare;

Arkansas, Florida and Vermont have 19% of their residents insured under Medicare; and

West Virginia and Main have 21% of their residents insured under Medicare.

Kentucky; Mississippi, Missouri, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Tennessee, Wisconsin, Ohio, Oklahoma, and Oregon have 18% of their residents insured under Medicare.

Every state has more than 10% of their residents insured by Medicare.

The uncertainly created by the majority regarding Medicare reimbursement over the last several years has forced physicians to reevaluate continuing their medical practice and frustrated hospitals working to make budget projections over several years into the future—this is critical to business decision making.

Because of uncertainty created by Medicare physician reimbursement—physicians and hospitals have been forced to close their offices, reduce services, or merge.

When patients find they cannot keep their physician or that their options for health care are being affected—it is not because of the Affordable Care Act.

Our nation has taken a momentous step in creating a mindset that good health is a personal responsibility with the enactment of the Affordable Care Act. The health care law did not automatically enroll all citizens into the program; it was specifically designed to be an opt-in process.

There are tens of thousands of visitors each day to the website and despite problems with the initial rollout of the online health insurance registration process, millions have enrolled and experience the peace of mind that comes from having affordable, high quality health insurance that is there when you need it.

I have held many events in my District to inform and connect people with Navigators and Community Health Centers and send a strong message to my constituents encouraging them that now is the time for them to obtain affordable, accessible, and high quality health insurance for themselves and their families.

So it is puzzling that with less than 70 legislative days remaining in the Second Session of the 113th Congress, we are still seeing attempts to end the Affordable Care Act.

The fact that a bill that is critical to the provision of payments to physicians that treat Medicare patients is not safe from the politics of the moment is troubling.

I ask my colleagues to support Medicare patients and their physicians by rejecting this Rule.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the amount of time that remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 15½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Colorado has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. BURGESS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I yield myself 2 minutes.

I wanted to just list some of the exemptions from the individual mandate—those passed in a bipartisan manner by the House of Representatives and those instituted by executive action by the President:

July 17, we delayed the individual mandate until 2015. Twenty-two Democrats voted in favor of that.

March 10, 2014, delayed the individual penalty for individuals who fail to have health care coverage. Twenty-seven Democrats voted in favor.

March 11, H.R. 1814, exempted individuals with certain religious beliefs. Passed by a voice vote. Not a single dissenting vote.

March 11, we exempted volunteer firefighters and emergency responders from the individual mandate. The vote was 410–0. 186 Democrats voted in favor.

March 11, we exempted individuals who receive health coverage under TRICARE, VA, from being counted towards the employer mandate under the ACA. 183 Democrats voted in favor of that exemption.

This is not something that is exclusive to the House of Representatives.

□ 1315

Just last week, the administration quietly excused millions of people from the requirement to purchase health insurance or else pay the tax. Now all you need to do is fill out a form attesting that your plan was canceled and you believe that the plan options available in the marketplace in your area are more expensive than your canceled insurance policy. You believe that to be true. You don't have to prove it. You believe it to be true. It is self-attestation. So the President has already delayed the individual mandate for another 2 years' time.

This is a reasonable proposal, what is out there today. Yes, doctors do need relief, but we need to pay for that. I believe the proposal before the Congress today will do just that.

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

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

The Republicans are getting worse and worse on these ObamaCare votes. You would think that you would get better with practice, after 52 times they would be better at repealing ObamaCare. That is because this body, the House of Representatives, has voted to repeal ObamaCare, in whole or in part, 52 times.

Those votes started out where it was very simple. The votes were to repeal everything that was in the Affordable Care Act. That is how those votes started. Now they have gotten to the point where the Republicans want to keep the taxes from ObamaCare and get rid of the benefits. I don't think anybody wants that.

I mean, if you are talking about repealing the Affordable Care Act, you still have people that are split on that. You might have a few more people that

agree with you or a few more that agree with us, but the American people have different opinions about that. But if you offered any of them keep all the taxes and get rid of the benefits, I can't imagine anybody wants that.

I would hope that, after so much practice, the Republicans would be quite good at this. It seems to be the core competency they are developing. Almost every week, in fact, this body repeals ObamaCare, but now they are repealing it in a way that keeps all the taxes and gets rid of the benefits; so I am quite surprised that the old adage of ''practice makes perfect'' is far from true with regard to the Republican approach to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Colorado for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity in this session of Congress of getting rid of an onerous policy that has affected the delivery of health care throughout our country since 1997, the so-called sustainable growth rate. That is the reimbursement that our doctors, our physicians receive in Medicare.

We have been working hard at this for a number of years. I commend my good friend and colleague from Texas for the leadership that he has shown on this issue.

The policy behind the SGR repeal that is going to be before this Congress tomorrow has been bipartisan in support. It moves the health care system in the direction where it needs to go, with an emphasis on quality and value, as opposed to the volume of services and moving away from the so-called fee-for-service reimbursement schedule that we have right now.

I believe that if we continue to drive the health care system in that direction, we can get much better quality of care for all Americans, but at a much better price. There are a lot of tools under the Affordable Care Act that are moving us in that direction now to a more integrated, coordinated, patient-centered health care delivery system, but also a reimbursement system that finally is based on the value or the quality of care that is given and no longer the volume of services that are rendered.

In fact, just recently, the Institute of Medicine at the National Academy of Sciences came out with their analysis of the health care system, and found that we are spending close to $750 billion every year on things that don't work. They don't improve patient care. It is the overutilization that is costing us so much and, most of the time, leading to worse outcomes rather than better outcomes; yet the bill with the SGR before us would correct a lot of this with different payment models, with the emphasis on quality and value, with value incentives built into it.

The problem that we have before us tomorrow is how they are going to pay for it. It is this itch that they have to scratch over and over again called the Affordable Care Act, or so-called ObamaCare. They can't help themselves but to keep going back to that well in order to find offsets and pay-fors for other measures where there is bipartisan support and agreement on.

So we will go through this ruse yet again tomorrow. We will have this debate. The vote will probably be along partisan-lines, knowing that it is not going to advance anywhere in the Senate, nor would the President embrace this type of pay-for eliminating the individual responsibility component of the Affordable Care Act. And then we will be right back to where we are today, and that is having to sit down, talk to one another, find some reasonable offsets in order to finally repeal the SGR.

Repeal of SGR is on sale right now. The Congressional Budget Office has been very kind in their score on what repeal would look like—roughly $138 billion. Still a lot of money. In fact, where current per capita health care spending is going right now, it keeps getting better month after month. We are at the lowest per capita health care spending in the last 50 years, certainly lower than anything that we have ever seen under Medicare and Medicaid.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 45 seconds.

Mr. KIND. So there are some powerful trends that are leading to a reduction in overall health care spending, things that we should study and explore and try to sustain.

But moving forward with an SGR repeal based on pay-fors that are being offered is just a dead-end road, it is not going to advance, and this is too important of a topic, too serious of an issue throughout our health care system to play these partisan, political games all over again.

So let's scratch this itch once again, and then, next week, let's come back together and see if we can, in a bipartisan fashion, find some commonsense, reasonable offsets that both parties can agree to, that the Senate can work on, that the President will sign, so we can finally get rid of this SGR onus that has been hanging over us.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, again I remind the body that this language, this compromise, this bipartisan, bicameral compromise has been available for all to see since February 6. During that time, what response have we gotten from the United States Senate as the responsible way to pay for this legislation? Crickets. Zero. Nothing.

We are offering this bill today with the pay-for that has been embraced by both sides in a bipartisan fashion, as I have demonstrated to you already. This would not be necessary if the Senate had provided us feedback on what their approach to a method of paying for this legislation would be, but they did not.

We know the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, the Finance Committee in the other body, the chairwoman has now gone to a different occupation, so there is a new chairperson in the other body on the Finance Committee, but that shouldn't have been an obstacle. There was a way forward to provide the discussion, a preconference conference, if you will, because we had all agreed on the policy. This was not a mystery. This was not something that one body had done in secret. This had all been done out in the open for the past 2 years. So that pathway was available.

But for whatever reason, the other body said no deal. We don't want to deal with the House. We want to jam the House at the last minute and get them to accept something. Or better yet, let's just do another patch and get us past our Election Day. That is a very cynical approach.

Mr. Speaker, today before us on the floor we are taking a responsible approach. And guess what. Because we have taken this approach, the Senate is now talking once again about their way forward, which, ultimately, I think is a good thing.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman if he has any remaining speakers.

Mr. BURGESS. As the gentleman from Colorado knows, I am capable of filling whatever volume of time remains on my own, but, no, I don't see other speakers seeking recognition.

I would inquire of the gentleman from Colorado his status of additional speakers.

Mr. POLIS. I am prepared to close. I have 6 minutes, and I wanted to yield to the gentleman if he has remaining speakers who wanted to speak before I close.

Mr. BURGESS. I am prepared to close.

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

Mr. Speaker, sadly, with these two bills, while the Republican job-killing water grab bill and the ObamaCare tax bill are both not going to become law, they both have a genesis in a real issue, one that calls for bipartisan cooperation, one that affects the water rights of ski areas that we have offered language in an amendment that would address, the other, my colleague, Mr. KIND, addressed.

This body has a long tradition of coming together around figuring how to pay for SGR. Now, the gentleman mentioned February 6 the language was available. The language regarding the SGR fix is not what is in dispute. The way of paying for the SGR fix is what is the topic of debate between Democrats and Republicans. That language was not seen February 6. That language is not even going to be voted upon under this rule. It is contained in the rule itself.

Sadly, while we take up our time on these bills that are not going to become law, we continue to avoid action on the pressing issue of reforming our immigration system. In August, a number of us sent a letter to Speaker BOEHNER saying that he should introduce comprehensive immigration reform legislation. If he failed to do so, we would work with a diverse group of our colleagues to introduce a bill for comprehensive immigration reform in the House. There were crickets, and so my colleagues and I, in October, introduced H.R. 15, comprehensive immigration reform, a bill that has bipartisan cosponsors, over 200 sponsors from both sides of the aisle.

Immigration reform is supported by an unprecedented coalition, including business and tech companies, faith leaders from across the country, police, security specialists, but most importantly, the American people, who are sick and tired of having over 10 million people in our country illegally.

We need to restore the rule of law. We need to allow American families to succeed in our country and to live their dreams. We need to have control of our border. We need to implement mandatory workplace authentication to ensure that people who are here illegally cannot work. Every day that passes is a failure of this body to address these issues, and the solution to all of these issues, workplace authentication, securing our border, uniting families, those are all in H.R. 15.

Look, we are ready to talk. If you don't want to bring H.R. 15 to a vote, Mr. Speaker, what are your immigration bills? What is the package of bills that will address these? Because we know it will take a multifaceted approach. A wall alone on the southern border doesn't solve this issue. The day after that wall is erected, there are still 10 million people here illegally, and the fact that half the people who are here illegally don't sneak across that border, they come here legally and then they outstay their welcome and work illegally. So this requires a solution that I think this Congress is capable of. I think we can work together.

Rather than consider divisive, job-killing water grab bills, rather than consider divisive ObamaCare tax bills that the Republicans want to use ObamaCare taxes, rather than repeal them, let's come together around immigration reform. House Republicans need to reject offensive and unproductive rhetoric and show real leadership that the business community in our country is calling out for.

A few weeks ago, a Wall Street Journal op-ed criticized Republicans' failure to act on commonsense reform. The Wall Street Journal said: ''Republicans have killed immigration reform for now, but the Farm Bureau study shows that in the real economy it's still needed.''

We could increase GDP by 3.3 percent. We can raise American wages by $470 billion with immigration reform. We can create 121,000 jobs for Americans each year by bringing comprehensive immigration reform to the floor.

Over 70 percent of the American people support immigration reform. It is time to act.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up the reasonable solution that would permanently fix the SGR and is offset by capping spending on the Overseas Contingency Fund.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, but I regret to say unsurprisingly, the Republicans continue to play politics with Medicare, politics with water that is the lifeblood of the American West and the economic lifeblood of the counties that I represent in Eagle and Summit County. And all we have here to vote on today is, once again, an attempt to undermine the Affordable Care Act, to keep the taxes and remove the benefits, and an attempt to grab the water from those who would use it for fishing and recreation in the Mountain West.

□ 1330

I hope that we can do better.

If we can reject this $183 billion rule, I think it will send a message to the Speaker that we are ready for immigration reform.

We are ready to reach out our hand on the SGR, on the doc fix, and figure out the best way to pay for it, taking the best ideas that Republicans and Democrats have to offer, working with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) and others to bend the cost curve, so that we can deliver a better quality of services to American seniors and contain costs more effectively.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question and vote ''no'' on the underlying bills.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to direct Members' attention to yesterday's Wall Street Journal, the article entitled ''ObamaCare's Secret Mandate Exemption,'' which goes into some detail about the self-attestation for the so-called hardship exemption, which the administration included as part of an unrelated rule last week.

As a consequence, there is an exemption from the individual mandate for the next 2 years for anyone who simply wants to go and say: I am sorry; this is too tough for me to do.

Mr. Speaker, today's rule provides for the consideration of two important bills, one dealing with critical water rights and the other addressing the serious problem in the Medicare Sustainable Growth Rate.

I certainly want to thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) on H.R. 3189, as well as thank the chairmen and the ranking members of the House Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means, as well as the Senate Finance Committee, for coming together for our Nation's doctors and seniors.

As I close, I would like to note that each committee's work is represented in H.R. 4015. H.R. 4015's base policy has the backing of the House and Senate negotiators and all three committees of jurisdiction. The original cosponsors of the bill include the chairmen and the ranking members of the full committees of jurisdiction, as well as their health subcommittees.

The bill has gained support from the GOP Doctors Caucus, as well as many physicians on the other side of the aisle. We have over 100 bipartisan cosponsors. The bill's policy has been embraced by organized medicine, with well over 700 State and national groups in support of the bill.

From primary care to specialists to surgeons to organized nursing and everyone in-between, we have support for this policy. We will not be able to accomplish this goal without substantive and immediate bipartisan dialogue seeking agreement on reforms to offset the costs associated with the policies in H.R. 4015.

While the delay of the mandate has received bipartisan support, I understand the problems that arise and the opposition that arises.

These reforms must receive the necessary majority support, not only of the House and Senate, but also be agreed to by the White House. However, no one Chamber can negotiate on such an important task in a vacuum.

This action by the House is a means of clearly demonstrating that the legislative policies contained within H.R. 4015 and S. 2000 not only have the support of the committees of jurisdiction and organized medicine, but can gain the necessary support to pass the House.

Mr. Speaker, this is clearly not the end of this conversation. It is another step—another step of many that have been taken in demonstrating to both sides of the Capitol that the committees of jurisdiction have produced significant policy that can serve as the solution to the sustainable growth rate formula that most of us have sought throughout our congressional careers.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to take a moment to thank some of the staff members who have done so much work. I really wanted to start with Dr. John O'Shea, who no longer is on the staff, but now works at the Brookings Institute.

Dr. O'Shea, a physician from New York, was hired by committee staff for the express purpose of helping develop the policy for repealing the sustainable growth rate. In addition, James Decker

on my staff assists me with rules issues.

J.P. Paluskiewicz, known affectionately by his friends as J.P., has put in extraordinary hours on this project, as have Sarah Johnson and Adrianna Simonelli on my personal staff.

On the committee staff, Clay Alspach and Robert Horne have additionally put in hours well above and beyond what ordinarily would be required of committee staff in order to see this project come to fruition.

I certainly want to thank Chairman UPTON for making this a priority during his chairmanship of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and I thank all of the staff—staff on Ways and Means and staff on Senate Finance—who have worked on this issue and will continue to work on this issue until it is solved.

Every success we have had at every point in this process was further than we have ever come before, and that involved a lot of working weekends; but ultimately, if we use this action to springboard to full bicameral engagement on the package that can go to the White House and get signed by the President, indeed, I think all involved would agree that it would be worth it.

I look forward to passage. I look forward to continuing the process with this Chamber and the other Chamber to embrace the underlying policy and ultimately identify the offsets that can get this badly needed policy into law. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and both underlying bills.

[From the Hill, March 13, 2014]

OBAMACARE'S SECRET MANDATE EXEMPTION

ObamaCare's implementers continue to roam the battlefield and shoot their own wounded, and the latest casualty is the core of the Affordable Care Act—the individual mandate. To wit, last week the Administration quietly excused millions of people from the requirement to purchase health insurance or else pay a tax penalty.

This latest political reconstruction has received zero media notice, and the Health and Human Services Department didn't think the details were worth discussing in a conference call, press materials or fact sheet. Instead, the mandate suspension was buried in an unrelated rule that was meant to preserve some health plans that don't comply with ObamaCare benefit and redistribution mandates. Our sources only noticed the change this week.

That seven-page technical bulletin includes a paragraph and footnote that casually mention that a rule in a separate December 2013 bulletin would be extended for two more years, until 2016. Lo and behold, it turns out this second rule, which was supposed to last for only a year, allows Americans whose coverage was cancelled to opt out of the mandate altogether.

In 2013, HHS decided that ObamaCare's wave of policy terminations qualified as a ''hardship'' that entitled people to a special type of coverage designed for people under age 30 or a mandate exemption. HHS originally defined and reserved hardship exemptions for the truly down and out such as battered women, the evicted and bankrupts.

But amid the post-rollout political backlash, last week the agency created a new category: Now all you need to do is fill out a form attesting that your plan was cancelled and that you ''believe that the plan options available in the [ObamaCare] Marketplace in your area are more expensive than your cancelled health insurance policy'' or ''you consider other available policies unaffordable.''

This lax standard—no formula or hard test beyond a person's belief—at least ostensibly requires proof such as an insurer termination notice. But people can also qualify for hardships for the unspecified nonreason that ''you experienced another hardship in obtaining health insurance,'' which only requires ''documentation if possible.'' And yet another waiver is available to those who say they are merely unable to afford coverage, regardless of their prior insurance. In a word, these shifting legal benchmarks offer an exemption to everyone who conceivably wants one.

Keep in mind that the White House argued at the Supreme Court that the individual mandate to buy insurance was indispensable to the law's success, and President Obama continues to say he'd veto the bipartisan bills that would delay or repeal it. So why are ObamaCare liberals silently gutting their own creation now?

The answers are the implementation fiasco and politics. HHS revealed Tuesday that only 940,000 people signed up for an ObamaCare plan in February, bringing the total to about 4.2 million, well below the original 5.7 million projection. The predicted ''surge'' of young beneficiaries isn't materializing even as the end-of-March deadline approaches, and enrollment decelerated in February.

Meanwhile, a McKinsey & Company survey reports that a mere 27% of people joining the exchanges were previously uninsured through February. The survey also found that about half of people who shopped for a plan but did not enroll said premiums were too expensive, even though 80% of this group qualify for subsidies. Some substantial share of the people ObamaCare is supposed to help say it is a bad financial value. You might even call it a hardship.

HHS is also trying to pre-empt the inevitable political blowback from the nasty 2015 tax surprise of fining the uninsured for being uninsured, which could help reopen ObamaCare if voters elect a Republican Senate this November. Keeping its mandate waiver secret for now is an attempt get past November and in the meantime sign up as many people as possible for government-subsidized health care. Our sources in the insurance industry are worried the regulatory loophole sets a mandate non-enforcement precedent, and they're probably right. The longer it is not enforced, the less likely any President will enforce it.

The larger point is that there have been so many unilateral executive waivers and delays that ObamaCare must be unrecognizable to its drafters, to the extent they ever knew what the law contained.

TEXAS MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
Austin, TX, March 13, 2014.

Hon. MICHAEL C. BURGESS, MD,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BURGESS: On behalf of the 47,000-plus physician and medical student members of the Texas Medical Association, I am writing to reiterate our strong support for the work you have done to effectuate the repeal of Medicare's Sustainable Growth Rate (SGR) formula. In conjunction with your Texas colleague, Kevin Brady, you have gotten closer to solving this challenging issue than ever before. And you have done so with the support of every member of the Texas delegation, both Democratic and Republican, on the Energy & Commerce and Ways & Means Committees.

Perhaps more than anyone in Congress, you understand the frustration and anxiety that the ongoing SGR uncertainty creates for practicing physicians. You have worked tirelessly to craft a piece of legislation that not only repeals the SGR immediately, but also guarantees positive updates for physicians for five years, removes potential causes of liability against physicians, and eliminates some unnecessary bureaucratic red tape that prevents physicians from concentrating on patient care.

We especially appreciate your ongoing consultation and dialogue with TMA and Texas physicians throughout this process.

As you know well, the SGR Repeal and Medicare Provider Payment Modernization Act of 2014 has made it this far because of a bipartisan, bicameral agreement on the need to replace the SGR. We are committed to helping you finish the task.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN L. BROTHERTON, MD,
President.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 515 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

Strike section 2 and replace with:

Sec. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4209) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare sustainable growth rate and improve Medicare payments for physicians and other professionals, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

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

Sec. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 4209

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on

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

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

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

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

Mr. BURGESS. With that, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 193, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 125]

YEAS—227

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

NAYS—193

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

NOT VOTING—10

Amodei
Bachmann
Bass
Courtney
Dingell
Gosar
Payne
Rangel
Rush
Wagner

□ 1404

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

Messrs. BRADY of Texas, MEEHAN, and CALVERT changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 12, 2014.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a facsimile copy of a letter received from Mr. Gary J. Holland, Assistant Director of Elections, Office of the Secretary of State of Florida, indicating that, according to the preliminary returns of the Special Election held March 11, 2014, the

Honorable David W. Jolly was elected Representative to Congress for the Thirteenth Congressional District, State of Florida.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk.

Enclosure.

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
DIVISION OF ELECTIONS,
Tallahassee, FL, March 12, 2014.

Hon. KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. HAAS: This is to advise you that the preliminary results reported on the night of March 11, 2014, for the special election for the Thirteenth Congressional District of Florida, reflected the following preliminary returns (which includes all early voting and Election Day results, along with all but two regular absentee ballots, provisional ballots, and the overseas absentee ballots which could be received within 10 days after the election):

David W. Jolly, REP, 89,099, 48.52%
Alex Sink, DEM, 85,642, 46.64%
Lucas Overby, LPF, 8.893, 4.84%
Michael S. Levinson, WRI, 0, 0%

The first set of unofficial results are not due to be reported until noon, March 15, 2014. It is only when the first set of unofficial results are reported that we will know if a recount actually becomes necessary. Florida law requires a recount when a candidate is defeated by ½ of a percent or less of the votes cast. To the best of our knowledge, there is no contest to this election; however, a contest may be filed at any time within 10 days after the state's Election Canvassing Commission certifies the election, which is scheduled to occur on March 26, 2014.

We will follow up with you after we receive the unofficial results and again after we have the official Certificate of Election, which we will transmit as required by law.

Sincerely,

GARY J. HOLLAND,
Assistant Director.

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE DAVID W. JOLLY, OF FLORIDA, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida, the Honorable DAVID W. JOLLY, be permitted to take the oath of office today.

His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Will Representative-elect JOLLY and the members of the Florida delegation present themselves in the well.

All Members will rise and the Representative-elect will please raise his right hand.

Mr. JOLLY appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are now a Member of the 113th Congress.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE DAVID W. JOLLY TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, as dean of the Florida delegation, it is my pleasure to welcome the newest Member of this proud body, Congressman DAVID JOLLY.

Today is a significant progression for DAVID, from staffer to elected Representative; a progression beginning from his many years working for his community as a staffer for our esteemed late colleague, Congressman Bill Young.

I am confident that DAVID has returned to these Halls to ensure that Bill's legacy is carried on, one of extraordinary constituent service, as well as his unwavering respect and civility for all of us in this Chamber. I also know that DAVID will, in his own words, ''bring his own deep desire and drive to get things done for this country.''

DAVID is a fifth-generation Floridian, and is joined in the gallery today by his rightfully proud parents and family to mark this momentous occasion. I am certain that he will work hard to maintain that sentiment with each of them, as well as his constituents in Pinellas County. He is a welcomed addition to our Florida delegation familia—a fresh and strong voice for our Sunshine State and our great Nation.

Before I yield to my distinguished colleague, CORRINE BROWN, let me also say that just like you, DAVID, I, too, won a special election to fill the seat of a legend of this institution, so believe me when I say that having big shoes to fill should be seen as both an exceptional honor as well as an exceptional opportunity.

Congratulations, and welcome from all of us.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to welcome our newest Member to Congress and to the Florida delegation.

As I am sure he already knows, Congressman JOLLY has big shoes to fill. Bill Young was a true statesman who put the needs of his district and our home State above politics, and Florida is a better place to live because of it.

I always say, to whom God has given much, much is expected. When you are born, you get a birth certificate, and when you die, you are going to get a death certificate, and that little dash in between is what you have done to make this a better place.

I am looking forward to working with the Congressman to make Florida and the United States the best that it can be.

I also want to say that the St. Petersburg mayor is here, Rick Kriseman; welcome.

Congressman JOLLY, welcome to the United States House of Representatives.

EXPRESSING GRATITUDE TO SERVE AS REPRESENTATIVE FOR FLORIDA'S 13TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

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

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank you and my new colleagues. Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Ms. BROWN, thank you very much. To the people of Florida's 13th Congressional District, I want to say thank you today for giving me a remarkable life opportunity, the opportunity to serve.

For my new colleagues, I simply want you to know two things about this new Member. First, I believe in this institution, the people's House. I believe in all that is good and right about this institution, the opportunity that this institution has to make our Nation better, to direct our Nation down the right path, to solve problems for all of us, and to secure for every American the sacred blessings of liberty.

The second thing I would like you to know about this new Congressman is I believe in civility. I had a wonderful opportunity to work for a man with whom you each served, and he left an indelible legacy in this House—one of civility. We are all elected to fight for our communities and to fight for our constituents. We are elected to fight for our convictions, for the causes we believe in, but it is a fight for the future of our country; it is not a fight against each other, and I know that.

We have had a nationally watched race. That race is over, and now it is time for me as a Member of Congress of this body to join with each of you to follow in the footsteps you have made in serving your community as I begin to serve mine.

You have my commitment today to work with each and every one of you. I look forward to it. I look forward to working with each and every one of you, and I would like to say thank you one more time to my friends and neighbors and my community, Florida's 13th Congressional District, that has given me this honor today. God bless each and every one of you.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for this moment.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentleman from

Florida, the whole number of the House is 432.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3189, WATER RIGHTS PROTECTION ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4015, SGR REPEAL AND MEDICARE PROVIDER PAYMENT MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2014; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM MARCH 17, 2014, THROUGH MARCH 21, 2014

The SPEAKER. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on adoption of House Resolution 515.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 184, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 126]

AYES—228

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

NOES—184

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

NOT VOTING—19

Amodei
Bachmann
Bass
Castor (FL)
DeFazio
Dingell
Duffy
Gosar
Kind
Labrador
Payne
Rangel
Rush
Simpson
Swalwell (CA)
Van Hollen
Wagner
Waxman
Yarmuth

□ 1423

Ms. SINEMA changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WATER RIGHTS PROTECTION ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill H.R. 3189.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 515 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3189.

The Chair appoints the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1425

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3189) to prohibit the conditioning of any permit, lease, or other use agreement on the transfer, relinquishment, or other impairment of any water right to the United States by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture, with Ms. FOXX in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

President Obama has made no secret of the fact that he is willing to act unilaterally to impose new laws and regulations on the American people, declaring that he has ''a pen and a phone.''

Over the last 5 years, there have been numerous examples of what has become an Imperial Presidency. Under the administration, the reach of the Federal Government has extended into nearly every sector of our economy and ensnarled it in new red tape and regulations.

An egregious example of this is the Federal Government's concerted effort to take water away from individuals and businesses. Water is the lifeblood of communities and essential for a strong economy. Cities, ranchers, farmers, businesses, along with the jobs

they support, all depend on a stable supply of water to survive.

For over a century, there have been established laws upholding a State's right to manage its water and its water laws, but now, this administration is threatening to undermine those laws and seeks to take away private property rights—or private water rights governed under State laws.

Madam Chairman, that is why we are here today, to consider H.R. 3189, the Water Rights Protection Act. This bipartisan bill would protect private property rights from Federal overreach that threatens to take water supplies away from water users, such as ski areas, ranchers, cities, towns, and local conservation efforts.

This bill is responding to a very real threat as the Obama administration has sought to extort water from individuals and businesses through the permitting process.

Now, how is this done, Madam Chairman? Federal agencies are threatening to withhold permits needed to operate on Federal lands, unless private water rights are turned over to the Federal Government.

Put more simply, the Federal Government is holding necessary permits hostage unless water rights are relinquished; and they are demanding that water rights be signed over without payment, which of course is a violation of the Constitution's guarantee of just compensation.

Unfortunately, these businesses that are affected need both the permits and the water in order to operate, so what the Federal Government is doing is forcing them into an impossible situation where either choice puts them in danger of losing their livelihood or their businesses.

□ 1430

During today's debate, we will hear specific examples of businesses and families, including ski resorts and ranchers, who have experienced this heavy-handed tactic of the Federal Government's.

It is important to be clear about the risk posed by the Federal Government's action. This is not simply a threat to ski resorts and to ski areas located on Federal land as, I am sure, some will argue on the floor here today. The known problem is much greater. We have heard testimony in our committee to that fact, and the threat is not limited to one part of the country.

If a Federal agency can demand that a ski resort in Vail or that a rancher in Utah has to hand over his water to get a Federal permit, then a Federal agency can certainly do the same thing in other States—Ohio, Florida, West Virginia. Water may be more plentiful in these regions of the country than in the arid West, but the Federal Government's appetite has no geographical limits when it comes to expanding its regulatory control and its disrespect for private property and the livelihoods of American citizens. This is a threat being felt first by the West, but the risk is real, and it exists for the entire country.

Madam Chairman, regardless of where the Federal Government seeks to take water and from whom it is trying to take it, it is simply wrong, and it must be stopped. That is why H.R. 3189 is necessary, and it is why the bill is endorsed by numerous national and regional groups, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Ski Areas Association, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Cattlemen's Association, the Natural Water Resources Association, and others.

Now, in the course of the debate, there will be claims and assertions made today that this bill is overly broad and that it will have a whole range of unintended consequences. Madam Chairman, I certainly don't blame those who support the Federal takings of private water rights from wanting to change the subject, but this bill is very focused. It has only one consequence, and that consequence is absolutely intended. It stops the Federal Government from taking the water of American citizens without paying for it. It does nothing else.

In fact, this bill carefully states that this prohibition will not affect irrigation water contracts, FERC licensing, endangered species recovery, national parks, or any other legal authorities. Important environmental restoration, wildlife protection and conservation work that has been occurring for years in a positive, cooperative manner—and that is whether it is in Puget Sound, which is in my State, in the Chesapeake Bay, nearby here, or in the Florida Everglades—will all continue, and all are protected. Such efforts will not be changed by this legislation.

Madam Chairman, I want to thank and recognize the sponsor of this legislation, our colleague from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON), for all of his hard work in advancing this important, commonsense, bipartisan legislation.

It is time for the legislative branch to exert itself on behalf of the American people and rein in the imperial overreach of the executive branch and this administration. No law gives Federal agencies the authority to take private property rights as the administration is seeking to do. In fact, the Constitution prohibits such takings. It is time to put an end to such tactics, so I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and send a strong signal to this administration—to leave private property rights alone.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The legislation we have to consider today is flawed on many levels—it is flawed on process; it is flawed on policy; and it is flawed in claiming that it protects States' water rights. H.R. 3189 does not solve the problem—it creates more problems—because it is so broadly written and has no chance of being enacted into law.

The majority introduced the Water Rights Protection Act as a way to protect private property rights. It is not about protecting private property rights. It is not about protecting States' water rights. It goes in the opposite direction, that of creating a new Federal definition of a ''water right'' when we have not had a hearing on that particular point.

Water rights have, for more than four centuries in American law, been defined as a matter of State law. If the majority is really concerned about Federal overreach, creating a sweeping new Federal definition of a ''water right'' without even a single hearing is not the best choice. H.R. 3189 only had a hearing, and it was held during the government shutdown, during the sequestration. As a result, the agencies affected were not able to provide expert analysis because they were not able to be at the hearing to talk to the bill's impacts. The bill's incomplete legislative record was worsened by the committee markup, whereby a clumsily drafted savings clause was added. This only added to the confusion as to the purpose of the bill, negating the purpose of the legislation, which I understand now makes it a broader bill in addressing some of the issues, as have been stated by my colleague, that it is overreach by the Obama administration, thus negating the water rights.

Today, the manager's amendment, with four additional savings clauses, continues to show the magnitude of the unintended negative consequences that H.R. 3189 would have on various activities that require a Federal permit.

There is some agreement on this bill. We both agree that the starting point of this legislation involves a conflict between the Forest Service and the ski resorts, which was the focus of the hearing. Unfortunately, the Forest Service issued a declaration, a release, that mandated certain things that are objectionable to my colleagues, and they are now having to set out a new policy directive that is under consideration by the OMB. We have not waited for the results of the OMB. We can't tell until after the comment period is given to the general public, and then it can be published.

There are currently 121 ski resorts located in 13 States that are operating on Federal Forest Service land. That is public land that belongs to the general public. It doesn't belong to the ski resorts, and it doesn't belong to this body. It belongs to the people. Through long-term special use permits, these resort companies are operating on public—taxpayer—land, belonging to the American people, for private profit. In many cases, these companies purchase water rights in order to operate the resort.

The Forest Service is currently struggling with what happens with the permitting of sales of water rights.

How could the agency find a new operator if there is no water to go with that land and if it is not available, if there is no water for the land? The Forest Service issued a directive in 2011 requiring that, as a condition of these special use permits, the applicant must place its water rights in the name of the United States. Who is the United States if it isn't the American taxpayer?

To be clear, this was not because President Obama is mad with power and wants to own water rights, as some have alluded to. Rather, it was so that the Forest Service could include those water rights as part of the package when seeking a new operator and issuing a new contract for an existing ski area on public—taxpayer—land.

The court validated that directive on procedural grounds, and the Forest Service is currently working on a new directive, as they have stated in the letter to this committee. One, they have said, will not involve permit applicants transferring their water rights to the Federal Government. It would be appropriate to consider legislation that really pinpoints and clarifies that ski area permits may not be conditioned on the transfer of water rights to the government. New legislation devising a real solution to this problem would not only be welcomed, it would be a necessity. This is why we support the Polis amendment, which addresses the narrow conflict between the ski resorts and the Forest Service, which is the real conflict.

This bill would prevent the entire Department of Agriculture and the entire Department of the Interior from conditioning any use of public property on the impairment of any water right. This bill goes well beyond ski resorts and well beyond the Forest Service to fundamentally alter public—taxpayer—land management, including the management of all units of the National Park System.

If this bill were to become law, grazing permits could no longer require that some water be left in the streams for the cattle, and bypass flows would be impacted. Any and all uses of public lands which touch on water would be affected. Without the ability to condition permits or authorizations on reasonable protections for water-dependent resources, such as habitat, timber, or recreation, agencies will not be able to comply with the conservation and multiple-use mandates required currently by law. The bill is so broad and so irresponsible that, if it were to be enacted, it would mean the very end of the public lands activities it is supposed to protect, because those activities could no longer be managed responsibly.

Congress should get out of the way, respect States' rights, and allow the Forest Service to issue its new directive, which is not the taking of anyone's property. Rather, it is placing responsible conditions on a permit allowing private companies to profit from their use of public—taxpayer—lands.

Finally, Madam Chair and Members, it is unfortunate that we are dedicating time and energy to this aspect of water management when our constituents and our communities are facing so many more important water challenges. Most of the U.S., especially the Western U.S., is suffering from drought. While 53 percent is facing moderate to exceptional drought, the entire State of California, my State, is in drought. We certainly have more fish to fry than talking about a bill that is limited to ski resorts and the Forest Service.

I do urge my colleagues to worry less about these resorts and more about the drought that is ravaging our West, the wildfires that are threatening our lives and property, and climate change, which, if we continue to fail to act or accept, makes snow skiing a thing of the past. Some would say that this goes far beyond ski resort issues and affects nationwide entities. I say let's deal with the ski issue and the Forest Service separately, and let's support the Polis amendment.

Madam Chair, I submit for the RECORD a letter dated February 11, 2014, from the National Ski Areas Association. In the very first sentence, they are including:

> I am writing on behalf of the ski industry to express the reasons ski areas strongly support passage of the bipartisan Water Rights Protection Act, H.R. 3189/S. 1630, and to advocate changes to the bill to narrow its scope.

I oppose the legislation. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill and to support the Polis amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

NATIONAL SKI AREAS ASSOCIATION,
February 11, 2014.

Re: Support for Water Rights Protection Act

Rep. SCOTT TIPTON,
Cannon HOB, Washington, DC.
Rep. JARED POLIS,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.
Sen. JOHN BARRASSO,
Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.
Sen. MARK UDALL,
Hart Office Building Suite, Washington, DC.

GENTLEMEN: I am writing on behalf of the ski industry to express the reasons ski areas strongly support passage of the bipartisan Water Rights Protection Act, H.R. 3189/S. 1630, and to advocate changes to the bill to narrow its scope. At the outset, the ski industry would like to express our deep appreciation of your effort to protect ski area water rights from federal encroachment over the past couple of years. Your leadership on protecting water rights and your commitment to working in a bipartisan fashion to solve this problem on behalf of ski areas and other permittees on federal land have had very positive and real effects to date. While ski areas have enjoyed a long and successful partnership with the Forest Service spanning almost eight decades, Forest Service water policy is an issue on which we simply do not agree. We have invested too much in water rights to simply hand them over to the federal government.

As you are well aware, the Water Rights Protection Act would stop the federal government from illegally seizing water rights from private parties that develop them, such as ski areas, in violation of State water law and 5th Amendment property rights protections. The intent of the bill is narrow—to protect valuable assets of ski areas and other permittees that use federal land from seizure without compensation by the federal government. Essentially everyone agrees on the need for this protection, given recent (and past) Forest Service policy that demands transfer of valuable water rights to the U.S. without compensation. This policy threatened to rock the foundation of over a hundred years' worth of water law in the West, and again, thanks to your intervention, beneficial changes are expected in the future.

The intention of the Water Rights Protection Act is not to impact stream health or aquatic species in any way. Some conservation groups contend that HR 3189 has a broader effect than simply protecting water rights, and in fact would hinder federal efforts to protect stream health and fish. Ski areas and other stakeholders strongly disagree with this interpretation of the bill and would never support a bill that had this result. In fact, a ''savings clause'' was included in the bill to explicitly state that the measure had no other impacts than to protect permittees' water rights from forced transfers. More importantly, the bill does not alter in any way the minimum stream flow protections that are set and enforced by the states on virtually every river and stream. Ski areas support and abide by these minimum stream flow requirements and would never take action to undermine them.

However, to make it abundantly clear that ski areas have a narrow and pointed agenda with respect to this legislation and that we are committed to maintaining stream and aquatic species health, we are now advocating changes to the bill to narrow its scope even further. These changes include narrowing the scope of the bill to apply just to the U.S. Forest Service, and clarifying that the bill prohibits forced transfers of ownership of water rights to the United States by inserting the term ''title'' into the bill. We offer these changes to demonstrate emphatically our unwavering commitment to maintain stream health and aquatic species, and our narrow focus of simply protecting our valuable water rights assets. These changes are directed at solving the concrete problem at hand, which is overreaching policy by the Forest Service that requires a forced transfer of ownership of water rights from permittees to the United States. The bill will continue to benefit all permittees on Forest Service lands, not just ski areas.

The release of a new water policy is expected from the Forest Service sometime in 2014. Ski areas welcome this new policy change, which we understand will not require a forced transfer of ownership of water rights. The release of this policy will not change the need for federal legislation however. First, the new policy is expected to apply prospectively, such that existing water rights subject to past Forest Service water clauses could continue to be in jeopardy of a taking by the Forest Service. Ski areas are proposing an amendment to the bill to protect against the implementation of such clauses beginning with the effective date of this bill. Ski areas have experienced four changes in Forest Service water policy in the last ten years. Only Congress can help stop the pendulum from swinging and provide ski areas the kind of stability they need to grow and succeed in the future.

After prevailing on our challenge of the Forest Service's water rights takings policy in federal court in 2012, ski areas offered an alternative approach for the Forest Service to consider that would not involve forced transfers of water rights. We offered this alternative in the spirit of partnership, and as

a way for the Forest Service to work cooperatively with ski areas to support their viability, and the viability of mountain communities, over the long term. The alternative offered by ski areas was to require resorts to provide successors in interest an option to purchase water rights at fair market value upon sale of a ski area. We continue to support this approach as a viable alternative that meets the needs of the agency, provides ski areas needed flexibility, and respects state water law.

Ski areas are great stewards of water resources. It is important for everyone to remember that only a small portion of water that is used for snowmaking is consumed. Most of the water diverted from streams for snowmaking returns to the watershed. Although it varies from region to region, studies show that approximately 80 percent of the water used for snowmaking returns to the watershed. Since the majority of water used for snowmaking is water purchased by a ski area, brought onsite through diversions, stored on-slope, and typically released more slowly back into the watershed with the seasonal melting of the winter snowpack, snowmaking typically benefits the watershed in which it is taking place, as well as downstream users, and can help counteract the harmful effects of drought. In addition to using a whole array of conservation measures, many resorts impound or store water in reservoirs for use during low flow times of the year without affecting fish or aquatic habitat. The ability to control our water assets and investments—which will be the outcome of passage of the Water Rights Protection Act—will enable us to continue this stewardship in the future. It will also allow us to continue to provide a high quality recreation opportunity for millions of people on the National Forests.

In closing, we thank you for your work to date on this issue, and we look forward to continuing to work together in cooperation to ensure the bill's passage.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL BERRY,
President.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. TIPTON. Madam Chair, after listening to our Democrat colleague's statement, probably the best thing that we can do to be able to allay their fears is for them to read the bill. It actually protects private property rights, and let me fill in the balance of the story from the letter that you just cited:

The ski areas are saying that they strongly support the passage of the bipartisan Water Rights Act, H.R. 3189.

I would like to submit for the RECORD letters from over 40 different organizations—farmers, ranchers, ski areas, municipalities—that are supporting this legislation to be able to protect private property rights in the United States.

Madam Chair, the fear in Washington is palpable. Yesterday, we heard from the White House of the threat of a veto, a veto against a piece of legislation which is just codifying what is protected in the Constitution—private property rights in this country. There is going to be a headline in tomorrow's paper. With the affirmative passage of this legislation, it will read that the House of Representatives stood with the American people—stood with private property rights—to stop a job-killing Federal water grab. That is what this legislation is about.

A very clear choice exists today. You can choose to stand with farmers, with ranchers, with municipalities, with our ski areas to be able to protect the Constitution regarding the Fifth Amendment for just compensation, or you can embrace the heavy hand of government and support a job-killing Federal water grab. That is the clear choice that we face today.

This bill is narrow in scope. In fact, the manager's amendment that I will be putting forward is actually going to make sure that many of the concerns that we have just heard expressed are reasserted in that legislation to be able to protect the Endangered Species Act, to make sure that authorities are not currently under law or exceeded, and to make sure that our tribes are actually protected from the heavy hand of government being used as a tool for another Federal water grab.

□ 1445

This is a commonsense piece of legislation—legislation that is designed to stand for the very principle that we have in this country of private property rights.

Protect the water of the West. Protect that private property right. This is simple, 2-page legislation.

Madam Chair, this is legislation which serves the interests of this country, serves the interests of the West, and I ask for its adoption.

COLORADO CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION
Arvada, CO, March 12, 2014.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, Washington, DC.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: The Colorado Cattlemen's Association (CCA) and Colorado Public Lands Council strongly support the Water Rights Protection Act (WRPA), (H.R. 3189). The CCA and PLC represent Colorado's public and private lands ranching industries through a grassroots network of affiliates and individual members. Many of our members hold private water rights on federal lands, which serve as an integral part of their operations; thus, these water rights keep our members in business and rural communities thriving. However, landowners face an unprecedented threat to the future of their water rights on lands managed by the USFS and potentially other federal agencies.

H.R. 3189, introduced by Congressmen Scott Tipton (R-Colo.), Mark Amodei (R–Nev.), Rob Bishop (R–Utah), Tom McClintock (R–Calif.), and Jared Polis (D–Colo.) disallows the USFS and the Bureau of Land Management from seizing water rights without just compensation. An issue that arose in a USFS directive applicable to ski areas was seen by industry as an issue that could threaten all water users, including ranchers, as they depend on water rights on public land (and private) to keep their businesses viable. It is important that H.R. 3189 pass without limitation to specific industries—ensuring ranchers have access to the water rights they own, maintain and have developed.

We support an amendment by Representative Tipton that would make revisions to the legislation which would clarify the intent of the bill. We also understand that several additional amendments have been submitted that would too narrowly focus the legislation so as to not protect livestock producers, and one amendment in particular that would cause the legislation to become applicable only to ski operations. CCA and PLC strongly oppose any amendment with exclusive language that will jeopardize the efficacy of the bill for our constituency, ranchers. Our members face the same threats as ski companies do—perhaps, with more at stake, as they are individuals and families depending on these water rights for their livelihood. It is important to include all industries that may be impacted in the legislation, to keep our rural communities thriving. Rep. Tipton's bill accomplishes the purpose of protecting all water right holders, including ranchers.

There is no justification to include an amendment that will only protect one type of water use, and we strongly urge all members of the House to vote against any such amendment.

We thank you for your attention to this crucial issue, and for supporting America's ranchers as they continue to be an essential part of rural communities and stewards of our public lands.

Sincerely,

GENE MANUELLO,
President,
Colorado Cattlemen's Association.
TIM CANTERBURY,
Chair,
Colorado Public Lands Council.

EAGLE RIVER WATER & SANITATION DISTRICT, UPPER EAGLE REGIONAL WATER AUTHORITY,
Vail, CO, February 27, 2014.

Rep. SCOTT TIPTON,
Washington, DC.
Rep. JARED POLIS,
Washington, DC.
Senator MICHAEL BENNET,
Washington, DC.
Senator MARK UDALL,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES POLIS AND TIPTON AND SENATORS BENNET AND UDALL: Please be advised that we are in receipt of the February 10, 2014 letter to you on the letterhead of the Water Quality/Quantity Committee of the Northwest Colorado Council of Governments (NWCCOG) regarding H.R. 3189, the Water Rights Protection Act, and its companion bill, S–1630. That letter gives the improper impression that all of the listed members, associate members, and participating water and sanitation districts support the position taken in that letter. They do not.

As the largest municipal water provider within NWCCOG, serving the over 60,000 customers from Vail to Wolcott, we strongly support H.R. 3189 and S. 1630, and do not agree with the amendments proposed by the NVVCCOG letter. In particular, the Forest Service does not have the legal authority to impose bypass flows and a Federal Water Rights Task Force has so determined, and any amendment that they do would be a major expansion of federal authority over state granted water rights. Federal bypass requirements are really just a taking of water rights by another name and on a smaller scale. It is hard to imagine that the members of NWCCOG support the federalization and taking of any of the property of their residents and area businesses regardless of the name the federal government gives to its taking. Moreover, bypass flows should not be thought of as an environmental solution to low stream flows as they

are not water rights that can be administered by a water commissioner and shepherded downstream. Rather, senior water rights from public lands that are required to be bypassed can simply be taken up by a junior water right holder just past the Forest Service boundary. This is one of the main reasons why the Colorado Water Conservation Board, which is the State agency with exclusive authority to obtain in-stream flows, has consistently opposed federal attempts to impose bypass flows.

We have enclosed a copy of a piece prepared by The Federal Water Rights Task Force entitled ''The Colorado 'Bypass Flow' Controversy'' for your review. It is an excellent review of the limitations on existing rights of the Forest Service to impose bypass flows and practical reasons why imposing such flows is not a good idea. (The link for the entire report is http://www.fs.fed.us/land/water/.)

We believe that many of the largest water users within NWCCOG agree with our position.

Very truly yours,

FREDERICK P. SACKBAUER, IV,
Eagle River Water & Sanitation District, Chairman of the Board.

GEORGE GREGORY,
Upper Eagle Regional Water Authority, Chairman of the Board.

COLORADO RIVER DISTRICT
Glenwood Springs, CO, October 9, 2013.

Re H.R. 3189.

Hon. SCOTT TIPTON,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TIPTON: The Colorado River Water Conservation District sincerely appreciates your leadership in Colorado and Western water matters. H.R.3189 is just one more example. The Colorado River District will recommend that its Board support H.R. 3189 with the consensus amendments developed by your staff, the national ski areas and the River District.

With the clarifying amendments, H.R.3189 provides responsible side boards to agency actions when permitting allowable activities and uses on federal lands. It prohibits the transfer of ownership of privately held water rights in exchange for required permits. We are also pleased that your staff will prepare a sponsor's statement to confirm that the bill will not change existing law that allows reasonable permit conditions that can protect both the natural environment and present and future downstream water users dependent on the forest for critical water supplies.

I want to express my genuine appreciation for your and your staff's willingness to work with us on language that accomplishes our mutual goals of protecting private property interests in western water while maintaining the authority to condition permits to ensure responsible exercise of those rights.

Sincerely,

R. ERIC KUHN,
General Manager.

COLORADO RIVER DISTRICT,
Glenwood Springs, CO, November 12, 2013.

Re H.R. 3189, Markup

Hon. SCOTT TIPTON
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As we've discussed previously, the River District board appreciates your leadership on Colorado water matters including your recent introduction of H.R. 3189. We deeply appreciate your and your staff's continuing engagement with us to refine and clarify the language to address the critical issues of water rights' equity and ownership while avoiding unintended consequences or inviting litigation.

Adam Eckman from the subcommittee staff shared final draft language in preparation for markup. I believe the new and amended language is an improvement and consistent with the River District Board's existing support for the bill.

The River District looks forward to continuing to work with you in support of this important legislation. Thank you and best wishes for a successful markup.

Sincerely,

R. ERIC KUHN,
General Manager.

CENTER CONSERVATION DISTRICT,
Center, CO, October 25, 2013.

Hon. SCOTT TIPTON,
Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. JARED POLIS,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPS. TIPTON AND POLIS: The Center Conservation District commends you for your introduction of H.R. 3189, the Water Rights Protection Act and endorses the Tipton-Polis bill, and will work closely with you to broaden bipartisan support for this measure and to gain its swift consideration and approval by the House of Representatives.

It is our understanding that the H.R. 3189 grants no new rights to any party, nor does it in any way infringe on existing rights of individuals, states or the federal government. This legislation simply reaffirms what has been existing law for generations and which is expressed in numerous places in federal law, including the Mining Act of 1866; the 1897 Organic Act establishing the U.S. Forest Service; the Taylor Grazing Act; and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976.

There is no provision in federal law authorizing or permitting the Forest Service or the Bureau of Land Management to compel owners of lawfully acquired water rights to surrender those rights or to acquire them in the name of the United States. Thus, H.R. 3189 does nothing more than assure holders of BLM or Forest Service permits that their lawfully acquired rights will not be abridged and that federal agencies may not unlawfully use the permit process to acquire rights they do not currently possess.

We look forward to working with you on this important legislation and again commend you for your leadership in this important area.

Sincerely,

DANNY NEUFELD,
President.

NWRA,
Washington, DC, March 10, 2014.

Hon. DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman, House Committee on Natural Resources, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HASTINGS, On behalf of the Board of Directors and the members of the National Water Resources Association (NWRA), I write in support of H.R. 3189, the Water Rights Protection Act. The NWRA is a nonprofit federation made up of agricultural and municipal water providers, state associations, and individuals dedicated to the conservation, enhancement and efficient management of our nation's most important natural resource, water. Our members provide clean water to millions of individuals, families, agricultural producers and other businesses throughout the western United States.

Collectively, NWRA members have spent billions of dollars investing in the development of state issued water rights and the associated infrastructure in order to provide a safe and reliable water supply to their customers. Their ability to continue meeting the nation's growing demand for clean water is dependent upon access to this vital resource. The Water Rights Protection Act would protect NWRA members' water rights and those who depend on the water they deliver by preventing federal agencies from making a permit, permit renewal or other action conditional upon surrendering a water right. The protection of water rights is of the utmost importance to our members. Water rights constitute a valuable property right and as such are valuable assets that are often irreplaceable.

For more than eighty years NWRA members have helped finance, maintain and manage some of the most valuable and iconic water systems in the world and have turned virtual deserts into some of the most productive agricultural land on the planet. To accomplish this irrigators have worked collaboratively with federal agency partners at the Bureau of Reclamation and Army Corps of Engineers. That collaborative partnership, formed through contracts and other agreements, is protected by this bill. Our members are gravely concerned by recent efforts by the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) that have made agency actions contingent upon the relinquishment or modification of a water right. These efforts go counter to the principle foundations of western water law, fly in the face of state law and set a dangerous precedent. Our members count on federal infrastructure to deliver both project and non-project water. Non-project water is privately owned; it has not been appropriated, acquired by, or apportioned to, the United States. In addition, many of our members deliver water through facilities that cross USFS or BLM land. The creation of a process through which water deliveries could be made contingent on the modification, relinquishment or surrender of a water right is unacceptable. Moreover, allowing such a precedent would cause this assault on state water rights to spread in various forms to other agencies within the Agriculture and Interior Departments. Congress, needs to provide the respective Secretaries with clear guidance on this subject, H.R. 3189 provides this guidance.

The USFS and BLM efforts to curtail water rights have been focused on western states, but the implementation of this kind of policy would have ramifications throughout the nation. According to the United States Geological Survey, nearly seventy five percent of the irrigated agriculture in the U.S. is found in the seventeen western states. These states on average receive less than twenty inches of rain each year, making the reliable delivery of irrigation water vital. In order to protect our members' water rights, assure the continued delivery of clean water to millions of people and protect the integrity of Western water law the NWRA supports the Water Rights Protection Act.

On behalf of NWRA's members I thank you for your attention to the critical water supply issues facing our nation, and for supporting our members as they continue to be stewards of our nation's water supply and a critical part of the economy.

Sincerely,

ROBERT W. JOHNSON,
Executive Vice President.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, there is opposition to this bill from 90 conservation, recreation, and sportsmen groups, including the Grand County Board of Commissioners, Summit County Board of Commissioners, Eagle County Board of Commissioners, besides the other agencies.

LETTERS IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 3189

Hinsdale County; Rio Grande Watershed Association of Conservation Districts;

Conejos County Board of County Commissioners; Colorado River District; National Cattlemen's Beef Association; National Association of Conservation Districts; National Ski Areas Association; National Water Resources Associations; Western Governors Association*

*WGA has taken a neutral stance on H.R. 3189.

LETTERS IN OPPOSITION TO H.R. 3189

U.S. Department of Interior; U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service; Grand County Board of Commissioners; Summit County Board of Commissioners; Eagle County Board of Commissioners.

90 CONSERVATION, RECREATION, AND SPORTSMAN'S GROUPS INCLUDING:

California Environmental Groups; Alabama Rivers Alliance; American Bird Conservancy; American Rivers; American Whitewater; Appalachian Mountain Club; Atlantic Salmon Federation; California Sportfishing Protection Alliance; CalTrout; Chesapeake Bay Foundation; Clean Water Action; Connecticut River Watershed Council; Deerfield River Watershed Association; Defenders of Wildlife; Earthjustice; Foothill Conservancy; Friends of Butte Creek; Friends of Merrymeeting Bay; Friends of the Rivers of Virginia; Friends of the White Salmon River; Gunpowder Riverkeeper; Hydropower Reform Coalition; Idaho Rivers United; Lower Mississippi River Foundation; Maine Rivers; National Audubon Society; National Parks Conservation Association; Native Fish Society; Natural Resources Defense Council; Northwest Resource Information Center; Rivers Alliance of Connecticut; Shenandoah Riverkeeper; Sierra Club; Stewards of the Lower Susquehanna, Inc.; Tennessee Clean Water Network; Upstate Forever; Utah Rivers Council; WaterWatch of Oregon; Yadkin Riverkeeper Inc.

I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, here we are again. We had a real problem. The Forest Service did overreach and trigger this issue.

Later on, we will have an amendment offered by Mr. POLIS from Colorado—whose ski areas originally brought this issue to him and who now opposes this bill—to narrow the scope of this bill down to assure that the Forest Service doesn't re-propose the rule which they have withdrawn, which would have caused the problem.

The rule was offered. There was litigation. A new rule was begun. The Forest Service withdrew the rule. There is no rule pending. But we are going to pass legislation that affects all water rights in the Western United States because of a problem that doesn't currently exist.

This is fairly extraordinary. Because we held a hearing on this when the government was shut down, not very many people knew about or got to participate in the hearing. I was there. I read the bill. That is a bad habit I have. I pointed out that the bill was so broadly written that it would impact any and all Federal actions that have to do with water in the United States of America. That goes way beyond ski areas and water rights. It goes way beyond farmers or individual property rights. It has untold consequences.

As a consequence, Republicans at the time denied it. But now this bill has six savings clauses. What does that mean?

Well, the bill was so broadly and poorly drafted to begin with, they now are carving out six exemptions to say, Oh, we didn't mean to say we would take away tribes' water rights; we didn't mean to say that we couldn't have any control of Bureau of Reclamation projects and deal with flood control. Oh, we didn't mean this or that. So there are six savings clauses in this bill because it is so poorly and broadly drafted and has so many unfathomable and unintended effects. Then there is the sixth savings clause which says this bill does nothing.

Now how could that be? Well, because we are here about headlines. We are here about a headline that will be meaningless by some gullible reporter somewhere who actually believes what they are saying on that side of the aisle.

Here is the final savings clause of this unbelievably poorly drafted bill with unbelievable, unintended consequences:

> Nothing in this act limits or expands any existing authority of the Secretaries . . .

That is, Interior and Agriculture.

> . . . to condition any permit, approval, license, lease, allotment, easement, right-of-way, or other land use or occupancy agreement on Federal lands subject to the respective jurisdictions.

So in the body of the bill they create a whole bunch of problems by threatening concessionaires in parks, issues relating to the Columbia River in Washington and Oregon, and a whole host of projects that relate to use of the water in the West. It is a very sensitive issue, the use of the water in the West. Then they carve out five particular exceptions, which are really hot button issues. Then they have this uber exception which says this bill doesn't do anything.

So what does the bill do? Well, that is the whatever thousand-dollar question here today. It may do something unbelievably destructive to private property rights.

On that side of the aisle we hear about this all the time. A couple of weeks ago, they passed another show bill pretending to deal with the drought in California by preempting 100 years of water law in the State of California. The Federal Government preempting it.

Now they are going to fight for water rights in the West—or, at least that is the headline they hope they get out of this. But that is not what they are doing because for the first time this bill has a Federal definition in statute of water right, which would seem to preempt or contradict the States. But it has sort of got a savings clause. So it says we are creating a new Federal water right, but it really doesn't mean anything because we are not affecting the States. And oh, by the way, we have got a clause at the end saying we are not doing anything at all anyway.

So why are we here? We are here because there was a narrow issue which we could have, in a bipartisan way, agreed to deal with. It could have been what is called a suspension bill. We probably wouldn't have even had a vote on it on the floor of the House—one of those routine bills we pass generally on Mondays or Tuesdays, travel days, requiring a two-thirds vote because they are noncontroversial.

It could have been done that way. But no, that wouldn't have got a headline. It would have solved a problem—a problem that used to exist and doesn't existing anymore and might exist in the future. It would have solved that problem if it ever existed again, if the Forest Service proposed the rule again, which they aren't going to. But let's just say some future administration chose to do that. We could have preempted them that way.

But no, we couldn't just do that because how could you come here and say you are fighting for cattlemen and you are fighting for agriculture and you are fighting for the little guy and private property rights and all those wonderful buzz words around here, when you are not really doing that, but get an undeserved headline out of it if you find a gullible reporter.

That is why we are here today. It is kind of a waste of time, to tell the truth. If you want to fix the bill and potentially fix a future problem if they do go after the ski area water rights again, vote for the Polis amendment. Go back to the narrow scope of the bill. That is where we started.

If that is adopted, that would be great, and we could vote for it. If that is not adopted, I would recommend that Members think long and hard about it because you may be causing unintended effects with this bill by defining a Federal water right that potentially preempts and upends hundreds of years of precedent in the Western United States and causes untold damage. It will certainly make a lot of lawyers happy, but it is not probably going to make your farmers and ranchers happy, who you think you are pleasing here today.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS), a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Madam Chair, this act reinforces our century-long system, working well in our States, where the States pass water law and administer State water law. State law is crucial in the West.

For example, take how a ski area permit is supposed to work. The Forest Service issues a permit for the use of the land, but the water is administered in accordance with State water law. The water does not belong to the Federal Government.

The headline here should be, ''Keep your mitts off our water.''

If the Federal Government wants water rights, it has to pay for them, or

get in line, just like other citizens and businesses. But now, instead of waiting its turn or paying fair value, the Forest Service is demanding water rights as a condition of ski area permits. They are demanding the full value of water rights it had no role in developing.

The Forest Service isn't just going after ski areas. It is targeting ranchers with grazing permits as well.

The Federal Government claims it needs the water rights because the Federal Government knows best how to manage water for ski recreation and grazing. The reality is the Federal Government doesn't know best at all, and that is why States are in control of water law.

Sound water management and conservation is necessary in the arid and semi-arid West, and the real work is done at the State and local level by individuals. These efforts will only be harmed if we let Federal agencies trample on State water law, substituting their judgment for those who live near water and depend on it for their well-being.

Madam Chair, I have spent thousands of hours of my life irrigating Wyoming's beautiful meadows.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentlelady an additional 1 minute.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Madam Chair, when you are still and you are out in a meadow, you can hear the water bubble into the ground, and I swear you can hear the grass grow. It is the most amazing, fulfilling thing, and some of the happiest hours I have spent in my entire life. This is personal with me.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the Tipton bill.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, may I inquire how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California has 15½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 18 minutes remaining.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Madam Chair, I will include in the RECORD a list of amendments proposed that the Rules Committee did not find in order that are asking to exempt Allegheny National Forest, Delaware River Watershed, and Delaware Water Gap from the effects of the bill.

We also have the Chesapeake Bay Watershed, the Long Island Sound Watershed, the Puget Sound Watershed, and Olympic National Park Watershed. They all want to be excluded from this bill.

SUMMARY OF AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED TO THE RULES COMMITTEE FOR H.R. 3189—WATER RIGHTS PROTECTION ACT

SUMMARIES DERIVED FROM INFORMATION PROVIDED BY SPONSORS

[Listed in Alphabetical Order]

Cartwright (PA): No. 1—Exempts the Allegheny National Forest, Delaware River Watershed, and Delaware Water Gap from the effects of the bill.

Connolly (VA), Van Hollen (MD), Sarbanes (MD), Scott, Bobby (VA), Edwards (MD), Cartwright (PA): No. 13—States that no provisions of the bill shall affect water rights agreements within the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

Holt (NJ): No. 5—Exempts the Delaware River watershed from this Act.

Israel (NY), DeLauro (CT), Esty (CT), Crowley (NY), Engel (NY), Tonko (NY), McCarthy, Carolyn (NY), Bishop, Tim (NY), Courtney (CT): No. 8—Exempts the Long Island Sound watershed from any provision in the legislation.

Kilmer (WA), Heck, Denny (WA), Larsen, Rick (WA), Smith, Adam (WA): No. 9—Clarifies that nothing in the legislation would affect or apply to the Puget Sound watershed.

Kilmer (WA): No. 10—Affirms that nothing in the legislation would affect or apply to the Olympic National Park watershed.

Kilmer (WA), Huffman (CA): No. 11—Clarifies that nothing in the legislation would impact or diminish the treaty rights of federally recognized tribes and nothing would impact water rights of federally recognized tribes.

Langevin (RI), Cicilline (RI): No. 7—Exempts the Nanagansett Bay watershed and the Wood Pawcatuck watershed.

Lujan (NM): No. 2—Notification requirements for the implementation of water settlements.

Mullin, Markwayne (OK): No. 4—Ensures that the federal government cannot make Native America tribes, apply for or acquire water rights under state law for the federal government rather than acquiring the rights for themselves. Prohibits the federal government from using permits, approvals, and other land management agreements to take the water rights of Native American tribes without just compensation. Ensures that nothing in the Act limits or expands the reserved water rights or treaty rights of federally recognized Native American tribes.

Polis (CO), DeGette (CO), Perlmutter (CO), DelBene (WA), Kuster, Ann (NH), Cartwright (PA), Huffman (CA): No. 5—SUBSTITUTE Requires the U.S. Forest Service to issue a new draft water directive within 60 days that does not condition ski area permits on the transfer of title of any water right or require any ski area permittee to acquire a water right in the name of the United States.

Speier (CA), Miller, George (CA), Lee, Barbara (CA): No. 6—Excludes the California Bay Delta system from the provisions of the bill.

Tipton (CO): No. 12—MANAGERS Makes several clarifying technical changes to the bill, and clarifies that the Act will have no effect on Bureau of Reclamation contracts, implementation of the Endangered Species Act, certain existing federal reserved water rights, and certain authorities under the Federal Power Act.

Tonko (NY): No. 14—LATE Ensures that nothing in this Act will affect or apply to the Hudson and Mohawk River watersheds.

Tsongas (MA): No. 3—States that Nothing in this Act shall affect or apply to the Lowell National Historical Park and Minute Man National Historical Park.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET, WASHINGTON, DC, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 12, 2014.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 3189—WATER RIGHTS PROTECTION ACT

(Rep. Tipton, R–Colorado, and 15 cosponsors)

The Administration opposes H.R. 3189, which would prohibit the U.S. Department of the Interior (DOT) and the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) from exerting some control over the exercise of water rights located on Federal lands. The bill threatens the Federal government's longstanding authority to manage property and claim proprietary rights for the benefit of Indian tribes and reserved Federal lands, and the broader public that depends on the proper management of public lands and resources. It adversely affects DOI's and USDA's ability to manage water resources to: (1) protect ongoing public lands uses and the environment; (2) allow for maximum beneficial use of Federal water facilities; and (3) ensure adequate water is available for fisheries or threatened or endangered species.

H.R. 3189 is overly broad and could have numerous unintended consequences. For example, the bill could impede private water rights holders from entering into voluntary agreements with Federal agencies, which benefit State, Federal, and private water rights holders' interests and improve water resource management.

The bill was introduced, in part, to address the U.S. Forest Service's ski area water rights clause proposal, which the Forest Service has changed in response to public feedback and will soon be publishing. The Administration looks forward to working with Congress to address any remaining concerns regarding the ski area water rights proposal after its publication and to developing legislation that maintains the Federal government's interest in protecting public lands and waters, allows for the continuance of voluntary agreements between the Federal government and other water rights holders, and ensures adequate protection of the environment.

Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Chair, H.R. 3189 is too broad. It would not solve the problem that it purports to address, but it would indeed impede ongoing collaborative efforts across this country.

Once again, I am afraid that the majority has ignored an opportunity for a bipartisan, solution-oriented engagement on an issue and instead chosen the same old attack-and-accuse and overreach politics.

This legislation stems from a very legitimate concern that was raised by the ski industry regarding how the Forest Service was proposing to handle water rights in public leases for ski areas. This was something that we could have worked together on. In fact, I think the House could have found a constructive bipartisan solution. We could have had this resolved by now.

Instead, the Republican leadership held a hearing on this issue during the government shutdown, meaning that we did not have the opportunity to question the Forest Service. Instead of the benefit of a dialogue and a conversation, we had an empty chair. Of course, the attacks on that empty chair ensued as part of the political theater.

Had the GOP bothered to actually talk to the Forest Service, they would have found a receptive partner in a solution to this problem. They would have found, in fact, that a solution was already in the works.

Had the Republican majority actually worked with the Forest Service, they could have influenced a proposal

that is being revised right now by the Forest Service. Instead, we are dealing with a bill here today that goes far beyond the scope of the issue at hand and could affect voluntary agreements and contracts across this country.

In fact, this bill before us today could stop the Federal Government from taking the very actions that could help ensure recreational opportunities for Americans, like skiing, rafting, kayaking, and fishing. Preventing water right holders from entering into agreements with Federal agencies could put our recreational economy at risk and could impede our ability to implement important water agreements throughout the West.

We still have an opportunity to get back on a constructive track here. We have a chance to pass an amendment—the Polis amendment—that narrows the bill's scope to its original intent and would address the concerns of the ski areas.

I urge my colleagues to support the Polis amendment to address the ski area water rights issues, and I encourage my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to work with us to try to salvage this bill and focus on the real concern at hand.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlemen from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), another member of the Natural Resources Committee.

□ 1500

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Chairman, people need to understand exactly what is going on here. The U.S. Forest Service and other Federal agencies have begun demanding that privately-owned businesses surrender their long-held water rights simply as a condition of receiving routine renewals in their special use permit so that they can continue to operate on public land.

This is a radical departure from more than 100 years of Federal deference to State law on this issue. It amounts to an uncompensated taking and is a violation of the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution, and it is an affront to State law, under which the Federal Government must acquire water rights through the proper channels as would any other user.

Now, there are 121 ski areas on Federal public lands that are affected by this practice; 14 of them are in my district. These businesses rely on their water rights for snowmaking. They use this water as collateral for financing to build and maintain their facilities and for supplying water to the local communities they support.

In 2011, the Forest Service issued a directive that would effectively take these private property rights without compensation, in violation of State law, while jeopardizing these enterprises all together and all the direct employment, spinoff economic activity, and tax revenues that they provide.

This involved far more than ski resorts. Our Subcommittee on Water and Power has also received reports of similar tactics directed against farm and ranch operations that rely on State-recognized water rights for irrigation and stock watering.

Mr. TIPTON's bill simply directs Federal agencies to stop perverting what should be a routine permitting process into an excuse to extract long-held water rights from private owners.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, I now yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS).

Ms. TSONGAS. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3189 because it could have severe unintended consequences for the Third District of Massachusetts, which I represent.

A hearing on the bill was held in a most untimely manner, during a government shutdown, thus preventing the Forest Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service or any other administration official from answering questions on this legislation.

Given the harsh statements about these very important agencies coming from the other side of the aisle, it seems only fair to have given them a chance to address these charges. According to ''Views'' of this legislation submitted by the Department of Interior after the fact, this bill ''could significantly impact the Department's ability to manage water-related resources within public lands.'' It also goes on to say that ''the legislation is overly broad and could have numerous unintended consequences that would affect existing law and voluntarily agreements.''

My constituents echo this statement. From a local organization that works tirelessly to protect our rivers and watershed in Massachusetts, they say: ''The bill is so very broad it is fairly impossible to assess its true impact. On those very grounds it should not be passed.''

I will be supporting the Polis amendment to narrow the scope of this legislation to its original purpose and to address the legitimate concerns of the ski industry. If this amendment is not adopted, I urge my colleagues to heed the advice of my constituents and to reject this bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), a member of the House Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Chair, when the ranking member was speaking, he quoted from the bill and said: This does not limit the Secretary's right, nor does it expand the Secretary's right. So he said then, What does it actually do?

What it does is very simple. It stops the Federal Government from hurting people. This came to view in the Federal Government trying to take away water rights from ski resorts, and not just in Colorado. It was all ski resorts. As I have said repeatedly, the ski resorts in Utah are far more significant and far better than the ski resorts in Colorado. It affects all of us.

It is not just limited to ski resorts. We also found out these same tactics have been used by BLM and other entities to affect farmers and ranches, same concept, same area.

So what the Tipton bill is trying to do is solve the problem for everybody, not just for a few people. Even people in the East who have water rights will be protected by this bill, whether they recognize that or not.

I want to introduce you to a guy by the name of Tom Lowry. He came to our committee to testify about what they were doing. This is a person, as soon as he got his ranch, the Federal Government—the BLM in this case—started to attack his private water rights. It took him $800,000 in legal fees to go through the system to try and protect his rights.

He eventually got to the Idaho Supreme Court and won, where the Supreme Court said: You are right, the Federal Government was wrong, they have to back up. But it cost him 800 grand in legal fees to do it. That is what the Tipton bill is trying to solve—the rights of those ranchers and those farmers, the rights of ski resorts to actually conduct business and have their rights protected.

That is why any effort to try and limit this down to say, oh, let's just deal with the ski resorts because we care about them, and forget the Tom Lowrys of this world, is a ridiculous approach. The issue is, How can we protect the rights of our people? That is what Congress is supposed to do. The Forest Service hasn't solved their problem yet. They have withdrawn their rules but haven't changed the rules. They have still yet to propose new ones. It is the purpose, and the right, and the responsibility of Congress to step in.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. It is the responsibility of Congress to tell the bureaucracy what they can and cannot do. We establish laws, not their rules and regulations, and we should tell them they have to respect the rights of individuals, and treat them as real people, and not take away their personal property rights, and that is exactly what the Tipton bill does.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, may I ask how many speakers my colleague from the other side has?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chair, I have at least four others, besides myself, that want to address this very important issue.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH)

another member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Madam Chairwoman, I am proud to stand here with my colleagues today in support of H.R. 3189, the Water Rights Protection Act. With the drought going on in California, and the Federal Government strong-arming private property owners into giving up their water rights, I am afraid that some of my colleagues may think that the Federal confiscation and mismanagement of water resources only affects the West.

Let me tell you, this issue of the Federal Government intruding on private property and water rights is not just limited to the West. In my district in southeast Missouri, time and time again, ill-thought Federal policy has threatened, and will continue, unfortunately, to threaten, private landowners.

In my now 9 months and 8 days in Congress, we have already had to fight back Federal attempts to restrict citizens in my district from using water.

The Department of the Interior tried to create restrictive ''buffer zones'' as a part of the National Blueway System that would have taken away private property rights. Fortunately, we got this program stopped. While the legal framework for water rights is different in the West, this administration's disregard for private landowners applies everywhere.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill to protect water rights not only because it will protect holders of water rights in Western States, but also because it sends a strong, direct message that Congress is tired of these schemes to administratively take away private property rights.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, there is no taking of anybody's water rights in this case and the majority knows it. Claiming this is a taking is misleading and irresponsible.

The only way State or private water rights could, I repeat, could be transferred or diminished in any way is if the owner of those rights volunteers to a transfer or a limitation to a portion of those rights as part of a deal to receive the permission to use Federal land.

Volunteering to limit your water rights in exchange for the use of Federal land, taxpayer land, is the opposite of taking.

The various court cases the majority has thrown around deal with legitimate, I repeat, legitimate water rights issues; cases where there are overlapping or conflicting claims over the same water. This is not that type of a case.

I defy my colleagues to produce any case law holding that a decision to give up a water right, voluntarily, in order to get another Federal benefit is a taking. There are no such cases.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), who I think was a member of the committee but is not anymore.

Mr. GARDNER. Madam Chair, I thank the chairman for his work on this very important issue, and my colleague from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) for his hard work to protect Colorado water rights.

You know, if you go to the capitol of Colorado, you go into the rotunda of that great and beautiful building, there on the wall on a mural are the words of a poem by Thomas Hornsby Ferril, and that poem says: ''Here is a land where life is written in water.''

The foundational laws of our great State deal with the waters of Colorado, the four corners of our State, whose agriculture, commerce, industry, and municipalities depend on that water and, yes, our ski industries, our farmers, our ranchers.

Thank goodness for legislation like this that will protect our water rights. Thank goodness for legislation like this that will make sure that the State's water law remains supreme.

How dare this body think that the Federal Government has a right to control our water or to condition permits based on the blackmail of a permit issuance from a ski resort, from a farmer, from a city.

These rights have gone through Colorado water law for decades, over a century. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent in Colorado to adjudicate these rights.

To think that the Federal Government can come in and take them because they won't issue a permit unless you give it to them, that is a taking of water. The Federal Government has no right to do that.

It is our State law in water that remains supreme. It is our State law that must remain supreme when it comes to the water of our land.

Here is a land where life is written in water. Those words will remain in our great State. Our laws will remain, and thank goodness for legislation like this to make sure that our State can control its water, not Washington, D.C.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, the base bill actually creates all kinds of uncertainty, and allows a ski area owner to sell their water rights.

If you are a local business owner in that area who depends on the ski resort business, let's say you own a restaurant or an equipment store or have a hotel, H.R. 3189 means that you have no idea, from one year to the next, whether the resort, which brings people to town, will still be operating if it has water.

If the water rights are not tied to the resort in any way, which is what H.R. 3189 wants to ensure, there is no guarantee that the owners won't sell the water, leaving the Forest Service holding a ski resort that cannot operate without that water because the water rights have been previously sold.

It is the Forest Service that is trying to create some minimal certainty that the resort would have current water rights to keep running, even if the current owners were to leave.

It is H.R. 3189 that is trying to prevent that certainty.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chair, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), a former member of the House Natural Resources Committee.

□ 1515

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the chairman for yielding, and I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) for leading on this issue.

Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of this legislation that finally puts a check and a balance on Federal agencies that are literally out there shaking down landowners over their property rights.

When you look at what the Federal Government is doing and you wonder why people are losing faith in the government, why people don't trust government, when a Federal agent shows up and says the only way you can get a permit is if you give up your property rights to your water, literally, extortion is coming from Federal bureaucrats.

This is not the way our government is supposed to operate, Madam Chair. This is what this legislation is here to remedy.

When you look at what is going on, it is not just the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture. We have seen this from other Federal agencies. Look at what the EPA does with their sue-and-settle process, where they literally go behind the cloak of darkness and cut secret deals and, again, force people to do things that aren't even in statute, just as a condition of getting basic permits. This is not how government is supposed to operate.

So while we have seen some of the egregious abuses limited in the Western parts of our country, this is not just a Western issue, Madam Chair. All Americans ought to be concerned when the Federal Government is literally shaking down and extorting Americans and forcing them to give away their private property rights just as a condition of getting a permit.

It is not right. It is not the right way to treat people. It is not the right way for the Federal Government to operate. This bill finally remedies that problem. It stops those abuses. I urge strong support of the legislation.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, H.R. 3189 turns the status quo on its head in order to provide a certain class of users a new advantage over all other users of our public lands.

It strikes me as interesting that I have heard farmers and ranchers mentioned a couple of times, although this, apparently, also affects grazing lands, which I believe farmers and ranchers

do use; and unfortunately, I am sure they have not looked at it well enough to understand what really could happen.

The status quo is that Federal land managers have to try to balance multiple competing uses of our public/taxpayer lands—recreation, timber, grazing, conservation, energy production, and the list goes on.

Under the status quo, one of the tools land managers use to achieve this balance is the ability to condition certain uses of public lands—taxpayer lands—on an agreement to transfer or limit water rights.

If you want the ability to graze or cut timber or build a dam on public lands, you have to agree to leave some water in the river for other uses, like recreation, habitat protection, et cetera.

If that authority is taken away, as the bill would do, then certain kinds of users of our public lands get to take all the water they want, leaving everybody else literally hanging high and very dry.

The status quo is balanced. H.R. 3189 tips the scale all the way in favor of a certain class of users and turns the status quo into chaos.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Chair, this is often characterized as a Western issue, and it is not a Western issue. The water wars that go on in the West are certainly a special type of battle; but this is an American issue in what it does.

There are two really interesting things going on, on the House floor today, that I hope all of my colleagues and I hope the American people are watching.

On the one hand, there is a really neat moment of agreement that is happening here. You hear so much about disagreement in Washington. The Federal Government issues an order that says, in order to continue to exercise your business, you must surrender your private property to the government. Well, we could all agree that is outrageous.

I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) for leading in the effort to repeal that, which has been a bipartisan effort on both sides of the aisle. We have an actual order—an actual proposal, and we can come together and agree that this is not who we are, as a people. It is very interesting, and I am glad that we are able to do that.

The second thing that is happening, Madam Chair, is that there is a concern that a certain class of citizen is going to get a higher and better use of land; and I just want to point out that that certain class is the owner of a private property right. Right? That is actually the debate that is happening here.

If you own something, if something belongs to you, should you be allowed to use it? Or in the name of creating a better country, in the spirit of maximizing the utility of Federal lands, should the Federal Government be able to take that from you and redistribute it, so that things are fairer? That is a legitimate discussion to have.

I come down on the side of my friend from Colorado who says not only is it outrageous that the government tried to take private property rights in this circumstance; but why not take this step now to recognize that private property means something? Not only are we going to protect our ski resorts, but we are going to make sure this never happens to any other American citizens again.

''Extortion'' is a strong word. It is a strong word, but I can think of no other word to apply to what the government was trying to do here today. I am grateful to my friends on both sides of the aisle for moving to stop that.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. I reserve the balance of my time, Madam Chair.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chair, I am very pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA), a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. LAMALFA. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Chair, I am glad to be able to speak today on H.R. 3189. This bill will have a great impact on many of the resource holders in my district here in the northeast part of California.

Yes, we are going through a drought, but this isn't just an issue that might affect ski resorts or even ranchers. This is a property rights issue that we should be looking at all across the country.

It is very dangerous when the U.S. Forest Service or BLM can just come in and arbitrarily decide, after long-held water rights—some of these ranches have been around 150 years or more—that they can change the game—change the rules.

The ranches have been around longer than some of these bureaucracies; yet they want to come in and say: we are going to change the game because we have decided it should be different.

Now, when you have this type of right under fire for something as beneficial—farming and ranching, grazing is actually beneficial to forest land, towards fire suppression—and yet, we have people who think that this is somehow a special right or something that is going to take additional water away from other people.

These are already adjudicated water rights—pre-1914 water rights in California. They are not taking more than what already belongs to them, so it is really a misnomer to think that we are now somehow rejiggering this because it is going to take more from other people.

For 150 years, they have been around; and now, in this day and age, because of the thoughts of a few bureaucrats who want to do this by extortion—which is what it is—you get a permit only if you give up something that has belonged to you for many, many years.

It belongs to them because it is a long-held water right—a long-held property right, so I am glad to help sponsor and support this bill.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My colleague is right, but then let's hold a hearing on the water rights themselves and bring the impacted and affected parties to the table, so that there is a fair hearing which is open, transparent, and fair, but we haven't done that.

We are talking about H.R. 3189, which essentially was set up to deal with the differences between the ski resorts and the Forest Service.

Water belongs to the State, and the State gives people the right to use it. It is owned by the people of the United States.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado, Congressman POLIS.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Chair, I want to make it clear that I was an original sponsor of this bill. Like my colleague from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON), I wanted to address the 2011 directive as it affected ski resorts.

However, this bill, in markup and through the manager's amendment, became worse. We were unable to get the improvements that we needed to narrow the scope; and it became a Republican job-killing, water-grabbing bill, which was not the original intent.

Even the areas where the intent was to help the ski areas—in Summit County and Eagle County in my district, in Pitkin County in Mr. TIPTON's district—the counties have all come out against this very bill.

It is a Republican water-grabbing, job-killing bill, and absent the amendment that I proposed, it is not something that I can support. I encourage my colleagues on my side of the aisle who value recreational opportunities, like fishing and white-water rafting, to join me in opposing this bill, unless the Polis amendment is incorporated into the bill.

We will soon begin a debate on that amendment. This debate would focus the actual bill to fulfill its purpose, and I hope that this body will adopt it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I will advise my friend from California that I am prepared to close and will reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, I am certainly grateful for the opportunity to have this dialogue, and I

think it is very important for the American people to listen in and understand that one bill that was meant to cover a specific issue has been turned into a gigantic—I would say—mess.

We understand the reasoning behind it, to some extent, and we trust that our colleagues understand and are prepared to vote on something that may have unintended consequences in their own backyards.

This bill is flawed. It is flawed on process, on policy, and in claiming that it does protect State water rights. The Governors Association has indicated that they wanted to ensure that the states' water rights remain protected.

We welcome legislation that devises a real solution to a targeted problem, which the amendment that Mr. POLIS has on the floor will address. We are supportive of that amendment and hope others will support his amendment, which was made in order.

We, unfortunately, feel that H.R. 3189 does not solve the problem. It creates more problems and has no chance of being enacted into law, and I trust that we will do the right thing by the people because we are talking about protecting the U.S. public, their lands, and their water.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself the balance of the time.

Madam Chairman, let me just comment on a few points here that were made by my friends on the other side of the aisle. There was some concern about the timing of the hearing and the people who were invited.

I just want to make this point: when the hearing was held, we have to have advance notice. We had witnesses coming in from across the country, so we are going to have the hearing on the day we said because of the expense incurred by those private citizens who wanted to come here and testify to help protect private water rights.

The second point is this was a bipartisan bill, as my colleague from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) admitted. He was an original cosponsor of the bill. Maybe that was a reason why my friends on the other side of the aisle did not call a witness for or against the original legislation.

I just wanted to make that point. The hearing was scheduled, and it had to go through because of the expense of the private citizens coming in to testify.

I want to make another point, too, that some of my colleagues have made. Several of them have said that this legislation redefines Federal water rights.

Madam Chairman, that is simply not true. If they read the bill, they would see that the definition is for the purpose of this act only, meaning that the definition is only for this act, so that doesn't hold up either.

Just about all of my colleagues on the other side that talked about the Federal lands and so forth—I will acknowledge that this is about Federal activity on Federal lands, but nowhere—nowhere did my colleagues suggest or say that the Federal Government had the water rights.

Why? Because that is states' rights; and as my colleague from Wyoming said: Yes, it is Federal land; but it is State water, and you have to mesh those together.

And finally—I think this is probably more important than anything else, and frankly, a debate like this has been going on for some time.

□ 1530

We agree—we agree, both sides—that ski resorts have been potentially compromised by the threat of the Federal Government saying ''no permit unless you give up water.'' Both sides agree on that. The question is, What is the remedy?

The big difference I think between the two sides is this. Their remedy is, well, the rulemaking isn't over. Let's find out what the rulemaking is, and then we will respond to it. Our side takes a different approach. Our side says wait a minute. We are the House of Representatives. We are part of the Congress. We make the law.

That is what this legislation does. It makes the law saying the Federal Government cannot extort, through the permitting process, State water rights. It is as simple as that. And so if we are going to continue to have the debate in this House on divisions between the two parties and what their philosophy is, frankly, I welcome this, because it appears every time we have a debate similar to this, their side says let the bureaucracy write the laws. We say wait a minute. That is not the way it is supposed to be. We are the Congress. We write the laws. That is what this debate is about here today, and I look forward to the amendment process.

In the meantime, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. It has been characterized as a Western piece of legislation, but as Mr. WOODALL says, indeed, it is not. It affects all water rights which are the province of the States.

It is good legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Chair, this legislation before us today claims to resolve a local and narrow conflict over water rights between the U.S. Forest Service and the Colorado ski industry. Unfortunately, this bill's scope and impacts have been expanded far beyond its originally stated intent.

Under the guise of addressing a specific local water rights issue the Republican majority is once again trying to tie the hands of agencies across the government as they work to protect and restore our waterways, public lands, and watersheds by restricting all actions that require a federal permit.

The deleterious effects, both intended and unintended, resulting from this deeply flawed bill will ripple far and wide across our country including in my region, most notably the Chesapeake Bay.

The Chesapeake Bay watershed is a national treasure stretching more than 64,000 square miles, encompassing six states, 150 major rivers and streams, and is home to more than 17 million people. It is America's largest estuary. But the Bay is in need of restoration.

Since 1983 federal, state, and local stakeholders have worked together to implement and refine the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement. As a result we have seen significant improvements in phosphorus and sediment pollution reduction, better management of fisheries including the restoration of blue crab, and restoration of habitats and wetlands.

According to the Chesapeake Bay Foundation's 2012 State of the Bay Report, of the 13 indicators being monitored, improvements have been made in five and only one indicator declined. Of particular importance, habitat scores received a B+ and rockfish and crab fishery restoration received an A and B+ respectively.

That progress has been achieved only by using all the tools at our disposal, including requiring conditional permitting for water rights.

There is still more work to be done to get the Bay restored to full health. That is why I offered an amendment with colleagues from Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania that would ensure that no provisions in the bill would affect water rights agreements within the Chesapeake Bay watershed. Sadly, the Republican–controlled Rules Committee refused to allow a floor vote on this.

One wonders about the true intent of this bill. Why didn't Republicans accept our amendment to protect the Bay? Why did they refuse similar amendments that would protect other local treasures including the Long Island Sound in the Northeast, the Puget Sound in the Northwest, and the California Bay Delta? All of these projects are threatened by this bill.

Unless this bill is amended to address these discrete local issues, I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 3189, an overreach that will harm watersheds across the nation.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill, shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 3189

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 ''Water Rights Protection Act''.

SEC. 2. TREATMENT OF WATER RIGHTS.

The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture—

(1) shall not condition the issuance, renewal, amendment, or extension of any permit, approval, license, lease, allotment, easement, right-of-way, or other land use or occupancy agreement on the transfer of any water right directly to the United States, or any impairment of title, in whole or in part, granted or otherwise recognized under State law, by Federal or State adjudication, decree, or other judgment, or pursuant to any interstate water compact; and

(2) shall not require any water user to apply for or acquire a water right in the name of the United States under State law as a condition of the issuance, renewal, amendment, or extension of any permit, approval, license, lease, allotment, easement, right-of-way, or other land use or occupancy agreement.

SEC. 3. DEFINITION.

For purposes of this Act, the term ''water right'' means any surface, groundwater, or storage use filed, permitted, certificated, confirmed, decreed, adjudicated, or otherwise recognized by a judicial proceeding or by the State in which the user acquires possession of the water or puts it to beneficial use.

SEC. 4. IMPACT ON EXISTING AUTHORITY.

Nothing in this Act limits or expands any existing authority of the Secretaries to condition any permit, approval, license, lease, allotment, easement, right-of-way, or other land use or occupancy agreement on Federal lands subject to their respective jurisdictions.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of House Report 113–379. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. TIPTON

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 113–379.

Mr. TIPTON. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 13, insert ''(including joint and sole ownership)'' after ''water right''.

Page 4, line 9, insert ''legally recognized'' after ''existing''.

Page 4, line 10, insert ''issue, grant, or'' before ''condition''.

Page 4, after line 13, insert the following:

SEC. 5. EFFECT ON RECLAMATION CONTRACTS.

Nothing in this Act shall in any way interfere with existing or future Bureau of Reclamation contracts entered into pursuant to Federal reclamation law (the Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388, chapter 1093), and Acts supplemental to and amendatory of that Act).

SEC. 6. EFFECT ON ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT.

Nothing in this Act shall affect the implementation of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

SEC. 7. EFFECT ON FEDERAL RESERVED WATER RIGHTS.

Nothing in this Act limits or expands any existing reserved water rights of the Federal Government on lands administered by the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 8. EFFECT ON FEDERAL POWER ACT.

Nothing in this Act limits or expands authorities pursuant to sections 4(e), 10(j), or 18 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 797(e), 803(j), and 811).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 515, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. TIPTON. Madam Chair, I offer this amendment to further strengthen and improve this bipartisan bill. As we heard during general debate, the bill has one goal: to eliminate Federal extortion of private property.

The Federal Government cannot and should not take and seize what it does not own without compensation, but that has been happening, and the threat continues to exist for a host of individuals and businesses who responsibly use our public lands for multiple purposes.

This bill ends this Federal property rights grab; however, we just heard a litany of charges that the bill impacts other Federal actions. Nothing could be further from the truth. The bill already has a savings clause ensuring that any existing Federal authorities are not impacted. Importantly, the Federal Government does not have the authority to take private property rights without just compensation; but, to further clarify, my amendment reiterates the specific actions into the bill—the protection of existing Federal water contracts.

The Colorado River Water District, the Family Farm Alliance, the National Water Resources Association, all organizations whose members have contracts with the Bureau of Reclamation, already support this bill, and that should have been enough. Yet we heard rhetoric from the other side today that water contracts are in danger despite the ardent support of water organizations.

This amendment specifically reiterates this protection, ensuring implementation of the Endangered Species Act and any flows needed for the species, the protection of reserved water rights for national parks and other Federal lands, and continuing the hydropower relicensing process for non-Federal dams. These additions to the bill are a simple reiteration of protections already built into the bipartisan bill.

Yet, in a good-faith effort to dispel any myths, I offer these provisions to ensure, once and for all, that the only thing the bill does is protect private water rights owners from being extorted by the Federal Government through underhanded administrative means.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TIPTON. I certainly yield to the chairman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for his work on the underlying bill and his amendment.

I support the amendment.

Mr. TIPTON. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, the amendment doesn't fix the bill because the bill cannot be fixed.

The savings clause in the base bill and the savings clauses that will likely be added by the manager's amendment are symptoms of the problem with the initial bill, not the solution.

If you have a 4-page bill and you need to insert five different savings clauses, you have a problem, my friends. The need to insert layer upon layer of text trying to explain that you don't mean for the bill to do this or that proves beyond any doubt that the bill is a massive and dangerous overreach.

We have no idea how these savings clauses operate in the context of the bill, but what we do know is that, even with the five savings clauses, you haven't caught all the problems.

The only responsible policy is the one offered by Mr. POLIS in his substitute amendment which focuses, again, strictly on the main issue that brought this to the forefront, and that was the Forest Service and the ski resorts. Everything else is just a failed attempt to fix the bill.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TIPTON. Madam Chair, I suppose I can bring some good news. It is not a 5-page bill, but actually a 3-page bill that we have actually put forward.

What I think we are really frustrated about is that we often hear from our colleagues that they want to be able to have bipartisanship. They are concerned about endangered species. While it is already protected in the bill, we add a further savings clause to be able to protect it.

They are concerned about the Federal Government being able to continue operations under legal authority—already protected in the original bill. We put in an additional savings clause to be able to address that.

We are concerned even more than they are, apparently, about standing up for Native American tribes in some proposed amendments that we are going to be putting forward to protect them from using Native tribes as a tool to extort water for the Federal Government.

This is a commonsense, sensible piece of legislation. Our colleagues want to say that it is expanded. Actually, I have the original bill in my hand. They say it is simply about ski resorts. We have common ground. I, too, want to be able to protect ski resorts, but I am not willing to sacrifice, on the altar of the Federal Government, our farm and ranch communities in addition to our municipalities.

Looking at the original bill, it doesn't mention ski areas once, yet an author of an amendment today said it has become more broad. Show me how.

This is a good piece of legislation. The manager's amendment addresses their very concerns.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. Madam Chair, I want to be clear that the concerns are by no means limited to the Endangered Species Act. The Republicans may care about endangered species, but they don't care about jobs. The Forest Service, the BLM, Interior, and Agriculture agencies all have relevant authority with regard to bypass flows. None of those are mentioned under this particular manager's amendment.

What this manager's amendment shows is Republicans care more about endangered species than they do about jobs in our mountain resort areas. This manager's amendment added the term ''impairment of title.'' We wanted this limited to ''transfer of title'' because ''impairment of title'' actually expands the scope of the bill from the original bill. In addition, the so-called savings clause actually appears to negate the very bill that it appears in.

This takes a bill that we had offered language to the committee and to Representative TIPTON to make this a bipartisan bill. I think it could have very closely unanimously passed the House, certainly enough to pass a suspension, and instead they made a bill that even the very ski areas that they are claiming to help—actually, all the counties that I have that have ski resorts actually oppose this job-killing Republican water grab bill.

Mr. TIPTON. Madam Chair, how much time remains?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. TIPTON. Madam Chair, for the point of clarity, to ease the concerns of my colleague from Colorado, the National Ski Areas Association endorses this bill today. That has not changed. Also, to alleviate the concerns that you just demonstrated, no existing authorities will be impacted under this legislation. No existing authorities will be impacted. No bypass flows will be impacted.

Effectively, what this bill is doing, Madam Chair, is we are codifying existing practice, which I think we all agree is a desirable thing to have continue.

This is about political theater. The job-killing part of what is happening right now is being conducted by the Federal Government. They are killing jobs with a Federal Government water grab.

Either you stand with the farmers, the ranchers, and long-held practices of the West or you don't. If you don't, I do, and that is what this bill continues to support.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, I know I have said it before, the ski resort association wants to focus on this bill, so I am suggesting that we do approve the Polis amendment and then hold a hearing—an open hearing and a transparent hearing—for those agencies that are impacted so they may have the ability to have a word and be able to move this forward. I might add that the savings clause does not include the national parks. So all the units, Grand Canyon and others, are impacted.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TIPTON. Madam Chair, again, I will refer my colleagues to the text of the bill. No Federal water rights that they currently have are going to be impaired. That includes national parks.

We continue to hear about the upcoming Polis amendment. The original bill that Mr. POLIS and I introduced never specifically mentioned just ski areas. It talks about any permit. So if you care about farmers, if you care about ranchers, if you care about municipalities, and if you care about ski areas, which we all share, let's protect those private property rights from Federal extortion.

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

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, when we considered the bill in committee, the majority claimed the bill had nothing to do with the ESA or the bypass flows or FERC or reclamation projects, which we pointed out that it did. Now they have a savings clause for each one of those issues. Now they admit their mistakes. Sadly, when a bill has this many holes in it, no amendment can fix them all, so this bill cannot be saved by this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MULLIN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 113–379.

Mr. MULLIN. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the table.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 18, insert ''(including any federally recognized Indian tribe)'' after ''water user''.

Page 4, line 7, insert after the period ''Such term shall include water rights for federally recognized Indian tribes.''.

Page 4, after line 13, insert the following:

SEC. 5. EFFECT ON INDIAN WATER RIGHTS.

Nothing in this Act limits or expands any existing reserved water right or treaty right of any federally recognized Indian tribe.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 515, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MULLIN. Madam Chair, protecting the rights of the sovereign tribes is a top priority of mine, and I am proud to work with Congressman TIPTON in supporting the Water Rights Protection Act and offering this amendment to clarify protections for the water rights of American Indian tribes. Many tribes rely on reserved water rights and water rights guaranteed by treaty to provide critical water supplies for their people. This amendment makes clear that these water rights are fully protected.

This amendment also ensures that the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture can't use one-sided permits, licenses, approvals, and other land management tools to take water from Indian tribes without just compensation. American Indian tribes have a distinguished record of being outstanding stewards of their water supplies and should never have to fear forfeiture of their water rights to the Federal Government. By prohibiting these Federal agencies from using heavy-handed tactics to take Indian water rights, we can proactively protect tribes from the potential Federal water grabs.

□ 1545

Taken together, H.R. 3189 and this amendment provide comprehensive water rights protections for all water users and help ensure the water supply certainty and jobs that are dependent on those rights.

I thank the chairman and urge a ''yes'' vote on this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, this amendment does not fix the bill because the bill cannot be fixed.

The savings clause in the base bill and the savings clause that Mr. MULLIN's amendment includes are symptoms of the problem that we pointed out before in this bill, not the solution. The amendment would be the sixth savings clause added to this 4-page bill.

I do support Representative MULLIN's and Representative COLE's efforts in protecting our Native American communities' water rights. As the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) mentioned at the Rules Committee last night, Native American water rights are the oldest water rights in the system. They are time immemorial, and yet we choose to ignore them.

I remember Congressman KILDEE repeatedly saying, under the Constitution, they hold the first water rights in the United States, and yet we do not recognize them. Yet, since Republicans took the majority 4 years ago, there has been no legislation, no oversight hearings on any Indian water rights settlements.

If we want to support Native American water rights, Congress should consider tribal water rights legislation, enact tribal water rights legislation, and fund tribal water rights legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MULLIN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington, Chairman HASTINGS.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to commend the gentleman from Oklahoma for his hard work on behalf of Native Americans.

American Indian tribes rely on their water rights to provide critical supplies to their people and to promote and expand their local economies. These rights must be protected from Federal regulations that are designed to take water without paying for that water, and this amendment does just that.

This forward-looking amendment simply allows tribes to have the same protections that are afforded to others in the bill by prohibiting the Federal Government from using routine permits to extort private water rights. It also preserves the water rights guaranteed to tribes by treaty and by Federal reservation. Although this bill already does the latter, we believe it is important to clarify this important protection, so I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment. I commend the gentleman for offering it.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MULLIN. In Indian country, we have learned that we can never just take something that the Federal Government says and take it as truth. We have to always verify. This is simply trying to clarify that the Federal Government has no rights to come onto the Indian land and tell us how we can and can't use our water. This is just simply saying, look, we have the rights; the treaties say we have the rights, and we want to make sure that the Federal Government doesn't come in and grab our water rights. There should be zero opposition to this. There should be bipartisan support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, this bill is so badly written we really have no idea—I repeat, no idea—what impact this may have on tribes. Yes, Mr. MULLIN, I totally support water rights for Native Americans. We have been working on that for at least 8 years in my subcommittee, as well as other water rights owners. We don't oppose your amendment, and we honestly really truly hope this will offer adequate protection to tribes. They deserve it. It is a long time coming. But, as we have said, the bill is beyond repair. Even if we were to adopt the amendment, H.R. 3189 is dangerous legislation that must be defeated.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment; although, I don't oppose the amendment, but I do oppose the bill, H.R. 3189.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 113–379.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. PROHIBITION ON CONDITIONING SKI AREA PERMIT ON TRANSFER OR ACQUISITION OF WATER RIGHTS ON BEHALF OF THE UNITED STATES.

The Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service, shall not—

(1) condition the issuance, renewal, amendment, or extension of any ski area permit on the transfer of title or ownership, including joint ownership, of any water right granted or otherwise recognized under State law, by Federal or State adjudication, decree, or other judgment, or pursuant to any interstate water compact, directly to the United States; or

(2) require any ski area permittee to apply for or acquire a water right in the name of the United States under State law as a condition of the issuance, renewal, amendment, or extension of any ski area permit.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 515, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Chair, my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON), mentioned the National Ski Areas Association, and I include their February 11 letter for the RECORD. It states here, in part:

However, to make it abundantly clear that ski areas have a narrow and pointed agenda with respect to this legislation and that we are committed to maintaining stream and aquatic species health, we are now advocating changes to the bill to narrow its scope even further. These changes include narrowing the scope of the bill to apply just to the U.S. Forest Service, and clarifying that the bill prohibits forced transfers of ownership of water rights to the United States by inserting the term ''title'' into the bill.

I believe that my amendment is consistent with the position of the National Ski Areas Association.

I am a strong believer in the original purpose of this bill. Yes, the U.S. Forest Service overstepped its authority by issuing a policy that requires ski area permittees to transfer ownership of their water rights to the Federal Government.

Ski areas are the lifeblood of our mountain communities in Colorado and many communities across the Nation. Their economic viability and strength is extraordinarily important for working families. Ski areas have invested hundreds of millions of dollars of capital, and they can't be simply required to hand over their water rights to the Federal Government. This harmful policy hinders ski resort growth and expansion and harms the economy. My amendment fixes it.

There is a legitimate issue here, and Congress could be solving it in a bipartisan manner. We agree that the 2011 U.S. Forest Service directive is a problem. This could have been a suspension bill, but H.R. 3189, despite our best efforts from my side of the aisle, does not reflect a bipartisan agreement to the water rights issue.

There is not one comparable Federal water rights directive like the U.S. Forest Service directive, but the Republicans couldn't help themselves here, and they have, instead of fixing an issue, created a job-killing, water-grabbing Republican bill that will destroy jobs in Colorado and in mountain resorts across the country.

This process has become convoluted and the bill overly broad. This legislation only serves to cast doubt on the complicated laws and precedents and authorities that make up our Nation's and States' water laws, and that it is critical to remain stable and predictable over time. This expansive legislation undermines jobs and recreational opportunities, from white-water rafting to fishing. Sportsmen's groups oppose this legislation. Ski counties in my district oppose this legislation.

It was brought up in committee yesterday, could the opposition be ''political.'' Well, I want to be clear, one of the ski counties in my district, all three of the commissioners are Republican. Grand County, they oppose this bill unanimously, as do Summit County and Eagle County. Rafting and paddling groups oppose this legislation because it impacts our world-class, white-water runs.

I hope we can fix this bill. We have tried hard throughout this process to offer language in the committee that would make this a bipartisan bill, to offer language to the chief sponsor, Representative TIPTON. Up to this point, we have been rebuffed. This is our last hope to fix this bill and create something that actually responds to the flawed Forest Service directive of 2011. Without this change, this bill has nothing to do with the 2011 directive. It is just talk. It doesn't even respond to the issue it is designed to solve, which is why some of the very same ski communities that wanted a response to the 2011 directive don't even support this bill at this point.

Since ski area water rights are a valuable asset that need to be protected, I am proud to have offered this amendment with Representative KUSTER, Representative DEGETTE, Representative PERLMUTTER, Representative DELBENE, Representative CARTWRIGHT, and Representative HUFFMAN that would fix H.R. 3189, return the bill to its original purpose, lead to a strong House vote, and ensure that any U.S. Forest Service directive will not condition ski area permits on the transfer of title of any water right or require any ski area permittee to acquire a water right in the name of the United States.

I reserve the balance of my time.

NATIONAL SKI AREAS ASSOCIATION,
February 11, 2014.

Re Support for Water Rights Protection Act.

Hon. SCOTT TIPTON,
Cannon HOB,
Washington, DC.
Hon. JARED POLIS,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.
Hon. JOHN BARRASSO,
Dirksen Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.
Hon. MARK UDALL,
Hart Office Building,
Washington, DC.

GENTLEMEN: I am writing on behalf of the ski industry to express the reasons ski areas strongly support passage of the bipartisan Water Rights Protection Act, H.R. 3189/S. 1630, and to advocate changes to the bill to narrow its scope. At the outset, the ski industry would like to express our deep appreciation of your efforts to protect ski area water rights from federal encroachment over the past couple of years. Your leadership on protecting water rights and your commitment to working in a bipartisan fashion to solve this problem on behalf of ski areas and other permittees on federal land have had very positive and real effects to date. While ski areas have enjoyed a long and successful partnership with the Forest Service spanning almost eight decades, Forest Service water policy is an issue on which we simply do not agree. We have invested too much in water rights to simply hand them over to the federal government.

As you are well aware, the Water Rights Protection Act would stop the federal government from illegally seizing water rights from private parties that develop them, such as ski areas, in violation of State water law and 5th Amendment property rights protections. The intent of the bill is narrow—to protect valuable assets of ski areas and other permittees that use federal land from seizure without compensation by the federal government. Essentially everyone agrees on the need for this protection, given recent (and past) Forest Service policy that demands transfer of valuable water rights to the U.S. without compensation. This policy threatened to rock the foundation of over a hundred years' worth of water law in the West, and again, thanks to your intervention, beneficial changes are expected in the future.

The intention of the Water Rights Protection Act is not to impact stream health or aquatic species in any way. Some conservation groups contend that H.R. 3189 has a broader effect than simply protecting water rights, and in fact would hinder federal efforts to protect stream health and fish. Ski areas and other stakeholders strongly disagree with this interpretation of the bill and would never support a bill that had this result. In fact, a ''savings clause'' was included in the bill to explicitly state that the measure had no other impacts than to protect permittees' water rights from forced transfers. More importantly, the bill does not alter in any way the minimum stream flow protections that are set and enforced by the states on virtually every river and stream. Ski areas support and abide by these minimum stream flow requirements and would never take action to undermine them.

However, to make it abundantly clear that ski areas have a narrow and pointed agenda with respect to this legislation and that we are committed to maintaining stream and aquatic species health, we are now advocating changes to the bill to narrow its scope even further. These changes include narrowing the scope of the bill to apply just to the U.S. Forest Service, and clarifying that the bill prohibits forced transfers of ownership of water rights to the United States by inserting the term ''title'' into the bill. We offer these changes to demonstrate emphatically our unwavering commitment to maintain stream health and aquatic species, and our narrow focus of simply protecting our valuable water rights assets. These changes are directed at solving the concrete problem at hand, which is overreaching policy by the Forest Service that requires a forced transfer of ownership of water rights from permittees to the United States. The bill will continue to benefit all permittees on Forest Service lands, not just ski areas.

The release of a new water policy is expected from the Forest Service sometime in 2014. Ski areas welcome this new policy change, which we understand will not require a forced transfer of ownership of water rights. The release of this policy will not change the need for federal legislation however. First, the new policy is expected to apply prospectively, such that existing water rights subject to past Forest Service water clauses could continue to be in jeopardy of a taking by the Forest Service. Ski areas are proposing an amendment to the bill to protect against the implementation of such clauses beginning with the effective date of this bill. Ski areas have experienced four changes in Forest Service water policy in the last ten years. Only Congress can help stop the pendulum from swinging and provide ski areas the kind of stability they need to grow and succeed in the future.

After prevailing on our challenge of the Forest Service's water rights takings policy in federal court in 2012, ski areas offered an alternative approach for the Forest Service to consider that would not involve forced transfers of water rights. We offered this alternative in the spirit of partnership, and as a way for the Forest Service to work cooperatively with ski areas to support their viability, and the viability of mountain communities, over the long term. The alternative offered by ski areas was to require resorts to provide successors in interest an option to purchase water rights at fair market value upon sale of a ski area. We continue to support this approach as a viable alternative that meets the needs of the agency, provides ski areas needed flexibility, and respects state water law.

Ski areas are great stewards of water resources. It is important for everyone to remember that only a small portion of water that is used for snowmaking is consumed. Most of the water diverted from streams for snowmaking returns to the watershed. Although it varies from region to region, studies show that approximately 80 percent of the water used for snowmaking returns to the watershed. Since the majority of water used for snowmaking is water purchased by a ski area, brought onsite through diversions, stored on-slope, and typically released more slowly back into the watershed with the seasonal melting of the winter snowpack, snowmaking typically benefits the watershed in which it is taking place, as well as downstream users, and can help counteract the harmful effects of drought. In addition to using a whole array of conservation measures, many resorts impound or store water in reservoirs for use during low flow times of the year without affecting fish or aquatic habitat. The ability to control our water assets and investments—which will be the outcome of passage of the Water Rights Protection Act—will enable us to continue this stewardship in the future. It will also allow us to continue to provide a high quality recreation opportunity for millions of people on the National Forests.

In closing, we thank you for your work to date on this issue, and we look forward to continuing to work together in cooperation to ensure the bill's passage.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL BERRY,
President.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado for recognizing that the Federal Government's taking of water rights and economic collateral of ski areas is wrong. His amendment also acknowledges that Congress must act to provide long-term certainty rather than rely on vague assurances from bureaucrats that are subject to change at any time.

I also appreciate the gentleman's initial support for the bill as introduced. His attention to this matter and willingness to fight for the ski areas in his district is commendable and has certainly been noted by colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

However, the amendment he offers today completely undermines the bill he originally added his name to in support. The bill, as introduced and in its current improved form, protects private property rights for all—Madam Chairman, all—water users across the country, not just ski areas. By limiting the bill's scope to ski area permits by the Forest Service, the Polis amendment transforms the bill so that it favors one special group at the expense of all others. Ski areas under his amendment would be protected, but any other water owner or user anywhere in the country would be subject to Federal extortion. It frees the Federal Government to continue targeting the water rights of family farms and ranches and municipalities.

Madam Chair, it is not just wrong for the Federal Government to take water away from ski areas, it is wrong to do it to anyone. There should be no discrimination in this manner. The Polis amendment would eliminate protections for farms and ranches, our Nation's food suppliers. That is why the American Farm Bureau opposes this amendment and supports the underlying bill. The Farm Bureau's members have already been victimized by this Federal overreach, and this amendment would allow that to continue.

Because the Polis amendment is a complete substitute text for the underlying bill, it would strike out all of the protections currently in the bill. The Polis amendment would even eliminate the protections for the Indian treaty rights and Indian water rights that the House just adopted a moment ago with the Mullin amendment.

It is true that the ski areas have suffered greatly at the hands of this Federal overreach. For this reason, the underlying bill does fully protect ski areas, along with every other water

user. How many times do we have to say that? It protects ski areas and all water users, and that is why, as has been mentioned several times, the National Ski Areas Association wrote in February after the committee markup that it strongly supports the bill.

When it comes to protecting the water and private property of American citizens, the Congress shouldn't be picking winners and losers; and Congress should be making the law for that protection, not the bureaucrats. The legislative branch should act to protect all citizens of the executive branch.

It is for these reasons I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the Polis amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1600

Mr. POLIS. Madam Chair, it is my honor to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO), the ranking member of the committee.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, I thank Mr. POLIS for yielding.

I must say that, again, I must direct attention to the fact that the February 11 letter from the ski resorts focuses on narrowing the bill, not the bill in total, but narrow focus.

Mr. POLIS joined Mr. TIPTON on this bill in an attempt to seek a reasonable solution to the problem facing ski resorts in the West, but when Mr. POLIS tried to work with the majority and when we on the committee tried to work with the majority to make reasonable, responsible changes to the bill, we were told no.

We were told the majority wanted a big, broad bill that goes way beyond the resorts and way beyond the Forest Service. We pointed out that when you start drafting big, broad bills that go beyond the original issue, you will have unintended consequences, but they would not listen.

Mr. POLIS' amendment is the last chance to make this a narrow, bipartisan bill that can actually pass, and we should adopt it.

Again, we don't want a job killing. We don't want a water grab. We don't want specific people to favor. I think the people need to understand it is the farmers and ranchers who benefit.

The six savings clauses the bill needs is not needed. It is in the Polis amendment because the amendment narrows the scope only to ski resorts and National Forest Service.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Chairman, this amendment creates two different classes of citizens: ski resorts and everybody else.

It leaves the portion of the bill that protects ski resorts from being forced to relinquish their water rights as a condition of continuing to operate in the Federal forests, and that is good, but then it creates a tier of second class citizens.

Unless you own a ski resort, you are fair game for the same demands by these Federal agencies to either give up your water rights or be forced out of business.

For example, our subcommittee heard testimony from Randy Parker. He is the CEO of the Utah Farm Bureau. He told us that the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management have threatened to force farmers that have grazing allotments to give up their water rights as a condition of continuing to use the public lands.

In some cases, these are permits that family businesses have held for generations. The water rights are accorded to them under State law. The Federal Government has no right to usurp that law or to force anybody into the Hobson's choice of closing their business or surrendering their water rights.

This amendment is an affront to the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment, as well as to the Takings Clause of the Fifth Amendment. These rights are fundamental constitutional rights that are unalienable for every American, not just those who happen to operate ski resorts.

Let's not take the Orwellian position that all Americans are equal, but some are more equal than others.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Chair, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlelady from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER), a cosponsor of the amendment.

Ms. KUSTER. Madam Chairman, I first want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) for his work on this issue and for leading this amendment.

I rise today in support of this substitute amendment that I am offering with Mr. POLIS and several colleagues in an effort to fix the issues with this legislation, but I wish I wasn't even here today to talk about this amendment. That is because this bill was originally introduced as a bipartisan bill to address a specific problem.

As we have seen all too often around here, the bill that is on the floor today doesn't look anything like it did when it was introduced. The bill that we are considering today wouldn't just address a water rights issue between ski areas and the Forest Service. It would go much further than that, impacting our national park system, wildlife refuges, hydropower relicenses, and so much more.

Where I come from, that doesn't make much sense. I came here to work with both parties to find common ground and to get things done. Instead of pushing partisan legislation that has no chance of becoming law, we should be working together on real solutions. That is why I joined Mr. POLIS to offer this substitute amendment.

What it will do is simple. It will narrow this bill so that it only addresses the issue between ski areas and the Forest Service. There is no need for this legislation to do anything more than that.

Let's pass the Polis amendment and start working together on commonsense policies to create jobs and opportunity for the middle class.

Again, I thank Mr. POLIS for his work on this issue.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Colorado has 2½ minutes remaining

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON), the sponsor of the underlying legislation.

Mr. TIPTON. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We continue to hear letters of support, ironically, out of my colleague from Colorado's home district. Eagle River Water and Sanitation District supports this legislation as we put it forward.

Colorado River Water Conservation District, Colorado Water Congress, National Cattlemen's Beef Association, and Family Farm Alliance support this bill.

When we look at the original incorporating legislation that my colleague and I introduced, it doesn't fit the narrow scope that they now want to talk about; so we do have to ask that question: Why are they so willing to be going to disregard farmers, ranchers, municipalities? Aren't they worthy of concern? I believe that they actually are.

We actually just received an email that came from the National Ski Association, which is dated March 12, supporting the bill with the Tipton manager's amendment. We are addressing their specific concern, but we aren't stopping there.

We think that that right to private property is inviolable, something that must be protected. If our friends want to say that farmers and ranchers and communities aren't worth protecting, we say they are.

That is what this legislation will do. We have worked with the minority. We have got a bipartisan piece of legislation that is standing up for those private property rights and to be able to assure that that constitutional right to receive just compensation that it is taking is actually preserved.

Madam Chair, I urge rejection of this amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I am prepared to close. I have the right to close, so I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Ski area water rights are valuable assets that must be protected. Rather than disguise that in a catchall Republican job-killing water-grabbing bill, we have the opportunity through the Polis-DeGette-Perlmutter-DelBene-Kuster-Cartwright-Huffman amendment for this House to come together

around something that helps the economy grow in our ski resort areas across the country.

As so many times on issues of even greater importance, there is a fork in the road for this House, a decision to make, between the partisan-charged route of job-destroying Republican water-grabbing legislation or the opportunity to fix this bill and come together to make sure that our ski resort communities are secure in their water rights and can continue to justify their capital investments and grow. That is the choice we have with the Polis amendment.

This amendment improves the bill. It helps turn the bill from a controversial bill into something that I think the vast majority of this body can and will agree on.

The amendment ensures that any U.S. Forest Service directive will not condition ski area permits on the transfer of title of any water right or require any ski area permittee to acquire a water right in the name of the United States.

That is the issue from the directive on 2011 that gives us a reason to even have the bill; but instead of addressing that issue in a focused way, this bill has tried to essentially rewrite centuries of water law in a superficial 2-page bill that has the impact of destroying jobs in Colorado and other mountain resort communities across the country.

We can and we must do better—better for my district in Colorado. Many of the ski resort counties—like Pitkin County represented by Mr. TIPTON, and Eagle, Summit, and Grand Counties that I represent—that benefit directly from the ski resort economy have come out opposed to this bill because it actually hurts their economy rather than helps it.

If the very folks that this bill was supposedly written to help oppose this bill, what on Earth are we doing here?

Thankfully, we have an amendment right now that can fix this bill. We tried in committee, we tried through the manager's amendment, and now, we are trying on the floor. Let's do it. Let's fix the bill.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and, unless it is incorporated, oppose the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

I have to say, the debate on the underlying bill in this amendment I find rather interesting—no, maybe bizarre is better than that.

The issue here is whether we should protect the State's responsibility to write water law or allow the Federal Government to extort from private individuals that water. That is what the issue is all about here.

He had bipartisan support when the bill was heard in committee, but then it changed for some reason. Now, we have in front of us the Polis amendment, which would very narrowly put this protection only to ski areas and not to everybody else that has private property rights.

The consequences if this were to become law—which it is not going to, I am convinced, with this amendment—but the effect of this would be this: okay. Ski areas are protected this year. Next year, it will be a rancher that is abused, so we will come back, and we will write a law to protect the rancher.

Next, it will be a water conservation district someplace that will be affected because of the directive, so we will come back and fix that. Then it will be some municipality someplace that will be affected because they don't have water rights because it was extorted by the Federal Government, so we will have a fix for that.

Madam Chairman, there is a better way to do that. Let's just simply respect states' rights to regulate water law and to codify that with this language.

Finally, just let me make this observation. The effect of adopting this, as I mentioned in my opening statement, as it relates to tribal rights, what this amendment really does more than anything else is it puts ski resorts' water rights above tribal rights. That is really what the adoption of this amendment does.

So I would say that the underlying bill is a bill that is the responsibility of us as the legislative branch in this Congress. It deserves our support. This amendment does nothing to advance that at all and should be defeated.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no,'' and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

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

Mr. POLIS. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YODER) having assumed the chair, Ms. FOXX, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3189) to prohibit the conditioning of any permit, lease, or other use agreement on the transfer, relinquishment, or other impairment of any water right to the United States by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture, had come to no resolution thereon.

DIRECTING THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO MAKE TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS IN THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 3370

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

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 93

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 3370) an Act to delay the implementation of certain provisions of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, and for other purposes, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make the following corrections:

(1) In section 12—

(A) in the matter preceding the new subsection added by the amendment made by such section, strike '', as amended by the preceding provisions of this Act, is further'' and insert ''is''; and

(B) in the new subsection added by the amendment made by such section, strike ''(e)'' and insert ''(d)''.

(2) In section 14, before the closing quotation marks that immediately precede the period at the end insert ''and''.

(3) In section 30—

(A) in the matter that precedes paragraph (1), strike ''is'' and insert the following: '', as amended by section 27 of this Act, is further'';

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter that precedes subparagraph (A), strike ''subparagraph (B)'' and insert ''subparagraph (C)''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) strike ''subparagraph (A)'' and insert ''subparagraph (B)''; and

(II) strike ''subparagraph (D)'' and insert ''subparagraph (E)'';

(C) in paragraph (2), strike ''and (C) as subparagraphs (D), (E), and (G)'' and insert ''(C), and (D) as subparagraphs (D), (E), (F), and (H)'';

(D) in paragraph (3), in the matter preceding the new subparagraphs inserted by the amendment made by such paragraph, strike ''subparagraph (B)'' and insert ''subparagraph (D)''; and

(E) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in the matter preceding the new subparagraph inserted by the amendment made by such paragraph, strike ''subparagraph (E)'' and insert ''subparagraph (F)''; and

(ii) in the new subparagraph inserted by the amendment made by such paragraph, strike ''(F)'' and insert ''(G)''.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FAITHFUL EXECUTION OF THE LAW ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 3973 will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered

by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 191, nays 227, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 127]

YEAS—191

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

NAYS—227

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

NOT VOTING—13

Amodei
Bachmann
Bass
Cantor
Dingell
Franks (AZ)
Gosar
McKeon
Rangel
Rush
Smith (WA)
Wagner
Waxman

□ 1642

Messrs. POSEY, MARCHANT, BUCSHON, RYAN of Wisconsin, and MAFFEI changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. HIGGINS and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Michelle Lujan Grisham of New Mexico moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3973 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end of the bill the following:

SEC. 3. PROTECTING NATIONAL SECURITY INFORMATION FROM FOREIGN ENEMIES AND SAVING TAXPAYER DOLLARS.

The amendments made by this Act do not apply to information that would expose critical national security and foreign policy legal, strategic, and tactical positions to terrorists, drug cartels, money launderers, or foreign enemies of the United States.

□ 1645

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New Mexico is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard passionate arguments in support of and in opposition to this bill. We have heard Members argue that this bill is needed to prevent the Obama administration's overreach on issues such as immigration and health care.

Conversely, we have heard Members note that the Republican leadership has refused to pass comprehensive immigration reform, refused to raise the minimum wage, and refused to compromise on a budget until they had shut down the Federal Government. These Members argue that this has forced the President to act within his constitutional authority to faithfully execute the law.

That sharp rhetoric and disagreement is a result of the political realities that we find ourselves in today, and it reflects Congress's failure to work together and solve problems on behalf of the American people.

I oppose the underlying bill, but I more strongly oppose the gridlock that has consumed this Congress and is leading it to become the most unproductive Congress and uncompromising Congress in the history of the United States.

I believe that we can move past that today by coming together and supporting my amendment, which would address significant national security concerns raised by this legislation.

My amendment would ensure that the bill's requirement that the executive branch explain why it prioritizes resources would not impact or expose critical national security and foreign policy interests, positions, or strategies to terrorists, drug cartels, and foreign enemies of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, Sandia National Laboratories and Los Alamos National Laboratory are located in my home State of New Mexico. These laboratories ensure the safety, reliability, and effectiveness of the Nation's nuclear deterrent.

The experiments and tests that they conduct are at the cutting edge of science and human understanding. They work every day to study, analyze, solve, and prepare for emerging and potential national security threats, contingencies, and risks.

They help inform our Nation's defense and foreign policy decision-makers on how to confront the increasingly complex dangers that our Nation faces.

I am sure there is not one Member of this body that would want the sensitive national security work conducted at the National Laboratories and other government agencies to be revealed to terrorists, to drug cartels and foreign enemies. But that is the risk that all of us will bear if we pass this bill today with this current broad language.

This bill requires the Attorney General to monitor every executive branch agency and every Federal officer who issues a formal or informal policy that refrains from enforcing any Federal statute, rule, regulation, program or policy.

So let me say that again: it would require the Attorney General to monitor every Federal officer's alleged non-enforcement of any Federal statute, rule, regulation, program, or policy.

The language would include Federal officials who are making decisions on national security concerns and interests, based on information and assistance supplied, in many cases, by the national labs in my home State.

This could put the Attorney General in the dangerous position of choosing between keeping strategic foreign policy positions and information from foreign enemies, and complying with the requirements of this legislation.

This would, undoubtedly, lead to litigation, court cases, and appeals, costing the American government embarrassing legal battles and leaving taxpayers to foot the bill.

That time and money is better spent on the activity that these national security agencies are intended to conduct: providing for the safety of the American people.

It just doesn't make sense to impose costly reporting requirements on activities that could potentially hurt national security interests. You wouldn't require a general to reveal his strategy and tactics before he goes into battle.

Mr. Speaker, we came together just last week to pass an aid package for Ukraine to address national security concerns due to recent Russian aggression. We passed that bill on an overwhelmingly bipartisan basis. Leaders of both parties came together in solidarity.

We can do that again today with the adoption of this amendment, which ensures that nothing in this bill adversely impacts our Nation's security.

I want to be clear. The adoption of this amendment will not prevent the passage of the underlying bill. If adopted, it will be incorporated into the bill and will be immediately voted upon.

Although we may all disagree on the need for the underlying bill, we have an opportunity to stand united and support our Nation's vital policy and foreign policy goals.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this final amendment.

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

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, we have in this country a government of laws, not of men. The Congress passes laws, the President executes laws, and the courts adjudicate disputes under those laws.

One law on the books already requires the Attorney General to report to Congress when the executive branch suspends enforcement of a law due to constitutional concerns, and AGs ranging from Holder to Gonzalez have done this.

When the executive branch suspends execution of the law for other reasons, this same reporting requirement should apply, and, in fact, may even be more important on separation of powers grounds. This transparency will help Congress safeguard its constitutional authority, and will allow the American people to evaluate the actions of the executive branch.

Now, why is this necessary?

Yesterday's paper, The Wall Street Journal:

> Last week the administration quietly excused millions of people from the requirement to purchase health insurance or else pay a tax penalty.
>
> This latest political reconstruction has received zero media notice, and the Health and Human Services Department didn't think the details of this delay were worth discussing in a conference call, press materials, or fact sheet. Instead, the mandate suspension was buried in an unrelated rule that was meant to preserve some health plans that don't comply with ObamaCare benefits and redistribution mandates.

This is no way to run a government. Surely, this is not consistent with being the most transparent administration in history.

Now, some have said that the transparency requirements would be burdensome, but this raises the question, exactly how many laws is this administration suspending?

This bill can only be burdensome if the administration is consistently suspending duly enacted laws.

My question is: What is wrong with a little sunlight?

Now, I have not heard the President's defenders articulate a limiting principle regarding his actions. ''If Congress does not do what I want, I will do it anyway'' is not a limiting principle, and is not consistent with constitutional government.

Here is a limiting principle. U.S. Supreme Court, Kendall v. United States:

> To contend that the obligation imposed on the President to see the laws faithfully executed implies a power to forbid their execution is a novel construction of the Constitution, and is entirely inadmissible.

Now, news reports have detailed how the latest ObamaCare suspensions are tailored to help the President's party in the midterm elections. Now, this is not sufficient justification. Of course there is always going to be another election around the corner.

Once you do suspension to get to 2014, well, you are going to have 2016. Do you need to get Hillary across the finish line?

Then when a Republican President takes over, guess what? That President's supporters are going to say, hey, they suspended these provisions. Why don't you suspend the provisions that we don't like?

Pretty soon, you end up with Presidents of both parties picking and choosing what they want to enforce.

Here is the deal. Short-term political advantages and fleeting policy victories do not trump our duty to support and defend the Constitution. This is true whether the President is a Democrat or a Republican.

I would much rather lose out on my preferred policy outcomes and see my party lose an election while safeguarding our constitutional order, because it is, ultimately, that Constitution which does the most to protect our freedoms.

If we go down the road where Presidents of both parties simply enforce what is good for their party and disregard what is not, then we will no longer be a government of laws, but a government of men, and this institution will be forever diminished.

The Constitution delegates the Congress the power to make law, not to make suggestions. The Faithful Execution of the Law Act will help shine a light on executive branch failures to faithfully execute the laws of our land.

A vote for this bill is a vote for transparency, for the rule of law, and for constitutional government.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this motion, and vote ''yes'' to pass this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage of the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 225, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 128]

AYES—192

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

NOES—225

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

NOT VOTING—14

Amodei
Bachmann
Bass
Capito
Courtney
Dingell
Franks (AZ)
Gosar
McClintock
Rangel
Rush
Smith (WA)
Wagner
Waxman

□ 1702

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 128 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MEEHAN was allowed to speak out of order.)

CONGRESSIONAL HOCKEY CHALLENGE

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to address our colleagues for 1 minute on behalf of the Congressional Hockey Caucus and our colleagues from both sides of the aisle who now, for the sixth year, have participated in what we call the Congressional Hockey Challenge.

This is the game for charity in which we have Members of Congress who play hockey and three of our friends from the Parliament in Canada, representing the lawmakers, play against a team of lobbyists. The game specifically supports hockey for children in underprivileged communities who would not otherwise have access to the game.

In addition, it has raised dollars for scholarships for children from underprivileged communities to go on to play hockey in college. This was the sixth annual game, and to date, we have raised over a $500,000 for that charity.

Let me just close with this observation. In addition to being able to play with our colleagues and the lobbyists, we were joined on each side by very, very special guests. They were members of the Wounded Warriors ice hockey team.

The lobbyist team was privileged to have retired Army reservist Joseph Bowser, who lost a leg in Iraq, playing on their team. Our side was joined by retired Army Captain Mark Little, who lost both legs in Iraq.

I might tell you that there is no more inspirational thing than to see the courage of two young men who have found hockey as a way to find continued aspiration and accomplishment.

I will close my observations by saying that the winning goal—and this was no giveaway. This was a remarkably competitive game. The winning goal was scored by Captain Mark Little.

So on behalf of my colleagues, I am pleased to report that the pride of the institution is intact. Congress won 7–5.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 244, noes 171, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 129]

AYES—244

Aderholt
Amash
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold

Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—171

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

NOT VOTING—16

Amodei
Bachmann
Bass
Becerra
Courtney
Dingell
Franks (AZ)
Gosar
Hinojosa
Rangel
Richmond
Rush
Smith (WA)
Wagner
Waters
Waxman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1714

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WATER RIGHTS PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 515 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3189.

Will the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER) kindly take the chair.

□ 1716

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3189) to prohibit the conditioning of any permit, lease, or other use agreement on the transfer, relinquishment, or other impairment of any water right to the United States by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture, with Mr. WEBSTER of Florida (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 113–379 by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) had been postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 113–379 offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 175, noes 236, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 130]

AYES—175

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

NOES—236

Aderholt
Amash
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell

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

NOT VOTING—20

Amodei
Bachmann
Bass
Becerra
Courtney
Davis (CA)
Dingell
Franks (AZ)
Gosar
Gutiérrez
Hinojosa
Johnson (GA)
Rangel
Richmond
Rush
Scalise
Smith (WA)
Wagner
Waters
Waxman

□ 1720

Ms. DUCKWORTH changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chair, on roll-call No. 130, had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3189) to prohibit the conditioning of any permit, lease, or other use agreement on the transfer, relinquishment, or other impairment of any water right to the United States by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture, and, pursuant to House Resolution 511, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Kirkpatrick moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3189 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Page 3, line 7, strike ''The Secretary'' and insert the following: ''Unless necessary to—

''(1) protect Tribal treaty rights;

''(2) preserve recreational fishing;

''(3) mitigate drought conditions in an area covered by an emergency drought declaration; or

''(4) facilitate fire suppression;

the Secretary''.

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

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill. It will not kill the bill nor send it back to committee. If it is adopted, this bill will immediately proceed to final passage.

Water is a critical issue in Arizona and especially in my district. Water can be, also, a divisive issue. In Congress, we need to provide leadership and work together on long-term solutions that protect our water sources, communities, tribes, and local economies.

In particular, I believe this bill needs language added to strengthen the rights of our tribal governments. Arizona's District 1 is over 90 percent public lands. It contains several important waterways, national forests, and recreation areas, and it has 12 Native American tribes.

In my previous term, I introduced the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Quantification Act, which was signed into law. It was a historic agreement that created jobs, protected tribal water rights, and established reliable water sources for many of Arizona's communities.

As this legislation moves forward, I want to ensure that we protect the following priorities: our tribal communities, our fishing and sportsmen, our drought mitigation efforts, and our ability to fight wildfires. And we need to manage water rights and land-use permits in a balanced way. We can do this in a way that respects tribes, preserves recreation, and protects our communities from droughts and wildfires that have already caused so much devastation in Western States. In my view, these issues should be our priorities.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the underlying bill does one thing and one thing only: it stops the Federal Government from extorting water rights from private citizens and businesses without just compensation. That is what the underlying bill does.

But, Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you that there seems to be a common thread here over the last several weeks—maybe even a year—on the differences of governance between the two parties, between this side of the aisle and that side of the aisle.

The reason why this is important as it relates to water law is simply because water law has always been the province of the States. There have been Federal courts that have said that over and over and over. Yet, when we come to the floor here, we hear constantly from the other side that there should be conditions on certain rights. This falls into that category.

The debate we had on the floor earlier was that there is acknowledgment that the Federal Government was taking water rights as a condition for permits. Their answer from that side of the aisle was, well, let's let the process go; our side was, let's respect the law. Big difference.

So now we have this motion to recommit, and if you look at the motion to recommit, it conditions, again, State water law. I think the best way that we should approach these debates is to say that we trust the people and we trust the Federal system, and the Federal system as it relates to water

law is that States' water law is premier. This motion to recommit is another attempt—another attempt—to qualify that, to give the Federal Government more authority.

I urge my colleagues to say ''no'' to the motion to recommit and pass the underlying bill to protect states' rights and water law.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 227, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 131]

AYES—183

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

NOES—227

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

NOT VOTING—21

Amodei
Bachmann
Bass
Becerra
Cassidy
Courtney
Dingell
Franks (AZ)
Gosar
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hinojosa
McIntyre
Mulvaney
Rangel
Richmond
Rush
Smith (WA)
Wagner
Waters
Waxman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1735

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 131 I was unavoidably detained at the physician's office. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 238, noes 174, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 132]

AYES—238

Aderholt
Amash
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby

Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—174

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

NOT VOTING—19

Amodei
Bachmann
Bass
Becerra
Castor (FL)
Courtney
Dingell
Franks (AZ)
Gosar
Gutiérrez
Hinojosa
McDermott
Mulvaney
Rangel
Rush
Sherman
Smith (WA)
Wagner
Waxman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1741

Messrs. LOWENTHAL, NOLAN, and POCAN changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the bill 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 prohibit the conditioning of any permit, lease, or other use agreement on the transfer of any water right to the United States by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 132, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule IX, I rise in regard to a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Whereas on March 5, 2014, during a hearing before the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Committee Chairman DARRELL E. ISSA gave a statement and then posed ten questions to former Internal Revenue Service official Lois Lerner, who stated that she was invoking her Fifth Amendment right not to testify;

Whereas the committee's ranking member, Representative ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS, clearly sought recognition to take his turn for questions under committee and House rules;

Whereas Chairman ISSA then unilaterally adjourned the hearing and refused to allow him to make any statement or ask any questions;

Whereas Ranking Member CUMMINGS protested immediately, stating: ''Mr. Chairman, you cannot run a committee like this. You just cannot——''

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

The Chair is going to ask, in the name of decorum of the House, that Members not display their electronic devices. It is a violation of the House rules. Regular order would be putting the iPads down. The House will not proceed until there is decorum in the House.

The gentleman will suspend. Proceedings will not resume until there is decorum in the House.

□ 1745

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, where is it specifically in the rule stated that Members cannot display their iPads? What rule is it?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the precedents of the House, Members are not allowed to stage an exhibition. The Chair has ruled based on the precedents of the House.

The Chair asks that Members not display their iPhones and iPads.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, may I proceed?

Mr. Speaker, the Members have removed their iPads. May I proceed?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When decorum has been restored, the gentleman may proceed.

Only a Member under recognition for debate can display an exhibit.

Mr. KILDEE. For the purposes of display, this is what the Members have been holding.

May I proceed?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. KILDEE. Whereas Ranking Member CUMMINGS protested immediately, stating: ''Mr. Chairman, you cannot run a committee like this. You just cannot do this. This is, we are better than that as a country, we are better than that as a committee.'';

Whereas Chairman ISSA then returned and allowed Ranking Member CUMMINGS to begin his statement, but when it became clear that Chairman ISSA did not want to hear what Ranking Member CUMMINGS was saying, turned off Ranking Member CUMMINGS' microphone, ordered Republican staff to ''close it down,'' and repeatedly signaled to end the hearing with his hand across his neck;

Whereas Ranking Member CUMMINGS objected again, stating: ''You cannot have a one-sided investigation. There is absolutely something wrong with that.'';

Whereas Chairman ISSA made a statement of his own and posed questions during the hearing, but refused to allow other members of the committee, and in particular, the ranking member, who had sought recognition, to make statements under the 5-minute rule in violation of House rule XI;

Whereas Chairman ISSA instructed the microphones be turned off and adjourned the hearing without a vote or a unanimous consent agreement in violation of rule XVI because he did not want to permit Ranking Member CUMMINGS to speak;

Whereas Chairman ISSA's abusive behavior on March 5 is part of a continuing pattern in which he has routinely excluded members of the committee from investigative meetings, has turned off Members' microphones while they were questioning a witness, attempted to prevent witnesses from answering questions, and has provided information to the press before sharing it with committee members;

Whereas on July 18, 2003, former Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Bill Thomas, asked the United States Capitol Police to remove minority members of the committee from the library where they were having a discussion about a pending committee

markup, and subsequently came to the well of the U.S. House of Representatives to publicly apologize for his belligerent behavior;

Whereas Chairman ISSA has violated clause 1 of rule XXIII of the Code of Official Conduct which states that ''A Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer or employee of the House shall behave at all times in a manner that shall reflect creditably on the House'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives strongly condemns the offensive and disrespectful manner in which Chairman DARRELL E. ISSA conducted the hearing of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on March 5, 2014, and requires that he come to the well of the House to issue a public apology to Members of the House.

That concludes the reading of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized to offer the resolution.

Does the gentleman offer the resolution?

Mr. KILDEE. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The text of resolution is as follows:

PRIVILEGED RESOLUTION AGAINST THE OFFENSIVE ACTIONS OF CHAIRMAN DARRELL E. ISSA

Whereas on March 5, 2014, during a hearing before the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Committee Chairman Darrell E. Issa gave a statement and then posed ten questions to former Internal Revenue Service official Lois Lerner, who stated that she was invoking her Fifth Amendment right not to testify;

Whereas the committee's ranking member, Rep. Elijah E. Cummings, clearly sought recognition to take his turn for questions under committee and House rules;

Whereas, Chairman Issa then unilaterally adjourned the hearing and refused to allow him to make any statement or ask any questions;

Whereas Ranking Member Cummings protested immediately, stating: ''Mr. Chairman, you cannot run a committee like this. You just cannot do this. This is, we are better than that as a country, we are better than that as a committee.''

Whereas, Chairman Issa then returned and allowed Ranking Member Cummings to begin his statement, but when it became clear that Chairman Issa did not want to hear what Ranking Member Cummings was saying, turned off Ranking Member Cummings' microphone, ordered Republican staff to ''close it down,'' and repeatedly signaled to end the hearing with his hand across his neck;

Whereas Ranking Member Cummings objected again, stating: ''You cannot have a one-sided investigation. There is absolutely something wrong with that.'';

Whereas Chairman Issa made a statement of his own and posed questions during the hearing, but refused to allow other members of the commmittee, and in particular, the ranking member, who had sought recognition, to make statements under the 5-minute rule in violation of House rule XI;

Whereas Chairman Issa instructed the microphones be turned off and adjourned the hearing without a vote or a unanimous consent agreement in violation of rule XVI because he did not want to permit Ranking Member Cummings to speak;

Whereas Chairman Issa's abusive behavior on March 5 is part of a continuing pattern in which he has routinely excluded members of the committee from investigative meetings, has turned off Members' microphones while they were questioning a witness, attempted to prevent witnesses from answering questions, and has provided information to the press before sharing it with committee members;

Whereas on July 18, 2003, former Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Bill Thomas asked the United States Capitol Police to remove minority members of the committee from the library where they were having a discussion about a pending committee mark up, and subsequently came to the well of the U.S. House of Representatives to publicly apologize for his belligerent behavior;

Whereas Chairman Issa has violated-clause 1 rule XXIII of the Code of Official Conduct which states that ''A Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer or employee of the House shall behave at all times in a manner that shall reflect creditably on the House'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives strongly condemns the offensive and disrespectful manner in which Chairman Darrell E. Issa conducted the hearing of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on March 5, 2014, and requires that he come to the well of the House to issue a public apology to Members of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution qualifies.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the resolution on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to lay the resolution on the table.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 217, noes 173, answered ''present'' 10, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 133]

AYES—217

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

NOES—173

Barrow (GA)
Beatty
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko

Tsongas	Visclosky	Wilson (FL)
Van Hollen	Walz	Yarmuth
Veasey	Wasserman Schultz	
Vela	Waters	
Velázquez		

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—10

Brooks (IN)	Dent	Meehan
Capuano	Deutch	Sánchez, Linda T.
Clarke (NY)	Gowdy	
Conaway	Issa	

NOT VOTING—31

Amodei	Gosar	Ruiz
Bachmann	Gutiérrez	Rush
Barber	Hensarling	Scott, David
Bass	Hinojosa	Smith (WA)
Becerra	Mulvaney	Vargas
Courtney	Noem	Wagner
Davis (CA)	Pastor (AZ)	Waxman
Davis, Danny	Peters (CA)	Welch
Delaney	Pingree (ME)	Whitfield
Dingell	Rangel	
Franks (AZ)	Ribble	

□ 1810

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 133, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 13, 2014 I was unable to be in Washington, D.C. and vote on the legislative business of the day.

On Ordering the Previous Question for consideration of H. Res. 515, a resolution providing for consideration of both H.R. 3189, Water Rights Protection Act and H.R. 4015, SGR Repeal and Medicare Provider Payment Modernization Act of 2014, rollcall vote No. 125, had I been present I would have voted ''yes.''

On Adoption of H. Res. 515, a resolution providing for consideration of both H.R. 3189, Water Rights Protection Act and H.R. 4015, SGR Repeal and Medicare Provider Payment Modernization Act of 2014, rollcall vote No. 126, had I been present I would have voted ''yes.''

On Agreeing to the Ellison of Minnesota Amendment No. 1 to H.R. 3973, Faithful Execution of the Law Act of 2014, rollcall vote No. 127, had I been present I would have voted ''no.''

On the Motion to Recommit with Instructions H.R. 3973, Faithful Execution of the Law Act of 2014, rollcall vote No. 128, had I been present I would have voted ''no.''

On Passage of H.R. 3973, Faithful Execution of the Law Act of 2014, rollcall vote No. 129, had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

On Agreeing to the Polis of Colorado Substitute Amendment No. 3 to H.R. 3189, Water Rights Protection Act, rollcall vote No. 130, had I been present I would have voted ''no.''

On the Motion to Recommit with Instructions H.R. 3189, Water Rights Protection Act, rollcall vote No. 131, had I been present I would have voted ''no.''

On Passage of H.R. 3189, Water Rights Protection Act, rollcall vote No. 132, had I been present I would have voted ''yes.''

On the Motion to Table the Question of the Privileges of the House, rollcall vote No. 133, had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BENTIVOLIO). The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 6968(a), and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy:

Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY, Florida

BOB MURRAY

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a respected community leader and a great friend to so many in central Illinois.

On February 26, longtime broadcaster, weatherman, and radio host Bob Murray lost his battle to brain cancer at the age of 66.

Throughout his career, Bob took his work incredibly seriously. He used to be my weatherman. I would watch on TV while growing up, but in his later life, he was a radio broadcaster. He arrived at the radio station at 1:30 in the morning to prepare for the day because he felt an informed community was important—from community fundraisers, to what was happening with government, to the weather, and to the breaking local news.

I had the privilege of being interviewed by Bob dozens of times over the last 18 months, and I can tell you without a doubt that he was one of the most honest, respectful, and professional members of the media I have ever met.

Bob's family is honoring his life by having memorials made to the Illinois News Broadcasters Association Foundation for a scholarship to be awarded in his name. I can't think of a better way to ensure that he is remembered for years to come.

So thank you, Bob Murray, for the years of service you provided to the families in central Illinois.

Thank you to Bob's family for sharing him with us for more than 40 years and for allowing him to become a part of our family.

DON'T CUT OUR MILITARY

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last night, I held a telephone town hall and called almost 60,000 homes back in Texas. I heard from southeast Texans about a lot of things that were on their minds, but the number one concern I heard about was cuts to the military.

Mr. Speaker, one citizen said to me: We, the United States, were not prepared militarily for World War II. Why are we doing the same thing now? We need to be increasing, not decreasing, our military capabilities.

I even took a poll and asked those who were listening in on the call: Do you think we should reduce our military? An overwhelming 85 percent of the people on the call said: No.

Mr. Speaker, our men and women in the military should be the last thing we cut from the Federal budget. The world is getting more and more dangerous as time goes on. We should not lose sight of the enemies we face. Both countries and terrorists who wish to do us harm still exist. Our military is the best in the world—and we must make sure it stays that way.

And that's just the way it is.

□ 1815

CHILDREN'S BUDGET

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this happens to be Women's History Month. I will continue to salute the dynamic women of this Nation.

I rise today as a founder and cochair of the Congressional Children's Caucus and indicate to my colleagues that I believe we are overdue for naming children as our number one priority. Working with First Focus, I intend to introduce a children's budget for the needs of our children. We have left children behind. Many times, the issues around children are discussed in a partisan way. Who wants early childhood education? Who wants universal pre-K or around-the-clock child care?

In actuality, the consumers and beneficiaries of funding for those very important issues are our children. We should give them the security, protection, and resources to prevent child abuse and for bringing families together and providing intervention for families that are troubled that result in not only child abuse, but violence against these children.

What about the best education they can have? What about the best health care they can have?

Mr. Speaker, children are our number one priority. I truly believe that a children's budget in the United States of America is long overdue.

Join me on the children's budget.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3370. An act to delay the implementation of certain provisions of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1086. An act to reauthorize and improve the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, and for other purposes.

S. 2137. An act to ensure that holders of flood insurance policies under the National Flood Insurance Program do not receive premium refunds for coverage of second homes.

PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

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

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be here on behalf of the Progressive Caucus today for the Progressive Caucus Special Order hour. We want to talk about the need to extend unemployment benefits in this country.

Since the end of December, millions of Americans have lost their extended unemployment benefits and are struggling just to get by in this economy.

We have had two really positive developments this week. One, the House Democrats have an initiative, led by Representative BRAD SCHNEIDER of Illinois, to do a discharge petition, which is a procedural motion to force the leadership of this body to let us vote on extending unemployment benefits, which it refuses to do.

We have to get 218 signatures—a majority of the House—to sign the discharge petition. If that happens, we can force a vote and make sure that people who have lost their benefits since the end of December get their benefits.

That is the first important thing that has happened.

The second important thing is, today, just this afternoon, it was announced there is a bipartisan agreement in the Senate by several senators to make sure that we can extend benefits through the month of May of this year.

We need to do everything possible not only to make sure that the Senate passes that, but to make sure that this House takes up that action. Because if we don't, millions of people—and many more every single week—will not get access to unemployment benefits.

So the Progressive Caucus is here today to highlight this issue and to raise awareness and explain why it is so important that we pass these benefits—and we pass them now—on behalf of the millions of people in this country that need those.

I am joined by several of my colleagues here today. I would like to make sure that they have a chance to talk about the unique situations in their area and why this is so important.

I would first like to yield to my colleague from the great State of Oregon, Representative SUZANNE BONAMICI.

Ms. BONAMICI. Thank you very much, Congressman POCAN. Thank you for leading this discussion. The discussion about extending the emergency unemployment compensation program is such an important topic.

Last week, the country marked a troubling milestone. The number of Americans who lost their emergency unemployment insurance hit 2 million. Thousands more will lose this lifeline every week if we do not extend this critical benefit.

The impact of losing unemployment benefits is immediate and devastating to our constituents. I recently spoke to a constituent in Oregon who was laid off from a large employer in my district. His unemployment benefits ended early this year when the program was cut off. Since then, unfortunately, things have gone from bad to worse. He has been in his home for about 10 years, and now he is in default because he cannot pay his mortgage.

I want to thank our colleague, Congressman MATT CARTWRIGHT, for leading the effort to provide my constituents and yours the opportunity to get a bit of relief. He is sponsoring the Stop Foreclosures Due to Congressional Dysfunction Act. That would put a 6-month moratorium on foreclosures of Federally-backed mortgages for individuals who have exhausted their unemployment benefits.

I have to say this is the least that we can do for our constituents who are still suffering because this House refuses to allow an ''up-or-down'' vote on extending unemployment compensation.

My constituent is actively looking for work. He continues to look for work. But he keeps getting passed over for jobs. They are being filled by employers who seem to be looking for younger, maybe less expensive workers.

He is one of many constituents across the country. What he and other constituents like him tell me is that it is particularly difficult for the more mature job seekers to find work, even though they have decades of productive experience.

His efforts to find work haven't stopped. And I have to emphasize this: the unemployment benefits that he was getting weren't making him lazy. They were allowing him to survive. But instead of giving him the resources he needs to help lift him up and out of this situation, we are abandoning him and constituents across the country when they really need that lifeline.

We need to extend this lifeline while we are tackling the problems of long-term unemployment in this country. The long-term unemployed need better access to job training; workforce development programs; resources; programs to engage employers and help connect the long-term unemployed, particularly older workers, with suitable employment.

All Americans must realize that being among the long-term unemployed does not diminish one's abilities, value, or potential contribution to the workforce and the economy. I want to emphasize that point, because when I had a roundtable discussion in my district, there were several constituents there who were unemployed. They get down and concerned that they aren't worthy. We wanted to emphasize to them, You are worthy. Keep looking. You can find work.

We should be extending this lifeline.

My home State of Oregon has been a bright spot in the midst of the recovery. In January, Oregon recorded its lowest unemployment rate since 2008. There is a recent report that shows that Oregon added more than 43,000 jobs last year—that is great news—adding to the unemployment base by 2.6 percent.

Unfortunately, the economic improvement provides little relief for the still about 30,000 long-term unemployed Oregonians who have lost these benefits over the last 2 months and are still struggling to reenter the workforce.

They need these resources to have a car to get to job interviews, to have a cell phone.

As the economy continues to recover, we must stimulate it, not stifle it. The Emergency Unemployment Compensation program doesn't just help the millions of Americans who are struggling to get by every day, it provides an economic boost.

When people get these benefits, they aren't saving this money. They put the benefits right back into the economy. While they look for work they use the unemployment benefits to pay their mortgages, to buy groceries, to keep the lights on.

We shouldn't be arguing over extending this lifeline to millions of hard-working Americans. I was glad to hear the news that the Senate has a bipartisan proposal. I hope they pass that and get it over to us right away.

Yesterday, I joined many other of our colleagues in signing the discharge petition calling for a vote to extend emergency unemployment. There is no better cause than helping the hard-working members of our country who desperately want to go back to work.

Thank you again, Representative POCAN, for organizing this hour. I hope that we can draw the attention of the Nation, but especially of our colleagues, about the effects of ending the benefit.

I urge our colleagues on the other side of the aisle and in leadership to reconsider this and put it up for a vote so we can help our constituents who are looking for work, trying to get back to work, and need that lifeline.

Thank you again, Representative POCAN, for leading this important discussion

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Representative BONAMICI. I am sorry to hear about your constituent losing housing.

For the State of the Union in this very Chamber, I brought a constituent of mine who had lost their benefits. Rather than be foreclosed on, they put their home up for sale. They are still looking for work.

It is a situation happening all too often. There is an article in today's Huffington Post talking about the

number of people who are being evicted because they can no longer pay their rent or mortgage simply because of the loss of benefits.

Thank you for sharing that story, and thank you for your work on behalf of Oregon.

I would also like to yield to my colleague from California, Representative JARED HUFFMAN, who would like to talk a little bit about the problem of extending unemployment benefits.

Representative HUFFMAN.

Mr. HUFFMAN. I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for your leadership in organizing this hour of debate on such an important subject. I certainly want to lend my voice to the voices of my colleagues on this important matter.

What we are asking for is very simple. We simply want an immediate ''up-or-down'' vote on whether to extend these Federal long-term unemployment insurance benefits. We are asking that because I think in all of our districts we see that too many of our constituents are unnecessarily suffering from Congress' failure to act. We owe it to our neighbors and their families—people who lost their jobs through no fault of their own, people who want to work, who continually are searching for work—we owe it to them to provide the support they need to get back on their feet.

In my own home State of California, we have got over 339,000 Californians who have lost unemployment benefits. The number continues to grow the longer Congress waits, the longer we fail to act.

California's currently got an unemployment rate of about 8.3 percent, but in many parts of my district—I include some rural areas—that rate is much higher. In fact, in Trinity County we have an unemployment rate that is over 11 percent.

It is very important to remember that this is not an abstract issue. This is an immediate and deeply personal issue about real people and real struggles. Since the Federal benefits expired in December of last year, I have received thousands of emails and phone calls from my constituents asking for Congress to wake up and take action.

One of them very recently is a great example. It is from Lisa in Eureka. She wrote to me:

> I have been on unemployment for just over 6 months now and I am not able to make my mortgage payment. I am a worker, not a lazy bum. I want to work, and I am still looking and hopeful. But in the meantime, I can't live without a little help from unemployment.

That is very typical of the kind of feedback and pleas that I am hearing and that I know you, Mr. POCAN, and many of us are hearing from hard-working folks in our district every single day.

So, again, I think it is important to emphasize this is not a handout. This is about offering a hand up to real people during a difficult time. Without the extension of this crucial lifeline, 181,000 children in California—let's remember the impact on families and children—will be hurt.

No one should be forced to make the unbearable choice between paying their rent and feeding their family simply because they lost their job due to no fault of their own. Extending these benefits should not remain a casualty to congressional gridlock.

Just today, we got some great news. I think we are all encouraged that Democrats and Republicans in the Senate are working together on a tentative agreement to extend unemployment insurance benefits for 5 months—an agreement that, as I understand it, would provide retroactive payments to people like Lisa in my district.

So, Mr. Speaker, let's help the economy. Let's help our constituents who are looking for work. This House should follow the Senate's lead and work together to find a solution.

Again, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

□ 1830

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Representative HUFFMAN, for all the work on behalf of your constituents in northern California. I appreciate your words and sharing the story of your constituent.

Again, 72,000 people every single week will lose benefits until this Congress acts, real people in California, Oregon, and real people in the State of Illinois.

Next it is my privilege to yield time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER), the person who led the initiative on behalf of the House Democrats, led the initiative to discharge the bill so that we could force a vote in this House to ensure that everyone across the country and in the State of Illinois can get the benefits they need so they can continue to get by to find work.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Thank you again, Congressman POCAN, not just for your friendship, but tonight for organizing and bringing us here to have this conversation.

For us in Illinois and Wisconsin, throughout the country it has been a harsh winter. Everyone has talked about the weather and the snow and the storms, but for some it has been a harsher winter than for others.

In January, I hosted a roundtable on unemployment, long-term unemployment. At that roundtable I met a young mother, 29 years old, with two young children, and she told me how, at the end of the day, she comes home, she makes dinner for her kids, and they crawl into bed under the covers to eat dinner and watch TV because she had to make the choice between paying her rent and paying her heat.

I met another woman who has been looking for work now for over a year. Her story was a little different. She was in an industry, travel agency, that is shrinking. She has two kids, high school age, who are looking forward to going to college, and she is now in the position of having to deplete the kids' college accounts so that they can simply make ends meet as she looks for work.

This is the reality for 2 million people around the country, and the numbers, as you have pointed out, grow by 72,000 people every single week. In Illinois alone, there are more than 116,000 people who have lost their unemployment insurance and are struggling just to survive.

Yet, in this Chamber, in this House of Representatives, we have not had a single vote to extend or address the unemployment insurance challenge. Partisan gridlock, partisanship and gridlock have already cost millions their emergency unemployment insurance, and the next year it is estimated that it will cost the U.S. economy 240,000 jobs.

Failing to extend unemployment insurance is hurting families, it is hurting businesses, it is hurting our communities, and it is hurting our national economy. That is why yesterday I filed this discharge petition to end the gridlock and to bring to the floor a vote on extending unemployment insurance.

Now, look, I understand some of my colleagues may disagree, and I respect their perspective and I respect their right to vote ''no,'' but not allowing a vote on the floor, not allowing us to voice our vote in this House of Representatives on unemployment insurance is simply unacceptable.

I believe extending unemployment insurance is not just smart policy, it is the right thing to do. That is why I celebrate the passage, or the agreement in the Senate, bipartisan agreement, to extend unemployment insurance by 5 months. I look forward for that to come into this House, and I hope we will have a chance to vote to it.

I know the path ahead is not going to be easy, but our constituents deserve better than partisan gridlock.

Thank you for sharing your time, and thank you for organizing this evening. Thank you so much.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Representative SCHNEIDER. Your efforts for this body, leading the House Democrats on that discharge position—we didn't know today the Senate was going to come up with something that may pass and may be able to get through this House. But your leadership made sure that those over 110,000 people in Illinois, and each and every week more people adding to that, can get those benefits.

So thank you for your efforts. We hope that we can force this House to have us vote to extend unemployment benefits.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. I hope it happens soon. Thank you.

Mr. POCAN. I would now like to yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK), one of the newest Members of the House.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Thank you, Mr. POCAN, for your leadership on

this critical issue. I also want to thank the gentleman from Illinois for all he has done to try and bring this vote to the floor.

A majority of Americans support renewing unemployment insurance, but the majority here in the House continue to show that they are out of step with American families by refusing to extend unemployment insurance for the 2 million Americans who need it, and the families of my home district in Massachusetts are left to suffer because of it.

This out-of-touch majority has invested billions of dollars in tax breaks for the ultra-rich and for wealthy corporations that have often shipped our jobs overseas. Yet, they are refusing to help those who are looking for work, our job-seekers who are struggling to care for their families and put food on the table.

I cringe when I hear some of the Members of the majority blame poverty on the poor, and then vote to give tax breaks for the wealthy. It is the same majority that looks to slash the budget and put that burden on the backs of our children and seniors.

Some have said that Democrats want to give children a full stomach and an empty soul, but I would say, people who would deny a hungry child lunch, they are the ones who need to worry about the condition of their soul.

In Massachusetts, more than $100 million has been taken out of our economy as Congress has failed to act on this issue. I signed the discharge petition to force a vote on unemployment insurance on behalf of the nearly 80,000 workers in Massachusetts who have lost their unemployment benefits. They cannot afford to wait for the majority to catch up with the rest of the country, who know this is the right thing to do.

Again, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for this opportunity, and I thank you for your work.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you so much. You deserve a lot of credit for hitting the ground running in Congress. Thank you so much for representing the people of Massachusetts so very ably and defending the unemployment benefits that we need to extend.

This is something that—the Progressive Caucus, earlier this week, released our budget, and our budget is the Better Off Budget, to make sure that people are better off, their families, they have access to opportunity for their families.

That budget offered extending the benefits to the full 99 weeks. So the Progressive Caucus was there from the very beginning to make sure that we can get these benefits extended for every single American, the 2 million Americans, including 40,000 people in the State of Wisconsin, that they can get these benefits.

We are very proud that the Progressive Caucus looked at this as a priority, and that is why so many Members tonight were here to discuss it.

It is interesting, I am going to read a couple of quotes from people that you wouldn't expect to hear coming out of the Progressive Caucus.

One is a quote from someone back in 1983, someone that often gets quoted in this Chamber, but usually by people on the other side of the aisle, former President Ronald Reagan. His quote was: ''Unemployment insurance is a lifeline that extends to millions of Americans.'' A lifeline. That is Ronald Reagan saying that unemployment insurance is a lifeline to the Americans who need it. He got it, in 1983.

Now, let me read another quote. In the year 2002, another person that people on this side of the aisle don't quote too often, former President George W. Bush, this is what he said: ''These Americans rely on their unemployment benefits. They need our assistance in these difficult times, and we cannot let them down.''

We cannot let them down. That is from President George W. Bush. These are two Republican leaders who understood that unemployment compensation is not a political toy.

It is not something about brinksmanship. It is the demand that we need to make sure that people who pay into the system, who have worked hard and played by the rules all their lives, have that lifeline when they need it because they have put in their dues. They have worked hard, and now, through no fault of their own, they are out of work and looking for work. We should be able to extend those benefits. So that is exactly what we are here to talk about tonight.

Forty thousand people in my home State of Wisconsin, and more every week, are losing their benefits because this Congress has refused to act up to now.

Now, they still can either act through the discharge petition the Democrats have put forth, they can sign the discharge petition to make sure we can get a vote in this body, or we can hope that the Senate does pass this bipartisan deal just from this afternoon, come to this House, and see that we do the right thing here and extend the benefits so that 72,000 people each and every week don't continue to lose their benefits.

This costs the economy. It was mentioned earlier, but it has been estimated, just in January and February alone, we have cost the economy $3 billion by not extending these benefits, and that is more than $51 million in my home State of Wisconsin, just during the months of January and February.

Folks, we need to make sure these benefits are passed, not just for the families struggling, but for our economy that is also struggling. We are coming back, but we can't keep putting roadblocks in front of our economy, things like this, that stop unemployment benefits for all too many Americans.

Now, it also is estimated that this will cost the economy 240,000 jobs this year alone by not extending the benefits, 240,000 jobs.

So here we are trying to bring the economy back, and by not doing the right thing, by not extending the unemployment benefits, we are going to cost 240,000 jobs in this country, on top of the people now who don't have benefits.

Now, you heard some stories tonight from people who talked about constituents, telling their very real stories about what this means to them.

Well, let me tell you about a constituent I had who came in this very body, and I quickly referenced it before: Brian Krueger of Mount Horeb, a hardworking person, a steamfitter.

As we know, the construction industry, when the economy gets a cold, the construction industry gets pneumonia. That is just the way it happens. It dries up even more. So people aren't back to work yet in this industry.

This is a hardworking person who was working as a steamfitter, trying to find work. His benefits were cut off at the end of December, and he is struggling to get by, looking for work each and every single day.

He even put his home up for sale so that it wouldn't be foreclosed on, just as he is trying get by, someone who has played by the rules and worked hard each and every single day.

Today there is an article in the Huffington Post, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to read a little bit from that. The headline was: ''Some Jobless Facing Eviction After Loss of Benefits.''

These are the very real stories that you were just hearing a little bit earlier tonight. Let me tell some more of these stories, and I am going to read directly from The Huffington Post article:

> Craig Bruce, 45, told The Huffington Post that he and his wife were evicted Tuesday from their apartment in California. He said they're fighting the eviction in court, but they spent Tuesday night in a motel room and bunked with family Wednesday.
>
> ''I can't get a job. Either I'm over-qualified or somebody else is closer and they don't have to pay them any moving fees to take the job,'' he told the Huffington Post.
>
> Bruce, a gulf war veteran, lost his quality assurance analyst job at an engineering company in the fall of 2012. He said his unemployment's been hard on him and his wife, who is still looking for work in quality assurance.
>
> ''There's been a lot of depression on my end,'' he said. ''She's scared. She's terrified right now.''

That is a real story of a real person who has worked hard and had a job for many years who, because of the economy, is out of work and can't get the benefits. And the result of this body not acting, the result has been he has been evicted from his home as of Tuesday.

That is wrong. That is not America. That is not the way we should be acting.

Now, I want to yield some time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), another colleague of mine, someone who has been a fighter for

working families throughout New York and across the country.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from the Badger State, for yielding some time, as well as for the leadership that you have continued to provide, week after week, in the context of this Congressional Progressive Caucus Special Order, and on behalf of the people that you represent, and indeed, people all across America, in bringing issues to the forefront that we, in this House of Representatives, should be dealing with in order to improve the quality of life of everyone who we represent.

Now, unfortunately, I stand today on the House floor again, finding myself in a situation where the only obstacle to progress is the House GOP majority. Once again, we are placed in a situation where the American people could stand to benefit from congressional action, but, because of obstinacy and obstruction on the other side, you have got close to 2 million long-term unemployed Americans who find themselves in a distressed financial situation.

Now, earlier today we were informed that a bipartisan agreement was reached in the Senate and, hopefully, that means we will see progress in that Chamber at some point this month, which means that we have a real opportunity here in the House of Representatives to act in a manner that would benefit long-term unemployed Americans.

Why should we do that?

Well, because there are many individuals all across this country, in the district that I represent in Brooklyn and in Queens, but all across America, who find themselves unemployed, not because of their lack of interest, not because of lack of effort, not because of an unwillingness to work, but because of structural changes that have occurred in our economy, particularly in the aftermath of the Great Recession of 2008.

□ 1845

We know that when the economy collapsed in 2008, that didn't have anything to do with folks on Main Street America. That didn't have anything to do with folks in urban America, in the district that I represent. That didn't have anything to do with folks in rural America who are struggling.

It was because of the behavior of some reckless institutions on Wall Street and connected to the financial services industry whose actions collapsed the world's economy, and Americans have suffered as a result, so those consequences are still being felt.

We are no longer technically in a recession. This is one of the arguments that our good friends on the other side of the aisle point out. So what is the emergency? The emergency is you still have an unacceptably high unemployment rate, and a disproportionately high number of those individuals happen to be long-term unemployed.

Now, the argument that is often advanced by our good friends on the other side of the aisle, as they attempt to justify the obstruction that has taken place in blocking unemployment insurance from being extended, is that we are enabling these individuals—enabling these individuals. What kind of myth is that? There is no evidence to support that argument.

First of all, it is important to note that, in order to qualify for unemployment insurance, as the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin knows, you have to demonstrate conclusively that you are actively engaged in an employment search. Otherwise, you are ineligible.

There is this caricature that has been created, as if these are these individuals who are sitting at home like couch potatoes, channel surfing, whose only exercise is when they run outside of the house in order to pick up the unemployment insurance check from the mailbox, and then run back in and continue to channel surf.

Can't we have an evidence-based discussion, Mr. Speaker, as opposed to fictional caricatures created to justify your harshness and refusal to move forward and provide assistance to these unemployed Americans? We know it is a fictional caricature that you have created to justify your indifference because the facts suggest otherwise.

We know that, for every 258 Americans who are searching for employment, only 100 jobs exist. I am no mathematician, but it suggests to me that, given the nature of the economy, it is impossible for every one of those individuals who would otherwise be eligible for unemployment insurance to secure employment because of structural realities in the economy.

That doesn't even account for the fact that, often, there will be a skills mismatch as our economy continues to change, a shift away from manufacturing jobs and a shift into technology and innovation. That is a good thing, but there is a skills mismatch that has to be dealt with.

So the choice that we have been given is to deem these individuals and brand them as lazy Americans when the facts are to the contrary? Why? Why would we leave these unemployed Americans on the recessionary battlefield?

We know that there has been a very schizophrenic recovery. Corporate profits are way up. Unemployment is still up, but the stock market is up, and CEO compensation is up; yet middle class families and those who aspire to be part of the middle class are increasingly struggling in America.

Whenever I am back home in Brooklyn, I am often approached by individuals who are in fear that they could lose their home, given the reality that they have been harshly and callously cut off by the obstruction of the House GOP majority.

I am just hopeful that for the good of America—because there are unemployed in blue States, and there are unemployed in red States; there are unemployed individuals in urban America, in suburban America, in rural America, all across this great country. Can't we find the compassion and the will to address this issue?

As I prepare to take my seat and yield back to the distinguished gentleman, I would also point out that what has occurred here is another example of us here in this Congress doing things affirmatively to prevent jobs from being created.

We allowed sequestration to take effect on April 1 of last year, notwithstanding the fact that independent economists suggested that we would lose 750,000 jobs in America if we allowed it to occur; yet the majority steadfastly stood behind sequestration. Then in October of 2013, we had a reckless, unreasonable, unnecessary government shutdown.

It cost the economy $24 billion, according to Standard and Poor's, in lost economic productivity. Well, you complain that Americans are supposedly sitting at home channel surfing, staying on the couch, not looking for work while you affirmatively damage the economy.

Now, as a result of your failure to deal with the unemployment insurance issue, if this were to continue throughout this year, you will cost us another 200,000 jobs.

I will just say that for a wide variety of reasons—because it is in the best interests of the American economy, the best interests of the people that we represent, and that it represents the best values of America—that we allow a vote to take place on the floor of the House of Representatives because I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that if you do, the votes exist to pass this into law, and we can put this sad chapter in the 113th Congress behind us.

I thank the distinguished gentleman again for his continued leadership.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you so much, Representative JEFFRIES, for your always eloquent fight on behalf of the working people across the State of New York and the need for the benefits.

I am glad you debunked some of the myths that are out there because I remember, during the debate we had on food stamps, there was discussion of a surfer dude from California who talked about gaming the system.

We were basically cutting $39 billion from food stamps because there was a surfer who abused the system from the State of California. Rather than governing by analysis, they govern by anecdote, and it is something that we need to get done and this body needs to get done.

Let me just share one final story, if I can, of someone from the State of California, again, from The Huffington Post article. This is Ricki Ward of Rancho Cucamonga, California, and I will read from the article.

Ward, who told The Huff Post Tuesday that she expects to be evicted next month, said she has worked all her life from paycheck to paycheck and raised two kids as a single

mother. For the past 5 years, Ward worked in offices, retail stores, and fast food before being laid off from a customer service job for a cable provider in March 2013.

Ward said she suspects she is having difficulty finding work because of her age.

''I took the year that I graduated from high school off of my resume, and I started getting calls,'' Ward said. ''Yet once they saw me, I wasn't what they wanted for their front counter. I'm 59 years old, but I'm a very young 59 years old. I keep myself in good shape. I'm nowhere near ready to stop working.''

She said her landlord has been fair with her and that she has received some help from family and friends, but she keeps falling further behind.

''It's so humiliating to have to have everybody else try to take care of you,'' Ward said. ''It's just not what I'm used to. I've worked all my life.''

These are the stories that we have talked about during this past hour from people across the country who, again, have played by the rules, worked hard and, because of a turn in the economy a few years ago, have lost work.

The commitment that we have to those people is that if they are working hard. We need to do everything we can to make sure that they have the help that they have paid into: unemployment benefits. We need to, in a time like this, pass those emergency benefits.

I would like to yield my final time to a Representative from Ohio who has done an absolutely amazing job for a number of years representing her constituents and is a great University of Wisconsin alumni.

I have to say that, being from Wisconsin, but she is a great colleague, Representative MARCY KAPTUR from the great State of Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. I want to thank Congressman POCAN for just a phenomenal presentation this evening and for lifting up those across our country who worked hard for a living and have fallen on hard times.

Trying to hold their families together, they go try to get a job, and 1,000 people show up for one job. What are they supposed to do? They have lost footing. They haven't been able to make their mortgage payments. They can't send their kids to college. Many of them get sick. They lose their health benefits. It is not so easy getting a job in today's America.

You have been such a leader not just on unemployment benefit extensions, but also on job creation. Since we are commemorating the second anniversary of the passage of the U.S.-Korean so-called ''free-trade agreement,'' I thought I would bring a startling chart to the floor to show why we have unemployment in this country.

One of the aspects of the U.S.-Korean so-called ''free-trade agreement,'' passed 2 years ago without my support, was that we were supposed to increase exports and decrease imports.

It was supposed to actually be good for America. We were supposed to create more jobs here at home when, in fact, we have actually lost 40,000 jobs when they told us we were going to gain 70,000 jobs as a result of that agreement. Those people who were supposed to have those jobs fell on unemployment benefits, large numbers of them.

Here is a chart that shows what has happened. This gives you a sense of how big the difference is.

All right. The idea is we are supposed to export cars from here to Korea. Well, guess what, folks? This is how much we export; and this is how much they export to us, so we have fallen so deeply in the red.

What happens is, with every $1 billion of trade deficit, you get another 4,000 people out of work. Factories shut down. Suppliers shut down. The math is very simple. You just need to understand it.

Now, you know, if you look at the individuals who stand in those unemployment lines, they were told that we were supposed to sell thousands and thousands of vehicles to Korea.

Well, I will tell you what: we have sold 3,400 more vehicles in that country—3,400.

Guess how much—since the trade agreement was signed with Korea, how many more they have sold to us. 125,000. 125,000.

Now, according to my math, they have sold to us 121,600 more cars than we have sold them. That means unemployment in Wisconsin. It means unemployment in Ohio. It means unemployment across this country. It means unemployment in the steel industry, unemployment in the machine tool industry. You can tick it off.

Now, they tell us agriculture was supposed to save us. Right? We have positive trade accounts in agriculture, and we are supposed to increase our exports to Korea. Guess what has happened. They are off by 41 percent—not just 4 percent, but 41 percent.

Our exports of poultry have fallen since this agreement was signed by 39 percent. Pork exports are down 34 percent. Beef exports are down to Korea 6 percent. U.S. meat producers have lost a combined total of $442 million in poultry, beef, and pork exports to Korea in the first 22 months of the agreement. That means more than $20 million lost every month.

So, Congressman POCAN, I am sure you have seen the impacts of this in Wisconsin. We have certainly seen it in Ohio, and we see these big trainloads coming through on rail of all these cars that they bring in here from the west coast that come from points over the Pacific or the Atlantic coming in to our country.

If you go to those countries and you look around on the streets, they not only don't buy U.S. cars; they don't buy cars from anyplace else but themselves.

□ 1900

So part of what we are doing with unemployment benefits is we are trying to make up for failures in our trade policy that have turned people away, away from the world of work and trying to struggle to make ends meet.

I will insert into the RECORD tonight a special report done by Public Citizen regarding the impacts of the U.S.-Korean so-called free trade agreement, and if this is the same template that the administration intends to use for bringing trade promotion authority in the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement up here, don't even start. Don't even start, because we have to reduce this and increase this, and until an agreement does that, we are not going to create more jobs in this country.

I will show you something. This is the big hole we are digging out of. We hear a lot about the budget deficit. Well, why do we have a budget deficit? We have a budget deficit because we have a trade deficit. We have had it now for one-quarter century, and every time we get into another one of those trade deals that are lopsided, what happens? We go deeper, deeper, and deeper into trade deficit. More and more companies close down; more and more people lose their work; and then we have to subsidize the differential between imports and exports through unemployment benefits.

We are trying to keep the hold, but we are not addressing this problem. This is after China PNTR. They told us: Oh, that will be so great; we are going to sell all this stuff to China. We fell deeper into deficit.

CAFTA—then they told us: Oh, Latin America, that will make it better. This is after Korea. It went down again.

What are we doing to America? We are ceding away our sovereignty in industry after industry. They have always said that electronics are going to save us. Those big, bad auto States? We are going to do better. Well, guess what? We have now fallen into deficit in advanced electronics. We are not even succeeding in exporting those. The people of this country have to pay attention because the heart and soul is being chipped away piece by piece. Try to find something made in this country—coats? shoes? cars? Some.

What we have is state economies like China competing against merchant economies like our own. And the auto industry got in such shape that it took the Government of the United States to prop it up and save it. We were faced with: Will the United States have an automobile industry or not? That is going to happen in other sectors. That is going to happen in steel, and that is going to happen in shoes. They didn't even fight. But if you look at every sector, unemployment, unemployment, unemployment—appliances, unemployment.

You can see it by census statistics. No matter what community you go to, we have had these lost jobs; and you look over 10 years, 2000 to 2010, poverty quadruples. Don't tell me those people don't want to work. They had jobs. The jobs disappeared.

You can go to these sweatshop countries and you can go find the production. Guess what? You can find TRICO now in Mexico. They used to make windshield wipers in Buffalo, New York. It was a major employer. The man who founded the company had a decent soul. He had a huge foundation that helped that community. It still does to this day. But all those jobs have moved down south of the border. No decent wage, no benefits, nothing. No corporate conscience at all.

That is happening from one end of this country to the other. America has a rude awakening ahead of her. It goes through Democratic and Republican administrations, and the American people know it. They know that it doesn't change here. Unemployment benefits are the least we can do for the American people—the people who went to work, they believed in making a good product, and now they have fallen onto hard times. Don't tell me it is all their fault.

I have done job fairs in my district. Thousands of people show up. There aren't enough jobs for everyone that wants to work. I would invite any President, any former President.

I would like to invite George Bush II to travel with me, because he came to my district. I would like to take him and show him where in Mexico these jobs have gone. Come with me to Guangdong province in China. I will show you where our jobs have gone. I will take you to Honduras. Then, do you know what? I am going to make everybody who comes with me work like those women work, and then you tell me why we face an unemployment benefit crisis in this country and what kind of a society we have here.

Those are earned benefits. Those belong to the people who have devoted their lives to going to work, earning a living, and trying to get ahead in an honorable way and in an honest way, and they deserve them.

So I want to thank you, Congressman POCAN, for giving me time this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I place this article from Public Citizen in the RECORD that summarizes everything that has gone haywire with the U.S.-Korean so-called free trade agreement.

ON SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF U.S.-KOREA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT, U.S. EXPORTS DOWN 11 PERCENT, IMPORTS FROM KOREA UP AND DEFICIT WITH KOREA BALLOONS 47 PERCENT—FUELING CONGRESSIONAL SKEPTICISM ABOUT OBAMA TPP EXPORT PROMISES

EXPORT DECLINE HITS U.S. FARMERS AND AUTO WORKERS PARTICULARLY HARD, DISMAL OUTCOMES OF PACT-USED AS TPP TEMPLATE WILL BOLSTER OPPOSITION TO OBAMA BID FOR FAST TRACK AUTHORITY

WASHINGTON, DC.—Two years after the implementation of the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement (FTA), government data reveal that the Obama administration's promises that the pact would expand U.S. exports and create U.S. jobs are exactly opposite of the actual outcomes: a downfall in U.S. exports to Korea, rising imports and a surge in the U.S. trade deficit with Korea. Using the administration's export-to-job ratio, the estimated drop in net U.S. exports to Korea in the FTA's first two years represents the loss of more than 46,600 U.S. jobs.

The damaging Korea FTA record, detailed in a new Public Citizen report, undermines the administration's attempt to use the same failed export growth promises to sell an already skeptical Congress on Fast Track authority for the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), a sweeping deal for which the Korea FTA was the template.

Contrary to the administration's promise that the Korea FTA would mean ''more exports, more jobs'':

U.S. goods exports to Korea have fallen below the pre-FTA average monthly level for 21 out of 22 months since the deal took effect.

The United States has lost an average of $385 million each month in exports to Korea, given an 11 percent decline in the average monthly export level in comparison to the year before the deal.

The United States lost an estimated, cumulative $9.2 billion in exports to Korea under the FTA's first two years, compared with the exports that would have been achieved at the pre-FTA level.

Average monthly exports of U.S. agricultural products to Korea have fallen 41 percent.

The average monthly U.S. automotive trade deficit with Korea has grown 19 percent.

The U.S. exports downfall is particularly concerning given that Korea's overall imports from all countries increased by 2 percent over the past two years (from 2011 to 2013).

The average monthly trade deficit with Korea has ballooned 47 percent in comparison to the year before the deal. As U.S. exports to Korea have declined under the FTA, average monthly imports from Korea have risen four percent. The total U.S. trade deficit with Korea under the FTA's just-completed second year is projected to be $8.6 billion higher than in the year before the deal, assuming that trends during the FTA's first 22 months continue for the remaining two months for which data is not yet available.

Meanwhile, U.S. services exports to Korea have slowed under the FTA. While U.S. services exports to Korea increased at an average quarterly rate of 3.0 percent in the year before the FTA took effect, the average quarterly growth rate has fallen to 2.3 percent since the deal's enactment—a 24 percent drop.

''Most Americans won't be surprised that another NAFTA-style deal is causing damage, but it's stunning that the administration thinks the public and Congress won't notice if it recycles the promises used to sell the Korea pact—now proven empty—to push a Trans-Pacific deal that is literally based on the Korea FTA text,'' said Lori Wallach, director of Public Citizen's Global Trade Watch. ''The new evidence of the Korea FTA's damaging record is certain to make it even more difficult for the Obama administration to get Congress to delegate its constitutional trade authority via Fast Track for the TPP.''

The decline in U.S. exports under the Korea FTA contributed to an overall zero percent growth in U.S. exports in 2013, rendering virtually impossible Obama's stated goal to double exports by the end of 2014. At the export growth rate seen over the past two years, the export-doubling goal would not be reached until 2054. While the Korea pact is the only U.S. FTA that has led to an actual decline in U.S exports, the overall growth of U.S. exports to nations that are not FTA partners has exceeded combined U.S. export growth to U.S. FTA partners by 30 percent over the past decade.

''The data simply do not support the Obama administration's tired pitch that more FTAs will bring more exports,'' said Wallach. ''Faced with falling exports and rising, job-displacing deficits under existing FTAs, the administration needs to find a new model, not to repackage an old one that patently failed.''

The Korea FTA has produced very few winners; since the FTA took effect, U.S. average monthly exports to Korea have fallen in 11 of the 15 sectors that export the most to Korea, relative to the year before the FTA. And while losing sectors have faced relatively steep export declines (e.g. a 12 percent drop in computer and electronics exports, a 30 percent drop in mineral and ore exports), none of the winning sectors has experienced an average monthly export increase of greater than two percent. Ironically, many sectors that the administration promised would be the biggest beneficiaries of the Korea FTA have been some of the deal's largest losers.

AGRICULTURE: While the administration argued for passage of the FTA in 2011 by claiming, ''The U.S.-Korea trade agreement creates new opportunities for U.S. farmers, ranchers and food processors seeking to export to Korea's 49 million consumers,'' average monthly exports of U.S. agricultural products to Korea have fallen 41 percent under the FTA.

U.S. average monthly poultry exports to Korea have fallen 39 percent.

U.S. average monthly pork exports to Korea have fallen 34 percent.

U.S. average monthly beef exports to Korea have fallen 6 percent.

Compared with the exports that would have been achieved at the pre-FTA average monthly level, U.S. meat producers have lost a combined $442 million in poultry, pork and beef exports to Korea in the first 22 months of the Korea deal—a loss of more than $20 million in meat exports every month.

AUTOS AND AUTO PARTS: The administration also promised the Korea FTA would bring ''more job-creating export opportunities in a more open and fair Korean market for America's auto companies and auto workers,'' while a special safeguard would ''ensure . . . that the American industry does not suffer from harmful surges in Korean auto imports due to this agreement.'' The U.S. average monthly automotive exports to Korea under the FTA have been $12 million higher than the pre-FTA monthly average, but the average monthly automotive imports from Korea have soared by $263 million under the deal—a 19 percent increase. So while U.S. auto exports have risen very modestly under the FTA, those tiny gains have been swamped by a surge in auto imports from Korea that the administration promised would not occur under the FTA.

In January 2014, monthly auto imports from Korea topped $2 billion for the first time on record.

About 125,000 more Korean-produced Hyundais and Kias were imported and sold in the United States in 2013 (after the FTA) than in 2011 (before the FTA).

Sales of U.S.-produced Fords, Chryslers and Cadillacs in Korea increased by just 3,400 vehicles.

The post-FTA flood of automotive imports has provoked a 19 percent increase in the average monthly U.S. auto trade deficit with Korea. The Obama administration has sought to distract from this dismal result by touting the percentage increase in U.S. auto sales to Korea. This allows the sale of a small number of cars beyond the small pre-FTA base of sales to appear to be a significant gain when in fact it is not.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you so much, Representative KAPTUR, again for your history of support not only for working families across Ohio. I know we are

going to talk more about trade in this body. Thank you for sharing that information.

With that, I am going to close the Special Order hour for the Progressive Caucus. It is imperative that this body pass the extension of the emergency unemployment benefits. The House Democrats have filed a discharge petition. We will do everything we can to force a vote off that; but we are hoping that the Senate, now that they have a bipartisan agreement, can get that passed as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time on behalf of the Progressive Caucus.

KEYSTONE PIPELINE AND ENERGY SECURITY

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

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, we have just gone through an hour of talking about uninsured, and I want to talk an hour about creating jobs and that it is time to build the Keystone pipeline.

The Keystone pipeline has just reached its 2,001st day of the birth of its permit, 2,001 days that this country has waited for our President to sign the permit allowing the construction of the Keystone pipeline.

Why is the Keystone pipeline important to us? First of all, the Keystone pipeline brings oil from Canada into the United States to six of our refineries. This provides us a level of energy security that is absolutely necessary in today's world. In fact, when I talk about today's world, let's talk about current events for just 1 second here.

This is a newspaper article that was just released a few hours ago:

> Retired General James Jones told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on Thursday that approving the pipeline would send a message to Russian President Vladimir Putin and other ''international bullies'' that they cannot use energy security as a weapon.
>
> Jones said rejection of the Canada-to-Texas pipeline would ''make Mr. Putin's day and strengthen his hand.''
>
> The Senate panel was holding its first hearing on the pipeline 5 years after it was proposed as Democrats wrestle with its impact on the outcome of next fall's election.

The reality is, in a geopolitical sense, Russia is using energy as a new economic weapon to control the countries that it once dominated as the Soviet Union. We have a new energy—well, it is a renaissance. Because of new technologies and new abilities, we are finding oil and natural gas within our own borders; but if we can team up with Canada's oil in a North American oil pact, the reality is we will no longer be relying on Venezuela. In fact, the amount that comes through the pipeline, the proposed Keystone pipeline, would completely offset Venezuelan oil. It doesn't matter what your party registration is; I think all of us would agree that if we didn't have to rely on Venezuelan oil, that makes us a more secure country.

Now, I want to talk about some of the other advantages besides just geopolitical. The first is 42,000 jobs. Now, I know a lot of the opponents to this pipeline say that it is a myth that it creates 42,000 jobs, but the reality is that when you add the direct jobs—for example, the hundreds if not 1,000 people from Nebraska that would go to work on the pipeline as it comes through Montana, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas—but what it also employs are all that we would call downstream, the downstream that would work on the refineries to upgrade them to be able to handle the additional oil and the oil that would come to them, and those refineries are in Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Kansas.

But then we can look about, okay, what are all the other indirect jobs? For example, Mr. GRIFFIN is going to talk about and mention a company in his district in Arkansas that actually fabricates, takes the steel that is hopefully made in America and fabricates it into the pipeline. So there are thousands of indirect jobs that rely on the construction.

Now, when I am out and about, I hear all these myths that have been perpetuated on the Keystone pipeline, and I just want to bat a few of them down tonight.

First of all, some of the environmental extremists that are opposing the Keystone pipeline tell people that it will increase CO_2, or carbon, in our air. The reality is the environmental studies and the final study concluded that not only does it not increase carbon, but because it will transfer transportation of the oil from train and trucks to a zero-emission pipeline, it will actually reduce carbon output; because the reality is the carbon output to extract the oil from the oil sands is diminishing, and the reality is that oil, as it is pumped out or created there, will be used. So if you stop the Keystone pipeline, the reality is there will be more carbon emitted.

In a recent meeting with the Canadian officials, they stressed to me that they are going ahead with their pipelines reversing the flow so that they can pump oil from the oil sands to the east coast of Canada and then will export it. Then they also have already accumulated all of the right-of-way necessary for a pipeline to the west and will build a second one to the west.

What that means is that, okay, they used the pipeline, but now it goes on a ship and is sent to China, so we lose the opportunities except for what can be brought by train and truck into the United States and makes us less secure.

Now, those are environmental studies that have done this. This is science. This is from reputable engineering firms in one of our national laboratories.

One of the other myths is that this pipeline won't be safe, that there have been leaks in the first Keystone pipeline that is already carrying some of the oil over. The reality is there were leaks in the first Keystone pipeline. They were defective seals that have been replaced, and the leaks have stopped.

Now, this pipeline has been studied safetywise more than any others. The liquid pipeline industry's safety performance initiative reflects these conclusions: first of all, that pipeline safety statistics deliver 99.999 percent of crude oil and petroleum products each year safely; 14 billion barrels of crude oil and petroleum products delivered in the pipeline in 2012; 62 percent decline in the number of pipeline releases since 2001; and 47 percent decline in the number of barrels released since 2001.

□ 1915

The reality is not only are pipelines becoming safer, but the pipeline, this Keystone pipeline has 59 special conditions placed upon it above all other pipelines. Most of these are to mitigate any risk of spilling or of a leak. If there is a leak, one of the other conditions is that they have to have people within a 2-hour drive to be able to stop that leak, thereby minimizing that leak.

Now, there is another myth about it hurting the Ogallala aquifer. They said that hasn't been studied, but the reality is that 22,000 pages of environmental studies that have been submitted to the State Department and made final clearly state that it has a minimal impact on the Ogallala aquifer. And when you read into the facts of the Ogallala—I learned something, growing up in Nebraska. We assumed that it was a big underground lake. What it is, it is a series of rock formations that capture water. So when you have a heavy crude, if it would leak, it is easier to pick up than a lighter crude or a gas. And because it is a rocky formation, it would trap it and not allow it to leak where they could get down there to where the leak was and be able to pump it out without further injuring the Ogallala aquifer. So the fact that it can pollute this huge underground lake that doesn't really exist all of the way down to Kansas is a myth, if you talk to the real geologists and the environmental folks, experts, in this area.

Now, does the Keystone pipeline have an economic impact? Yes. It will have $2 billion worth of earnings throughout the U.S., property tax revenue, through the property taxes paid along the pipeline to the communities that will help schools and counties with their budgets.

Now, one other thing that I hear once in a while is that Canadian oil sands are more dangerous or dirtier than other oils. The fact is that the U.S. currently imports 1.4 million barrels of this crude daily. Nearly all of it is transported by already existing pipelines or trucks or trains, and there has

not been a single recorded pipeline rupture caused by the oil sands. That is one of the other things—because of the chemical that they use to help it slide down the pipeline and be pumped, that somehow that weakens the pipeline, but that is just not true.

Then I hear, and this is another one that is famous: the Keystone XL pipeline is going to increase gas prices. Well, first of all if you know economics, if you know oil economics, you go: Huh? How can that be? It just defies logic and defies common sense. The reality is that in a memo by the Department of Energy regarding Keystone XL, it asserted that the gasoline prices in all markets served, and this is the Department of Energy saying it, the Obama administration Department of Energy saying this, they asserted that gasoline prices in all markets served by refineries on the east coast and the gulf would decrease, including in the Midwest. The discount from WTI crude does not and has not translated into lower gasoline prices in the Midwest. This is because the Midwest must import gasoline from outside of the region, forcing buyers to pay global market prices. Bringing new pipeline capacity online would allow WTI to reconnect with other benchmark prices while simultaneously helping to drive down the price of oil and gasoline.

This dovetails into my last myth, and that is all of this oil is just going to be exported anyway, so why risk any environmental issues in the United States if all it is going to be is put on ships and exported.

That is just pure bull. That is an emotional argument that has no basis in truth. There are six refineries that are contracting for this oil to refine it into gasoline and other products. The United States uses gasoline. The gasoline that is refined from this product and those six refineries is going to stay in the United States.

Can you say that 100 percent of every barrel is not going to be exported? No, because there are a variety of products made from a barrel of oil, including lubricants that are not even used in the United States but are used in other places. Those will be exported. Some of the diesel will be exported. But the reality is that the gasoline that we care about stays in the United States. It is just a fact that it will stay here. It just baffles me that people say that it is all going to be exported and it is going to raise gas prices, and none of it is true.

At this time I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate the gentleman yielding. I rise today to discuss our country's energy future, and specifically the role of the Keystone XL pipeline.

I am going to reiterate a little bit what the leader of this Special Order has already stated.

Due to recently technological innovations, the United States is the number one producer of natural gas in the world today. That is hard to believe when you think about 20 years ago and what the naysayers were saying where we were going to be.

In oil production, we are set to pass Saudi Arabia by the year 2020. This is a long way from the gas lines of the 1970s, when there were restrictions at gas stations on how many gallons you could buy or on what days you could buy gas. I can remember going to gas stations and you had a number on the end, and they said this is the number we are taking today. If you didn't have it, you weren't buying gas. But today, that has changed. It has changed.

Today, we are on the cusp of a bright promising energy future where millions of jobs will be created because of it. We must ensure that the right policies are in place in order to realize our great energy potential. Again, that potential is there.

The Energy and Commerce Committee has heard testimony and passed numerous pieces of legislation aimed at ensuring that America is on the right path to energy prosperity. One of the quickest solutions is to build the Keystone XL pipeline. Thanks to Mr. TERRY's leadership on the Keystone XL pipeline, we passed a bill to approve it. The expansion of the pipeline will bring additional jobs, income, and investment into the United States. The project will produce up to 42,000 manufacturing, construction, and indirect jobs.

In my home State of Ohio, the project is projected to bring 2,419 jobs by 2015. These jobs will offer high wages, strong benefits, and a resurgence of America's hardworking taxpayers. The project will also produce approximately $20 billion in economic activity from food, lodging, construction equipment, supplies, and investments during the project development.

In my home district, the Fifth District, I have visited companies that are going to be making equipment for drilling and parts for large machinery that will bring oil from the pipeline. Not too long ago, I was at one company that was very proud to tell me that they are going to be adding on to their company today because they are going to be making equipment that will be used in the pipeline in its construction.

There is also a company that makes parts for the large machinery that will be operating up in Canada. Those are jobs in northwest Ohio, and those are the jobs that we want to keep. These are permanent jobs for people looking for good employment.

In our committee hearings, we had one panel that was very interesting. At one end of the table we had a representative from TransCanada, and at the other end of the table we had an individual who was representing the trades, whose men and women will be actually building this pipeline. It was very hard for them to understand why we weren't going forward with this project today to put these people to work because these people are going to be working. They will make sure that they have roofs over their families' heads, food on the table, and will be saving money for their kids' education and putting money away for their own retirement.

This pipeline is going to bring about 830,000 barrels of oil into the United States every day. We have a great friend and neighbor to the north, Canada. For every $1 we send to Canada, we will get about 90 cents back. We send billions of dollars every year overseas for oil to some countries who aren't our greatest friends.

As we speak, due to the President's foot dragging, Canada is studying an eastern route across her southern border that would bypass the United States and send her oil to her eastern ports to ship that oil some place else. What is wrong with this picture? They want to send it south, not east. Talk to them.

Another point about the Keystone pipeline is that it is a $7 billion privately funded project. Once that oil would reach its destination in the United States, as Mr. TERRY has already said, it will be refined into many products, putting Americans again to work.

The pipeline is expected to generate more than $585 million in State and local taxes in the States the pipeline passes. I was a county commissioner for 6 years, and I know what that means to be putting back into local government.

Approval of this energy project should not be controversial, but President Obama and his administration have made this commonsense, shovel-ready project a cornerstone of partisanship and needless delays. Two thousand days have passed since the Keystone XL pipeline application was filed. This pipeline has undergone more State and Federal assessment than any previous pipeline, and every assessment has come back to the same conclusion: that the pipeline will have minimal environmental impact. Further, the Keystone XL pipeline will be the most advanced pipeline in operation, using the most reliable materials and innovative technology. In fact, the pipeline will include 57 extra safety measures, which led the U.S. State Department to declare that the project would have a degree of safety over any other.

Another benefit: the Keystone XL will provide additional capacity to our current pipeline infrastructure.

Finally, again to point out what Mr. TERRY has already said, that this is about our security, not just energy security, but our national security, because as Americans pick up their paper and look at the news in the evening and they see what is happening in Ukraine, people in Europe are fearful of what is going on because energy is being used as a weapon against them. We want to make sure that we are independent in this country. We want to make sure that Americans can go to bed every night and say we can take

care of ourselves, and we can take care of ourselves with oil from a country north of us who is one of our greatest friends and neighbors.

This project has the support of the American people, the United States House and Senate, and it is time for the President to put jobs, community investment, and energy security before politics and approve this pipeline.

I thank Mr. TERRY for leading this very important energy Special Order tonight.

Mr. TERRY. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

I think if there is someone watching C–SPAN and they watched the first hour, the Democratic hour, and now they are watching us, they are seeing how they advocated for unemployment insurance, and we are advocating for jobs. It is quite a stark difference in our philosophies showing on the House floor tonight.

At this time I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. GRIFFIN).

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support once again for the immediate approval of the Keystone XL pipeline. I feel like I have been doing this year after year, calling for the President to move forward with the Keystone pipeline, and I realize I have been doing this year after year, pretty much since I got here in 2011.

And every day, as the gentleman from Nebraska mentioned, every day there is another name added to the list of folks who say: You know what, this does make sense.

When I look closely at the articles, I see that it is a former Obama administration official, and the next day, another former Obama administration official, and again and again and again. There was another one today, as the gentleman mentioned.

Just a few weeks ago, more than 2 years after President Obama first rejected the Keystone pipeline and more than 5 years after the application to build it was first submitted to the State Department, the government's latest environmental analysis of the Keystone pipeline project was released.

This analysis showed very clearly that this project will have little environmental impact, provide much-needed jobs, and contribute $3.4 billion to our economy.

What you have in this situation now is the President waiting for a report; the report comes out from his State Department. Waiting for another report, and then one comes out from the Academy of Sciences. If he keeps waiting, there are not going to be any reports left, and the only decision left will be his decision. That is really where we are.

□ 1930

Hardworking Americans are ready for a real, all-of-the-above energy strategy. The need for this is made more and more clear by what has been going on with Russia and Ukraine, but the Obama administration continues to block this critical infrastructure project and all the good-paying jobs it would create.

I believe they are doing it for one reason and one reason only—politics—because they have some extreme supporters that they want to keep relatively happy in an election year. That is what this is all about.

Where I live in Little Rock, Arkansas, workers at a company called Welspun have manufactured hundreds of miles of pipe, but it is just sitting in a storage yard because the President refuses to let the Keystone XL pipeline be built.

In fact, I was wondering whether there was still some out there, and we confirmed today there is still about 350 miles of pipe sitting out there in the yard.

Last September, Dave Delie, the head of Welspun, testified to Congress that the Keystone XL project has so far employed more than 600 Arkansans for over 1½ years at Welspun alone.

Imagine how many other people could get paychecks, could have a job, for all the other work related to the pipeline, including construction work and operation of the pipeline. Americans are looking for work right now. They have waited long enough. It is time to build this pipeline.

I understand that folks—some folks—are worried about protecting the environment and making sure our families and children have clean water to drink. I am too, so let's not argue over settled science.

Research released last year from the National Academy of Sciences concludes that the oil sands crude Keystone will transport is no more corrosive than other crude oils and does not increase the risk of leaks.

We all saw what happened when a train carrying oil in Canada derailed last July. Most of an entire town was obliterated, and nearly 50 people were killed. That was tragic and devastating.

We know that pipelines are safer. We know this. The solution is clear. We need to improve and modernize our pipeline infrastructure, and the Keystone XL project will include over 50 additional safety measures.

President Obama and Secretary Kerry should do the right thing for our environment and the right thing for American workers. Let's create jobs. Let's build Keystone now.

Mr. TERRY. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas.

At this time, I want to yield to our friend from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. Thank you, Mr. TERRY, and thank you for your leadership on this issue. I am honored to serve on the subcommittee that you chair.

The discussion this evening has been on unemployment insurance, and that is a worthy discussion. Almost all Americans want to work. The best way for Americans to work is for jobs to be created. The unemployment rate in this country is far too high and the labor participation rate in this country is at a 30-year low.

To those of us who are concerned particularly about the labor participation rate, the best way to get that rate up and to have jobs created is to create jobs, and that is what the Keystone pipeline will do.

Like many Americans and, certainly, like many Americans whom I represent in north/central New Jersey, I have been incredibly frustrated by the repeated and unnecessary delays in moving forward with the construction of the Keystone XL pipeline.

As Chairman TERRY has pointed out, it has been more than 2,000 days since TransCanada filed its first application to build Keystone. This is a disappointing milestone for this important economic and energy project.

2,000 days is a long time, and not making a decision is making a decision. It is making a negative decision. The people of the United States deserve a decision to be made and, in my judgment, deserve an affirmative decision.

We, of course, have passed legislation in this regard. I am very proud of the Energy and Commerce Committee on which Mr. TERRY and I serve. American-made energy production is one of the few bright spots in today's struggling U.S. economy.

This is due to a series of factors, and of course, our abundance of American gas is at the heart of that. As innovation leads to greater production, the Energy and Commerce Committee, under the leadership of Chairman FRED UPTON and of the united effort of those of us on the Republican side, we have been working together to pass measures that will bring increased American-made energy to consumers and businesses.

The Keystone XL pipeline is an important piece of our all-of-the-above energy policy strategy, and we believe—and I think this is demonstrated conclusively—that this will help lower energy costs, create jobs, and reduce our dependence on foreign sources of oil.

Foreign sources of oil, of course, come from dangerous parts of the world, not only the Middle East, but Venezuela as well. We need to be less dependent on foreign sources of oil, and that is why we have promoted the all-of-the-above strategy.

Those who have opposed the Keystone project cite environmental concerns. I certainly respect environmental concerns. I try to be a strong environmentalist, and I know my colleagues on both sides of the aisle try to be strong environmentalists.

The U.S. State Department report regarding environmental concerns related to Keystone found that the project would have a minimal negative impact on the environment. I believe that we should look at the science and what has been demonstrated, that this would not negatively affect the environment in any meaningful way.

The State Department report also outlined some of the other benefits that would come with the project—as Chairman TERRY has pointed out—42,000 direct and indirect jobs, this at a time when our economy needs to have more in the workforce, so that we can rely less heavily on unemployment insurance, rely more heavily on getting Americans back to work, and make sure that our labor participation rate increases.

The report also indicates that there would be 3,900 construction jobs. These are high-paying jobs. This is what America should really be about: construction, making things. That has been the history of America, certainly in most parts of this country.

This would be of enormous benefit not only to the center of the country, but, in my judgment, to the entire country. Of course, the report also says that there is an estimated $3.4 billion in a boost to our economy.

I was interested to read the testimony today of General James Jones, the distinguished former National Security Adviser to President Obama. He came out in favor of the Keystone pipeline today, as has been referenced by Chairman TERRY and by my distinguished colleague from Arkansas, and I am sure by others who will speak this evening.

General Jones has had a distinguished career in service to the United States of America, a career regarding our national security.

There are national security concerns, Chairman TERRY, regarding the Keystone pipeline. Canada is one of our best friends. Canada has stood with us. We can recall all of the times in the past where Canadians have come to help the United States.

Recently, in Mexico, there was a summit among the Prime Minister of Canada, the President of Mexico, and the President of the United States. Certainly, the Prime Minister of Canada favors the construction of Keystone. That is one of the many reasons that we should move forward with Keystone.

Most important of all is our own national security, our own creation of jobs, but also we should be a friend to Canada as Canada has been a friend to us. If we do not build it, then, of course, the Canadians might look elsewhere. They might turn east to China, yet another reason to build Keystone.

Of course, the situation that now exists regarding Russia and its terrible actions involving the Crimea and perhaps even other parts of Ukraine, yet another reason, in my judgment, to build Keystone.

After enduring more than 5 years of review of red tape and of delay, I do not believe there is any reason left for President Obama not to approve Keystone XL and to approve it immediately.

I would urge the President, in all sincerity, to examine what is best in the interest of the United States, to examine what is best in the interest of making sure that we move forward together.

It is time to create U.S. jobs from this aspect of energy. It is time to reduce U.S. dependence on foreign oil from unstable sources. It is time to build the Keystone pipeline, long past time.

Mr. TERRY, I commend your leadership this evening.

Mr. TERRY. Thank you. It was about a year ago this time that H.R. 3, one of our leadership bills, came through our Energy and Commerce Committee that would have permitted the Keystone pipeline passed overwhelmingly with bipartisan support in this Chamber.

It has been sitting on Senator REID's desk for over a year now—42,000 jobs that could be created collecting dust.

I yield to our friend from Virginia, Mr. MORGAN GRIFFITH. If you would give us your thoughts on the Keystone pipeline?

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Well, I have to tell you, first of all, I appreciate your leadership on this. Ever since I got to Congress 4 years ago, this has been an important item for you, not just because it will help the United States, not just because it will help your district, but because it is the right thing to do.

I commend you for that hard work that you have been doing and will continue to do until this project is actually approved. I hope that will be sooner than later.

It would be nice if our bill that we had passed with bipartisan support would have action taken on it by the Senate. I don't know how the good Senator sits down with all those bills in his back pocket. He has got a lot of our good bills back there.

Mr. TERRY. We in the House have passed about 430 bills. 89 of them actually gotten out of the Senate. Well over about 100, I guess—maybe even more than 100—actually are like the Keystone pipeline, that would create—immediately create jobs, but yet they are sitting on a desk.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. That is what we need in this country. We need opportunities. We need abilities. Bottom line, we need policies that will create jobs. I have got to tell you that one of the favorite things that I do as a United States Congressman is I go to the high schools in my district, and I talk with the students.

Sometimes, it is middle school students. Most of the time, it is senior high students. I talk to them, and I talk about how the decisions that we are making in Washington and the policies that we set here in the Nation's Capital will affect them far more than they affect me because, long-term, when you look at the debt and the deficit and you look at the effects on our health care system that have been coming down with various policies, these will all have a greater impact on them than they will on us.

Particularly talking about debt and deficit, I will often say to them: Well, who do you think is going to pay more of that, me at 55 or you at 17 or 18?

They get it real quick. One of the things I always make sure I try to put into the question and answer process as I am talking with the students is this: the United States of America is a great country. We are the number one economic nation. There are a lot of other countries out there that would like to be the number one economic nation.

While things do not look good in the short run, if those of us in Washington, including the President of the United States and the Senate and the House, make the right policies and have a true all-of-the-above energy policy for this country, we can be the number one economic nation, not just for the next decade, not just for the next 20 years, but I submit to you for the next 100 years.

□ 1945

That's a big deal.

That means jobs and prosperity for the people of the United States for a long, long time. Then I say, but if we make mistakes in Washington—if we don't have a true all-of-the-above policy where we use North American oil, natural gas, coal, wind, solar, nuclear, across the board—we can slip out of that number one spot, and we won't have the advantages that the number one economic nation has had throughout history, and I always mention the Keystone XL pipeline. The reason I mention the Keystone XL pipeline is that it sends a message to the world that the United States is open for business, that we want jobs in this country.

We can send those jobs to China if we want, like we have done in so many other areas, but we want those jobs. We want the jobs in laying the pipeline. We want the jobs in doing the refining. We want the jobs that come from having that extra supply right here in our country, whether it be the oil or the gas that is produced from this oil or whether it be the chemicals that we can make cheaper because we have an abundant supply in North American oil.

It is true, as my colleagues have said, that we also want to make sure that we send a message to the world that we are going to stand with our friends in Canada. As the general said today, a former Obama adviser: Let's send a message to Vladimir Putin.

These are all combined in the Keystone XL pipeline, and when you have the reports on the environment that indicate minimal effect—in fact, some would argue that there may even be positive effects by the pipeline because you don't have to worry about the train system—then what you have got is the situation of ''why?'' Why would the President, with all of the reports and with the 2,000 days of study and jumping through hoops, not have already signed it? I am surprised he is not having a press conference as we speak to sign the Keystone XL pipeline. Let's get on with it.

I had one person tell me today that he believes that this is better than the

oil that we are importing from Venezuela because it has a less negative impact on the environment, our using this oil from Canada, and the Canadians are working to make their process even better so that it has less of an impact on the environment.

So I thank you, Mr. TERRY, for all of your hard work. If you can explain it to me, I would love to hear it, but I can't explain to the high school students in the Ninth District of Virginia why we are not pursuing the Keystone XL pipeline with haste instead of with delay when we know that it will create jobs for American citizens and for people like these high school students will be in a few years when they finish their educations.

Mr. TERRY. I am baffled, too, so I appreciate your comments.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to sum up here:

2,001 days since the permit for this pipeline was filed and over 22,000 pages of scientific review. This permit has been sitting around longer than it took the United States to win World War II. This permit has been here longer than it took Lewis and Clark to explore the Louisiana Purchase and come back. Eleven Federal agencies have participated in reviewing the Keystone pipeline—11 Federal agencies on top of the scientific studies. Every State in which the proposed Keystone pipeline route goes through has approved the pipeline and has independently reviewed it.

Six weeks ago, the President, right behind my right shoulder here, said that he would take out his phone and his pen and would act.

Mr. President, tonight, we ask you to pick up your phone. Call Prime Minister Harper and tell him, Yes, I am ready to sign the permit. Then take out your permit, sign it, and let's get 42,000 people back to work.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Mr. TERRY, even though I believe I know the answer to this question, I would just ask you: If the President needs a pen to sign that, would you take it down to him on Pennsylvania Avenue?

Mr. TERRY. I have got an extra one, and I will let him keep it.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. There you go.

Mr. TERRY. I would even let him keep it.

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

NATIONAL WOMEN'S HISTORY MUSEUM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAMALFA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) for 30 minutes.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank all of you for joining us this evening. I am delighted to be here to speak about the importance of the National Women's History Museum. I am so pleased to be joined by some of my colleagues who will speak about outstanding women from their States and in the history of our country, women who deserve to be recognized in this museum.

First, I would like to thank my colleague in this effort to create a national museum for women on or near The Mall. She is MARSHA BLACKBURN, from the great State of Tennessee, whose passion and unyielding commitment to making the National Women's History Museum a reality is unrivaled. She is a godsend, an inspiration, and a great friend to women, and I thank her so much for her extraordinary leadership and for the announcement I hope she will make tonight about March 25—moving our legislation forward.

Women stand on historical quicksand. With each step we take forward, the steps behind us disappear. Women have to re-create the wheel with every generation.

Think about what is taught in our American history classes. It is mostly written by men and focuses on their experiences. As my daughter said: It is usually about a bunch of wars between men. Where are the stories about the women?

In large part, women are invisible. History is empowering. It shapes who we are and provides role models to guide us.

We need a museum for half the generation, half the population—women. There are women's museums that focus on aspects of women First Ladies, of women artists, but not one in the United States or around the world, which I am aware of, that focuses on the sole accomplishments and contributions of half our population—women.

I now yield to my colleague, MARSHA BLACKBURN.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased to stand on the floor of the House and join my female colleagues from both sides of the aisle as we work together to make the dream a reality, which is the dream of a women's history museum, to celebrate the cause of wonderful women who have participated in the push and preservation of freedom here in the United States. It will, indeed, be a wonderful day when we see this as a reality.

As Mrs. MALONEY mentioned, we are moving forward legislation that would allow for the establishment of a commission to study where to place a museum. By the way, I think everyone will find it so interesting, which is that the women of this great Nation have said that we don't want any Federal money at all involved in this project. We are going to privately raise every single penny that is necessary for the location, for the physical facilities, for the exhibits, for the maintenance and upkeep and endowment. This is a project by the women of this Nation for the women of future generations to celebrate the accomplishments that women have made to the Nation.

Indeed, let's think about what has transpired in each and every State, and I hope, over the next few weeks, we have the option, as we celebrate Women's History Month, to talk about what women have accomplished in our country and what our States have contributed.

In Tennessee, we talk a good bit about what transpired when women got the right to vote. We had had all of the process through the fight with suffrage, and it came down to the point of ratification of the amendment to give women the right to vote and to make certain that we had the 36 States to ratify the 19th Amendment. It had been through 35 States, and on August 18 of 1920, it went to the Tennessee Legislature.

Guess what?

It was voted to a tie. There was a State rep, Harry Burn, and he was the one who broke the tie. As we often hear, the hand that rocks the cradle rules the world. Indeed, this is a story that is a great example of that because Harry Burn changed his vote and gave women the right to vote. Harry Burn did it because Harry got a letter from his mother. Here is the letter:

> Dear Son, hurrah and vote for suffrage. Don't keep them in doubt. I noticed some of the speeches against. They were bitter. I have been watching to see how you stood, but have not noticed anything yet. Don't forget to be a good boy, and help Mrs. Catt put the ''rat'' in ratification.
>
> Sincerely, your mother.

Harry Burn changed his vote, and Tennessee became the ''perfect 36''—the State that gave women the right to vote.

So, because of that, we are able to stand today in Women's History Month and push for a museum to celebrate the accomplishments of people like Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton and the suffragettes and so many other women whom we will have the opportunity to learn about and talk about.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. My colleague pointed out the historic importance of Tennessee in its giving women the right to vote.

It is interesting that both of our States played such a crucial effort in the women's leadership in achieving this right—Tennessee, the final vote, giving women the right to vote, and, New York, the birthplace of the women's movement and of the first resolutions and efforts to gain that right to vote—in Seneca Falls, New York, with Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Lucretia Mott, and Susan B. Anthony. Incidentally, they were all Republicans, and yet they gave their lives so that we could have the right to vote.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I think it is so significant that, again, those two States joined in pushing forward H.R. 863.

I want to commend Chairman CANDICE MILLER and the Admin Committee for the hearing they have already held on the legislation and to

take the opportunity to announce that Chairman HASTINGS and the Natural Resources Committee will hold their hearing on March 25. So it is another step as our States and women from our States move forward on moving this to becoming a reality—something women have wanted in this country since they got the right to vote.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. The gentlelady is so correct. We are making history tonight, and we are making history with these hearings.

It was noteworthy of CANDICE MILLER, from the great State of Michigan, that the day she held the hearing was the day that Mary Barra came up the ranks from an intern to the head and CEO of one of America's greatest companies, General Motors.

So I look forward to hearing from my colleagues here. In order of appearance, MARCY KAPTUR, from the great State of Ohio, is a great leader for women and, really, all people, thank you for joining me. You are making history, too, with all of your hard work.

Ms. KAPTUR. Thank you. It is just great to be here this evening and to have so many women gathered on the floor—women Members. That in itself is historic.

As an Ohio Representative, I want to voice my support of your bill, H.R. 863, the National Women's History Commission Act, to study the potential creation of a National Women's History Museum in Washington, D.C., on our mall of democracy, our Nation's Mall.

I can't thank CAROLYN MALONEY of New York and MARSHA BLACKBURN of Tennessee more on behalf of the people whom I represent. The part of Ohio that I come from has really been the leading region of our State to elevate women to public life. I will enter some of that in the RECORD this evening, but in a personal way, let me say that, when I first got here in the 1980s, there were 24 women who were serving in the House.

□ 2000

A dear, dear Member from Louisiana, Congresswoman Lindy Boggs, took me and shepherded me through those rather unusual days. I can remember finally being elected to the Appropriations Committee. When I walked in, there were only the two of us. Virginia Smith from Nebraska was there. Virginia was a Republican. That was it. And me. It was just a different experience. It was like you ended up in heaven and you just saw who was there for the first time.

Over the years, I befriended many people. In 1995, I wrote a book about the women of Congress. I thought it would be easy. But what I found so difficult was, where were the primary materials? I ended up spending more time doing research on women who had served up to that point. I thought, Wow, this is really a huge vacuum.

I drove up to Maine to interview then retired-Senator Margaret Chase Smith. I recorded her. She had created next to her home a tiny little museum where she had some of her papers, and I thought, Oh, my gosh, there really isn't any place for this nationally, and yet this is such a significant person—the first woman to have served both in the House and the Senate.

So as I got into that book, I realized how these materials were all over the country and not really well gathered at all. Then, one of the women from our State, Mary Regula, who was married to former Congressman Ralph Regula of Ohio, worked for years to build the National First Ladies Museum in Canton, Ohio. I went there for the dedication. I am on the board. I saw how Mary and Ralph fought for that for years. It should have been so easy, but it was so hard.

As you go through that particular museum and you start reading the lives of the First Ladies, you are actually shocked to read what really happened and the materials that have been brought together. It was proof to me that the history of women really is yet to be recorded.

So I came down here tonight to compliment you on your efforts and to say that in the region that I come from, we have now seen women rise to positions of heading universities and major corporations. Obviously, women are the anchors for their families and communities in so many ways. They are physicians, engineers, attorneys, judges, athletes, Justices of our Supreme Court. Janet Yellen is now the first woman to head the Federal Reserve of our country. Finally, maybe she will straighten things out.

They are military personnel and legislators. They are career paths that had once been blocked or not even considered for women.

I wanted to come down here this evening and say I stand with you.

I am dedicating my remarks tonight in honor of a constituent of my own district, Mrs. Mattie McAlister, who has just celebrated her 90th birthday. Even as she begins her tenth decade of life, she maintains a full schedule. She is a grandma to all. She teaches children—and she has for years—full time at the Grace Community Center in the heart of our community of Toledo.

The lessons she has learned in her own life are passed on to new generations as the children learn through example. Mrs. McAlister maintains an active social life as well and is involved civic and church life. Throughout her life she has never hesitated to be involved serving her family, church, and community with dignity and grace.

She deserves to be honored in this Women's History Month because she is, fundamentally, a teacher. No child that walks by her doesn't learn. All these years that she has technically been retired, she still teaches in a community that is most in need of her shepherding ways and her incredible gifts as a teacher.

So I want to compliment both of you for allowing the American people to record the history of over half of our citizenry in a way that brings them into full view.

I can guarantee you that you have begun a project that is going to take the rest of your lives to complete. It is a mammoth undertaking, and one that certainly deserves our attention here in the Congress. How great to be living in this great moment in history where we can actually make it a reality.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Thank you so much for your inspiring comments.

I would just to briefly note that one needs to go no further than today's history textbooks to see why our museum is so important.

Approximately 10 percent of historic references in U.S. history textbooks refer to women. Less than 8 percent of the statues in National Parks are of women leaders. Our U.S. Capitol building, which hosts millions of tourists each year, displays only 15 statues of women out of the more than 200 currently on exhibit.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. We are so delighted that Mrs. LUMMIS is here to join with us. I have to tell you she was quite a trailblazer in her State before coming to Congress, as she served as her State's treasurer.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. At this time I yield to the gentlelady from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

Mrs. LUMMIS. I thank the gentlelady from New York and the gentlelady from Tennessee. Along with the gentlelady from Ohio, and someone we will hear from shortly, the gentlelady from Florida, it is an honor to be with you tonight.

I represent the State that is officially known as the ''Equality State,'' and that is for this reason: Wyoming is the first government in the world to continuously and fully grant women the right to vote.

Most people think that had to have been some State associated with the Eastern intelligentsia, but here is the real story.

In the Wyoming Territory, the legislature passed into law on December 10, 1869, a measure stating:

> That every woman at the age of 21 years, residing in this territory, may, at every election, to be holden under the laws thereof, cast her vote.

This Suffrage Act granted women in the Wyoming Territory the right to vote with full civil and judicial equality with men.

The first woman to cast her ballot pursuant to those rights was Louisa Swain. She voted in Laramie on September 6, 1870, becoming the Nation's first woman voter under laws guaranteeing absolute political equality with men.

Now think about that. That is 1870. That is 50 years before the 19th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. She was a 70-year-old woman.

Here is the account of her vote in the Laramie Daily Sentinel:

> It is comforting to note that our first woman voter was really a lady . . . of the

highest social standing in the community, universally beloved and respected. The scene was in the highest degree interesting and impressive. There was just too much good sense in our community for any jeers or neers to be seen on such an occasion.

And so it was. Wyoming became the inspiration for the rest of the country.

Wyoming didn't become a State until 1890, and that brought upon the codification of this suffrage right through the ratification of the new Wyoming State constitution.

The Congress of the United States—the very Congress in which we stand—threatened to withhold statehood from Wyoming because we had granted women the right to vote. The Territory's legislators replied with a telegram stating that Wyoming would remain out of the union a hundred years rather than join without women's suffrage.

So President Benjamin Harrison, deferring to the wiser Wyoming territorial legislature, on July 10, 1890, signed into law a bill admitting Wyoming into the union and recognizing it as the Nation's Equality State.

Once again, events of the first woman voter happened in Wyoming 50 years before every woman in this country received the same rights. Consequently, Wyoming has an exemplary early history.

We have the first woman elected to statewide office in the Nation in 1804. She was Wyoming's superintendent of public instruction, Estelle Reel.

Why does that matter? Because she died and her estate and her belongings are currently in a little tiny, neglected museum in a town in the district belonging to the chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee, DOC HASTINGS, giving our chairman, who is going to hold a hearing later in this Congress, pride and reason to help us support obtaining Estelle Reel's property for this museum.

In 1870, Esther Hobart Morris from South Pass, Wyoming, was the first woman to hold judicial office in the world.

The first women delegates to both the national Democratic and the national Republican convention came from Wyoming.

We had the first woman elected Governor in the United States in 1925. She became the first woman director of the U.S. Mint.

By the way, Estelle Reel later became the first woman national superintendent of Indian schools.

The list goes on and on. We had the first woman bailiff and the first woman grand juror.

Wyoming's history is illustrious. That is why we are called the Equality State. We want very much to share that history with the rest of the country, and thanks to the gentlewomen here tonight who are leading the effort to share women's history in this country, that may become a reality.

I want to thank and salute the gentlewomen from New York and Tennessee who are leading this Special Order tonight and are leading this effort to create a national women's history museum. Wyoming looks forward to being a proud contributor. I look forward to being at the ribbon-cutting. I want to send so much history to you and share it with the people of this country. I am so delighted that you are leading this effort.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentlelady from Wyoming for sharing that incredible equality history and really inspiring me and Congresswoman BLACKBURN to work harder and harder to pass this important bill.

Imagine how much more inspired, confident, and successful women in general could be if our national narrative included an equal proportion of women's stories? I firmly believe that we wouldn't be trying to lean in—we would already be in.

Also helping us with this museum is the Representative from the great State of Florida. After very personal observation, I can tell you she is very hardworking. She happens to live with me. We share what we call the Members' House together. She is a trailblazer who keeps on knocking down trails and building new opportunities.

In addition to being an outstanding Member of Congress, she was elected and appointed by the President of the United States to chair the National Democratic Committee.

So I now yield to DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, my very good friend and housemate. Thank you for joining us tonight and thank you for all of your hard work.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you so much to my friend, the gentlelady from New York. It is an absolute privilege and pleasure to be your friend, to be your housemate, and to join you and our distinguished colleagues and friends on the House floor tonight to continue the press and the push for a national women's museum. This has been a longtime goal and passion of yours.

I was so pleased when you came home and told me of your excitement that you had enlisted the gentlelady from Tennessee to cosponsor this effort. I just knew between the two of you, it is very clear that this is going to happen, because the combination of BLACKBURN and MALONEY is just unstoppable, there is no question.

□ 2015

It is wonderful to be here with our colleague from Wyoming. We have had an opportunity to travel internationally together and actually, specifically, to the state of Israel, in which we had an incredible opportunity to bond.

That is what the women Members—in spite of maybe some of the disagreements and vitriol that, sadly, permeates the House of Representatives from time to time, the women Members really do have a bond.

The wonderful thing about our Women's Caucus is that we come together around issues like this, so when everything else is swirling around us in disagreement, the Women's Caucus' goal is always to come together and try to find some common ground and advance the cause of women.

Let me just take a moment to honor and acknowledge our wonderful colleague from Ohio, MARCY KAPTUR, because she is too humble and modest to brag on herself.

We should point out that she is actually currently the dean of women, the longest-serving woman in the House of Representatives today, and someone who I have the honor of serving on the House Appropriations Committee with.

She does a wonderful job, is an incredible advocate for the State of Ohio and for the Midwest, so I wanted to make sure we acknowledged her.

I am here, I am proud to join you, not only to continue our quest for a National Women's History Museum, but also to honor and acknowledge Women's History Month. We do that each March, where we honor and we remember the women who came before us, the women who worked to make the world a better place, who blazed trails for us to walk on and who opened doors for us to walk through.

I think each of us could tell a story about a woman whose shoulders we stand on. I know that, when I ran for the Florida House of Representatives when I was 25 years old, 21 years ago, that would never have been possible without the trail blazed by the women in Florida who came before me, who had it so tough, and who made it possible for me to even think about the possibility of running at that stage of my life.

So, really, we are here during Women's History Month to honor our foremothers and create a Women's History Museum to do just that.

We have historical activists like Mildred Loving, who, in 1967, successfully challenged the banning of interracial marriage in the U.S. Supreme Court.

We have more recent leaders, like Janet Yellen, who, this past year, became the first woman to chair the Federal Reserve.

Amazing women that I have met and come to know in my own home district in South Florida:

Ronnie Oller, a community organizer and philanthropist who organizes an annual event to provide children with free health care and education services;

Josie Bacallao, the leader of Hispanic Unity, which provides Hispanic and other immigration communities with the services and tools they need to live productive, civically engaged lives;

And a young woman who named Valeria Hansen who, at just 15 years old, is the founder of the first south Florida chapter of Girl Up, a campaign that promotes girls' empowerment and education worldwide through social media, fundraising, and advocacy.

We celebrate all of these women, not only for their accomplishments, but for having the drive and tenacity to overcome barriers to equal opportunity and lead by example.

The challenges of sexism, discrimination, and inequality future generations of daughters will have to face are significantly diminished thanks to the brave women who have come before us.

I think we should also acknowledge our colleague, Congresswoman ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN of Florida, who was the first Hispanic woman elected to Congress, someone who is a great friend of all of ours, who we are so proud of, and is so collegial, so warm, and such a wonderful person and leader to work with.

Former Congresswoman Carrie Meek, and our current colleague, Congresswoman CORRINE BROWN, who were the first African American women elected to Congress from Florida. These are tremendous sources of pride for us as women leaders.

I want to congratulate the gentlelady from New York and the gentlelady from Tennessee on their commitment to building the National Women's History Museum. We really need to build it, so that we can note the accomplishments and progress of women throughout American history because it is important to do that in so many ways.

As the mother of two young daughters—and each of the women here tonight have met my daughters on numerous occasions—and are all about girls' empowerment, we are a girl power caucus as women Members.

If we build this National Women's History Museum, we are going to have an opportunity to have a showcase—a place where we can show our daughters everything that is possible because of the achievements of who came before us.

Instead of having to try to thumb through a history book and hope that a teacher or a professor along the way gave them some understanding about what was possible, we give them a place that they can go, show them what is possible, and show generations of younger women coming behind them as well.

Thank you so much.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank my good friend for her inspiring and thoughtful remarks.

Women's history is not focused strictly on the accomplishments and contributions of individuals; rather it includes recognition of the collective efforts of women to enrich society.

After all, it was women who lobbied pasteurization of milk, vaccinations for our children, and sewage systems for our communities. Women banded together during World War II to support the war effort.

They planted victory gardens, donated nylons to be used for making equipment, and even took up collections that yielded enough money to purchase aircraft bombers.

Clearly, women have succeeded in shaping our Nation in important and lasting ways. A women's museum would chronicle those important achievements of women throughout history that are scattered across the Nation, as MARCY said, and we need to work to make this happen.

I yield to my good friend and colleague in this effort, Congresswoman BLACKBURN.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Thank you, Mrs. MALONEY.

I want to talk for just a moment about some of the women from Tennessee who have made such a significant contribution.

Now, each of us standing on the floor tonight have stood in this Chamber and have fought for children.

Dr. Mildred Stahlman—Millie Stahlman—is from Nashville and is part of the Vanderbilt University Medical Center team. She is a pioneering professor in pediatrics and pathology at Vanderbilt.

Anyone who has ever been in a neonatology unit has seen some of the pioneering work of Dr. Stahlman because she was the first to ever look at, study, and develop methods for monitoring lung disease in premature babies.

With over 1,300 preemies born every single day, if you were to go into a hospital neonatology unit, you would see some of the knowledge, the experience, the insight, and the discovery that has been brought about by Dr. Stahlman in helping these young babies to live.

I would also like to mention Beth Harwell. Beth is our speaker of the house in Tennessee. She is the first female speaker of the house ever in our State's history.

Beth started her career in public service when she was elected to the general assembly in 1988; and then, in 2011, she was unanimously elected to serve as speaker of the Tennessee House.

She is a diligent worker. She is very devoted to public service, and she represents our State so well.

Chief justice of the Tennessee Supreme Court, Connie Clark, who is one of my constituents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York's time has expired.

NATIONAL WOMEN'S HISTORY MUSEUM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) for 30 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, we are so excited about our talking, we didn't realize that the time had to be split, but so be it. We women stand and abide by the rules of the House, and so we will accept the acknowledgment of the change of time.

I will return to directing our attention to Chief Justice Connie Clark in Tennessee. What is so important about her career is that she was first appointed to the State court by a Democrat Governor, again served under a Democrat Governor, and then chief justice under a Republican Governor.

Justice Clark is such an incredible inspiration to women in our State. She has proven herself, has really been devoted to the judiciary and the law field, and is so active in our community, a tremendous role model.

If we step outside of the venue of politics and law, Amy Grant, who is a singer, songwriter, a native of Nashville, has had such a successful music career. Amy Grant became the first artist in Christian music to ever have a platinum record, and she went on to become a crossover sensation in the music world.

Amy Grant has pioneered the Christian music genre, and she has also blazed quite a trail in the music industry.

When we look at the world of sports, another Tennesseean, from Clarksville, Tennessee, which is in my district, Wilma Rudolph, many of you will recognize her name. She was a Tennessee State University track star.

On September 7, 1960, in Rome, she became the first American woman to win not one or two, but three gold medals in the Olympics. She was a track-and-field champion and was regarded as a civil rights and women's rights pioneer and is warmly remembered and treasured in our State.

Pat Summitt, who was the head coach of the Lady Vols at the University of Tennessee and is now the head coach emeritus, she was at the helm of the Lady Vols for 38 seasons. She is the all-time winningest coach in NCAA history—the all-time winningest coach in all of NCAA history. That is men and women's teams.

She is forthright, well-respected, ethical, and a winner in every sense of the word.

Sandra Cochran, who is the president and CEO of Cracker Barrel, Incorporated, she became the president and CEO on September 12 of 2011, following her service as Cracker Barrel's president and chief operating officer. Cracker Barrel is headquartered in Lebanon, Tennessee.

Ms. Cochran was previously CEO at the Nation's third largest book retailer, Books-A-Million. She is serving our community and that country well.

Ms. Cochran is a chemical engineering graduate from Vanderbilt University and a masters of business administration from Pacific Lutheran University.

After graduating from Vanderbilt, she entered the United States Army, where she ultimately served as a captain in the 9th Infantry Division.

There are so many other influential women that come from our State, and we are delighted to know that we will have the opportunity to recognize them and their contributions and the contributions of all women who have contributed to the cause of freedom in that Nation.

I yield to the gentlelady from New York.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentlelady for giving

that overview of the wonderful contributions of women from the great State of Tennessee, and I think it really is historic that the birthplace of the movement for the women's right to vote began in New York and really was completed in the great State of Tennessee. How historic is that?

I must say that the great men who built this Nation and shaped our society did not do it alone. I want to tell you about some of the women from the great State of New York.

First, I would like to speak about one of my mentors, a great friend, a great leader, Geraldine Ferraro, whose run for Vice President inspired me and countless other women who followed her into office.

As a young woman, she demonstrated her extraordinary capacity for hard work and dedication by skipping three grades and graduating high school at the age of 16. After college, she taught second grade in New York public schools and put herself through Fordham Law School at night.

□ 2030

After her children were born, she spent 13 years as a homemaker, after which she did something that was unusual at the time: she went back to work as an attorney in the Special Victims Bureau of the New York District Attorney's Office.

Later on, she ran for Congress and became an outstanding Member representing Queens, New York. During her three terms in Congress, Ferarro became known as a strong advocate for her district and for issues such as protecting Medicare and Social Security.

Then, in 1984, she literally made history when she became the first female candidate for a major party for Vice President. She is a symbol of the possibility that women could achieve their dreams, break the glass ceiling, and aspire to the highest realm in their chosen profession.

Ferraro is the type of woman I hope inspires my daughters just as she inspired me. Her life is the story girls and boys should hear when they come to our Nation's Capitol, but too often the stories of women are swept under the rug and not remembered. That is why we need this museum.

But Geraldine Ferraro would not have had the opportunity to be such an important trailblazer without the hard work of some of the amazing New York suffragettes: Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, and Lucretia Mott. Their statue is in the rotunda of the Capitol, and it was a bill of Connie Morella's and mine to move the women out of the basement into the rightful living room of the Capitol with the country's other great revolutionary leaders.

Stanton met Mott in 1840 when they both were refused seats at the World Anti-Slavery Convention in London on account of their sex. It was there that they first discussed the need for a convention to address the condition of women in the United States. This led to the first women's rights convention in Seneca Falls, New York, which was attended by Anthony. Together, they championed the National American Woman Suffrage Association, dedicating their lives to achieving equality and the right to vote for women.

The activist work of Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, and Lucretia Mott are the roots under the women's movement in this country. None of them lived to see women gain the right to vote, but it would have been literally impossible without their hard work and dedication. They literally dedicated their lives working daily to raise awareness, build coalitions, and to pass the 19th Amendment.

Without their dedication to women's rights, Alice Paul, the author of the Equal Rights Amendment, would not have been inspired to secure a woman's right to vote. Alice Paul, incidentally, was a relative of my late husband, Clifton Maloney, from the great State of New Jersey. Without their dedication, I would not have been inspired to continue the work on the amendment to our Constitution which we coauthored to ensure equality for women and men in all areas of society.

But there are also countless women whose work has had a tremendous impact on our lives and in our communities. For all intents and purposes, they have been forgotten.

Nellie Bly was one of the most influential journalists of the 19th century. She pioneered the field of investigative journalism at a time when our Nation was rapidly undergoing industrialization. She also emulated the voyage of Mr. Fogg, Jules Verne's character made famous in the classic novel, ''Around the World in 80 Days.'' But Bly pointed out, however, that he made the trip in 72 days.

While working for Joseph Pulitzer's The New York World, Bly went undercover and feigned insanity to report on the deplorable conditions of the Blackwell Island insane asylum. She exposed the horrific physical and emotional cruelty she had seen patients endure. Her work caused an uproar in New York, resulting in more money to help people with mental illnesses and a change in care for the people in the asylum. Bly's work helped open the profession to future generations of women journalists who wanted to write hard news rather than the light features in society columns.

Lillian Wald, another great New Yorker, was a progressive-era reformer setting the standards for modern social work and community nursing. She left medical school in the 1890s to work with poor immigrant families on New York's Lower East Side and founded the Henry Street Settlement, which still serves New Yorkers, and Visiting Nurse Services, which still serves our country and which continues to offer health care and social services to the needy.

Wald tirelessly campaigned for the rights of women and minorities and undertook some amazing humanitarian efforts to improve our country helping to found the United States Children's Bureau, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, and the NAACP. The New York Times nominated her as one of the 12 greatest living American women in 1922, and she later received the Lincoln Medallion for her work as an outstanding citizen of New York.

There are untold numbers of women like those that I have mentioned who have made great contributions to this Nation. In addition to learning about their specific contributions, we are only now gaining a full understanding of how civilization evolves through the power of feminine values and women's enduring traditions.

Nowhere can one find a place for all of these contributions and traditions in one place. That is what we want to accomplish for women. I want to note that there are numerous museums in and around The Mall. We have museums for stamps. We have museums for law and order and for space. We have the great Smithsonian. We have museums for African Americans. We have museums for Indian Americans, and we have museums for the media—the important media. We have over 22 different museums right in this area, but not one is focusing on the valid and incredibly important contributions of women.

They say women hold up half the sky, but where do you find it? It is not in the history books. It is not in the museums. It is nowhere to be found. Now, if all these other museums had sections focused on the contributions of women, maybe we wouldn't need this museum. But they don't.

As my daughter used to say when I would read stories to her at night, she would say: Mommy, Mommy, why aren't there any stories about girls? Why are all the stories about boys? Can't you read me a story about girls? We don't focus on the contributions of women. There is a woman who rode longer and farther than Paul Revere, and nobody even knows her name. Let's build this museum and talk about her contributions, too.

If we and future generations are to learn all the lessons of the past upon which to build a future, we must be aware of the true experiences, the hardships, the successes, and the contributions of women.

I have here some people I feel deserve to be in that museum:

Sandra Day O'Connor, the first woman to serve on the Supreme Court, one of the first elected to serve in the State legislature, an outstanding attorney;

Eleanor Roosevelt, from the great State of New York, an outstanding First Lady who helped so many;

Rosa Parks, who was tired and decided not to give her seat to a White and started an entire civil rights movement that literally changed this country and the opportunities for all people; and

Sally Ride, the great astronaut who went into space.

We don't really chronicle the women scientists and the explorers, all these incredibly important women.

Marsha, I know—I know—that we would not have these hearings and we would not have the momentum—we have over 84 cosponsors of our bill now. This would not have happened without your hard work and your leadership. I know she has been reaching out to her colleagues that chair these committees, to the leadership of the majority and others to move this effort forward and to gain momentum. So on behalf of the women I am privileged to represent, I want to thank you for all of your hard work. It is historic.

A NATIONAL MUSEUM FOR WOMEN'S HISTORY

(By Rep. Renee Ellmers, R–NC)

Throughout history, conservative women have impacted our nation's future and become an important voice in our democratic republic. We have proven ourselves as pioneers, innovators, leaders and decision-makers. We have created and contributed to many aspects of history—be it agriculture, medicine, politics, philosophy, science, and art. We have touched countless lives and shaped history, yet rarely does society teach, recognize or display our contributions—and it is time for this to change. In an effort to change this, I have joined my colleagues in advocating to establish the National Women's History Museum (NWHM) in Washington D.C.

Young women deserve a space to call their own—a physical space they can visit to hear and read about those who came before them and changed history. We need a tangible place that encourages our girls to wonder, to feel empowered, and to inquire about the people who fought to provide them with the freedom and opportunities they enjoy today. We need to share the stories of the strong women who have shaped our past and present so that young girls can learn the true meaning of perseverance and courage. There are too many women whose achievements have gone unrecognized and too many women whose efforts have been underappreciated. With such a vibrant history, it is a shame that we have yet to formally establish a museum dedicated to honoring their accomplishments. However, we are making strides.

This past December, my friend Rep. Marsha Blackburn (R–Tenn.) sponsored legislation with Rep. Carolyn Maloney (D–N.Y.) to create a commission that would recommend site locations and funding for the NWHM. This bill would have no additional cost for taxpayers, as the commission would be entirely paid for without federal funds. Information gathered by the commission would then be relayed to both the president and Congress. This past December, Reps. Blackburn and Maloney testified before the House Committee on Administration to relay the importance of establishing this commission. Joan Wages, president and CEO of the National Women's History Museum, an organization dedicated to establishment of the museum, also testified. Yet, nearly four months later, there has been no movement on this bill. With more than 82 bipartisan co-sponsors in the House, 19 in the Senate, and a plethora of national women's groups supporting the bill, there is no excuse for this inaction.

As one of only 19 Republican women in the House of Representatives, I see firsthand how our underrepresentation can impact our future opportunities. But as we continue to increase our ranks, our daughters need an environment to learn about the conservative heroes who made this possible—women like Jeanette Rankin, Sandra Day O'Connor and Condoleezza Rice. These women have earned their place in history, and our girls should have every opportunity to study them and feel inspired by their contributions.

If there were a museum that honored and proudly displayed our history, perhaps more women would be encouraged to run for political office, to seek out top-tier leadership positions, or to launch a new business. By establishing the NWHM on the National Mall, the notion of conservative women holding office could become less of a rarity and more of the norm.

As Republican women, we must continue to demonstrate that conservative principles—like fiscal responsibility, individual liberty, and a strong defense—are values worth pursuing. We need to make women's history a part of mainstream society. We need to have our story told, and we need to lead the way for other young conservative women. Let's honor our mothers and daughters by providing them with a place to learn and feel inspired. Let's establish the National Women's History Museum in Washington, D.C.

[From CNN.com, Mar. 3, 2014]

THE WOMEN YOU DON'T KNOW—YET

(By Rep. Marsha Blackburn, Rep. Carolyn Maloney, Sen. Susan Collins and Sen. Barbara Mikulski)

(Editor's note: Rep. Marsha Blackburn (R–Tennessee), Rep. Carolyn Maloney (D–New York), Sen. Susan Collins (R–Maine) and Sen. Barbara Mikulski (D–Maryland) are part of a bipartisan effort in Congress to establish the National Women's History Museum in Washington.

Did you know that the ''frequency hopping'' technology that is vital to much of our military technology and helps keep your cell phone and your GPS devices secure was developed and patented by a famous movie star?

Did you know that there was an amazing 16-year-old patriot who outdid Paul Revere, riding 45 miles in the pouring rain to warn New York colonial militias that ''the British are coming''?

Did you know that there was a secret agent, code named ''355,'' who worked for George Washington's band of spies, the Culper Ring? The agent supplied key intelligence on British activities during the Revolutionary War, and she was so good at keeping a secret that we still don't know her real name.

If you don't know about all these people, it's understandable. Their stories aren't told widely or often—perhaps because they were all women. For some reason or other, when the story, of our country is told, women—really great women—have tended to be left out of the telling.

You see the results everywhere you look:

A survey of U.S. history textbooks found that only 10% of the individuals identified in the texts were women;

Less than 8% of the 2,560 national historic landmarks chronicle the achievements of women;

Of the 210 statues in the U.S. Capitol, only 15 are of female leaders.

That's the bad news. The good news is that thanks to a strong bipartisan effort in Congress, we may soon be one step closer to addressing this imbalance by establishing a National Women's History Museum in Washington. Together, we have introduced a common-sense bill to move this idea forward.

We have more than 73 bipartisan co-sponsors in the House, 19 in the Senate and a national coalition of women's groups behind us. We recognize money is tight—that's why we're not asking for taxpayer support. Private donations would fund the museum's construction and operation.

A vital part of recognizing equal rights for women is acknowledging and commemorating the deep and lasting contributions women have made throughout history. When young people visit our nation's capital, they should have a chance to be just as inspired by women's accomplishments as men's.

We establish and operate museums, not just as some kind of giant drawer in which to store our memorabilia but as way to celebrate our accomplishments, affirm our shared values and preserve the full and accurate story of our common history. And unfortunately, only half of that story is presently being told.

The stories of courageous and pioneering Americans such as abolitionist Harriet Tubman, astronaut Sally Ride, Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O'Connor and the founder of the Girl Scouts, Juliette Gordon Low, will inform and inspire future generations.

The remarkable women who helped to make this country what it is today deserve to have their histories told and preserved for the ages. Their stories of success are the stories that will inspire and encourage millions of women. Our daughters and our sons deserve the chance to learn the story—the full story—of how this amazing country came to be.

And by the way, the movie star inventor? That was Hedy Lamarr.

The 16 year-old who rode farther than Paul Revere was Sybil Ludington.

And the spy, code named ''355''? Well, we still don't know the name—but we know the patriot was a ''she.''

And just wait until you see all the other amazing women and American history you'll learn about one day soon when the National Women's History Museum opens.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentlelady from New York.

I want to yield to the gentlelady from Wyoming for some other comments on our conversation this evening.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I thank the gentlelady from Tennessee and New York.

The gentlelady from New York mentioned the name of a woman who, at The New York World, was a trailblazer for women journalists. Today, my daughter, a journalist, a graduate of Columbia's Pulitzer School of Journalism, is a journalist at The New York World; and without that kind of leadership on the part of women, we wouldn't have the opportunities for ourselves and our children to lead. That is why we need to memorialize what women have done, so women and young girls can envision themselves in these roles.

I was recently in Moscow, and we toured the Museum of the Cosmonauts there, and the efforts the United States has currently with Russia, Russia now leading the international space station, so we can continue those efforts. We met with an American woman astronaut and a Russian male cosmonaut. We were led on this tour, and you could see the little kids flock to them as heros. Well, women and girls need role models. The women in this room are role models.

All of us here this evening are at an age when we remember what it was

like not to have intermural women's sports in high school, what it was like to have to wear skirts to high school and to junior high and grade school, not even having the opportunity to wear pants. I remember when I applied for my first job, I was told that we are not going to hire a woman to be an agricultural loan officer because men don't like to ask women for money—and it was legal. It was legal for them to say that to me in a job interview, and they hired the man instead of me.

Well, it just made me mad, and it made me determined. I know by looking at the ages of my colleagues here this evening that you each had similar experiences somewhere in your careers. Our own daughters can't even imagine being told that. This is recent history. These are the kinds of stories that we need to be able to share, what we even went through.

It is a recent history, and it is a long-fought battle. That is why I am so proud, so proud, A, to serve with these wonderful women Members of Congress today who are leading this effort, so proud to be a woman Member of this institution, and, B, so proud that you are going to leave this legacy that will create and memorialize the history of women in the United States in order to provide an exemplary and visionary picture for our own daughters, granddaughters, and Americans long after we are gone.

Thank you so much to the gentlelady from Tennessee, to the gentlelady from New York, to the wonderful woman from Ohio with whom I served on the House Appropriations Committee. You are fine leaders, exemplary women. I have great respect for the work you are doing this evening.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. How true it is that we have to take the time to pause and paint that vision for future generations so that they do know the trails that have been blazed and the roadblocks that have been removed to make their way easier so that they are able to excel, to achieve, to have, and to do. Isn't that what we would desire for them to be able to do, to dream big dreams and make those dreams come true and to have role models and examples who may have been through those same struggles and found a way to make it work?

I yield to the gentlelady from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank Congresswoman BLACKBURN so much and Congresswoman MALONEY. I share the same passion as Congresswoman LUMMIS. We want to just lift you and be a part of this team for H.R. 863. We hope that everyone listening this evening will cosponsor this important legislation.

As I listened to you talk, I thought I would give some background, having lived through it here. You talk about museums, Congresswoman MALONEY, and you go around the Capitol itself, it is a museum, and you go: This doesn't look like America.

For three decades, we have been trying to hang portraits of women who chaired committees in this institution, and it has been a herculean struggle. We finally rehung a portrait in the Education and the Workforce Committee for Mary Norton, who chaired that committee. She wrote some of the most important legislation in this country and was the first woman ever to chair that committee. They had her portrait in a closet—in a closet—just like these statues of suffragettes had to be brought up into the main Capitol.

□ 2045

When I first arrived in Congress, there were only the statues. There was the portrait of Pocahontas in the main room, and then the statue on the very top, Liberty, on the top of the Capitol. But as you looked at the other portraits, you never saw women. Well, Congressman Bob Ney of Ohio, who headed House Administration many years ago, heard our plea and he finally arranged to have Jeannette Rankin, a Republican and progressive from Montana, but it took us until the 21st century to do it. She was actually elected before the 19th Amendment was passed to the Constitution. She came from Montana, and we didn't even have her portrait in the Capitol hung.

In addition, Shirley Chisholm of New York, she is now hung on the first floor. She was the first woman of color to run for President of the United States.

The lack of their presence to me is just so blatant, and that is why I want to thank both of you marvelous, marvelous Members and women for seeing this gap in American history.

Even the Women's Room in the Capitol is behind closed doors so the general public doesn't always see the women. It is very interesting. I think we are about to open another door and allow the fullness of American history to come forward.

I would like to place in the RECORD the names of citizens from northern Ohio:

Toledo's Geraldine Macelwane, appointed the first woman on the Lucas County Common Pleas bench. She won election for four consecutive terms;

Julia Bates, our current county prosecutor in Lucas County, Ohio, and Ohio Supreme Court Justices Alice Robie Resnick and Maureen O'Connor, the only two women ever in American history to be elected to the supreme court of our State;

In northern Ohio, we have sent many fine women. Obviously, Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE, who serves with us now, and Congresswoman Stephanie Tubbs Jones before her, the first two African American women ever elected to Congress from the State of Ohio, now joined by JOYCE BEATTY of Columbus; Mary Rose Okar; and State legislators Nina Turner, Capri Cafaro, Shirley Smith, Nikki Antonio, Nan Baker, Sandra Williams, Barbara Boyd, Theresa Fedor Edna Brown, Linda Furney and Marijean Valiquette, all women who were trailblazers on the political front.

Toledo has had a woman mayor, Donna Owens. Tina Skeldon Wozniak is a Lucas county commissioner; and Anita Lopez, our county auditor.

Sister Ann Francis Klimkowski was the founding president of Lourdes University, and all of the sisters, the Roman Catholic sisters—the Franciscans, the Sisters of Notre Dame, the Sisters of Mercy, the Sisters of St. Joseph, and the Ursuline Sisters who served selflessly across this country in hospitals and schools and gave themselves to their communities almost unrecognized. There was a traveling display of them that finally went around the country, and I hope that becomes a part of this museum. They gave their lives for us.

All of those women helped build us and on whose shoulders we are standing, and, as with Congresswoman LUMMIS, I just wish to place in the Record—when I was young, I thought I would go to the Air Force Academy, and when I sent my letter in and was rejected because I was a woman, I didn't really completely put it together in my mind. I just tried to do something else, and so I applied to Notre Dame University, and was rejected because I was a woman. They didn't allow women to be students there in those days. And then finally to the FBI. I thought it would be great to work for my country. I would be a female Elliot Ness. And, of course, I was rejected because a woman.

So another door always opened, but in the area in which I grew up, it wasn't possible.

Finally, let me say in memory of our mother, who was never able to obtain her degrees until after she retired. She had a very hard life, and received her high school degree after she went on Social Security. One of her very first jobs was working in a restaurant where, when the minimum wage went into effect her boss, who was an animal, basically cashed the check with the additional amount in it, and then he kept the difference. We didn't have enforcement at the Department of Labor. So each of us have stories about what happened in our lives, and they deserve recording in a museum for the women of America.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentlelady for sharing those stories and her insight and what she has experienced in her career and seeking to remove those barriers to overcome obstacles and to make the way smoother for future generations.

Indeed, as Congresswoman MALONEY and I move forward on H.R. 863, we do, as the gentlewoman from Ohio said, invite and are hopeful that every Member of this body will join us in supporting this legislation and that they will pay attention to the hearing on March 25, and we commend Chairman HASTINGS and the House leadership for moving this bill forward, for making it a priority and saying, let's have the hearing, let's move the bill forward to markup, let's support women who are

willing to give of their time, their talent and efforts, raise all the money for the museum, for the exhibits, for the upkeep, for the endowment, and to make what has been a dream for decades, make it a reality in this great Nation.

I thank my colleagues for joining us tonight, and I yield back the balance of my time.

REDUCING REGULATORY BURDEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) for 30 minutes.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is amazing when we get a chance to be able to talk about something simple: Can a company run its own business? That seems like a very straightforward statement. Of course a company can run its own business. But it is fascinating to me when we begin to go down the process of how many regulations and how many things a company has to do to fulfill Federal mandates, and it begs one simple question: Is Washington the boss of every company in America? Is Washington the boss of every family in America? Quite frankly, is Washington the boss of every employee in America? We don't work for ourselves anymore unless we are given permission by the Federal Government.

Now lest someone think I may be carrying this overboard, tonight we want to have a little conversation on what is happening in our Nation right now, when we have a Nation that is so focused on how we can wrap around every business to decide what is best for the employees, what is best for the employer, and what is best for everyone around them.

There are several Members here as well, and I want to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN), who has been an amazing Member of this House of Representatives in the work he has done, and he comes with this small business perspective. He knows how to grow a business. He grew a small business to a very large business that was very significant, even through all of the regulatory process.

I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN).

Mr. MULLIN. I thank Mr. JAMES LANKFORD from Oklahoma. What a wonderful colleague you are. You are absolutely correct, and the only reason I stand in front of you today is truly the biggest threat I had as a business owner, from a gentleman who literally had the opportunity to have a very small company and see how the Lord can bless it and take it until now we employ over 120 people across the State of Oklahoma, when I woke up one day and realized that the biggest threat I have to my company is the Federal Government, that is a sad reality.

You are absolutely correct. It is ridiculous to sit and think we have to ask Washington, D.C., for permission to be able to hire. They literally regulate who we can hire and how we can fire them. We don't ever want to fire an employee, but the truth is sometimes you have to move on. The relationship doesn't work, and yet you are told how you have to do that.

As a business owner, we want to hire the best people and keep the best people. That is how we grow the company. But at the end of day when we have to constantly ask permission how we do our job, can we do our job this way, are we allowed to grow the company, are we allowed to complete it, what agencies do we have to go through just to get a permit to do something that needs to be accomplished, it gets out of hand. We woke up one day and we realized we were spending 40 cents out of every dollar that comes into our company to simply comply with a mandate or a regulation coming down from the government. Forty cents out of every dollar.

I was questioned one time on an interview. They said, How is that possible? Aren't you including taxes?

I said: No, this doesn't include taxes.

The person said I don't believe what you are saying, and I challenge you.

I told them, just walk the halls with me in my office, and you will go past a compliance office, you will go past a payroll department, which is strongly regulated. You will go by an H.R. department that is strongly regulated, and so on and so on. I said you will be shocked how much we spend on payroll just to meet those certain mandates and those regulations.

It is literally laughable when you have people up here in Washington, D.C., get up and say they got a job package. If they were really that good at creating jobs, why didn't they do it before they got here? The truth is they don't know because if they did, the only thing they would have to do is start reining in the regulations. At the end of the day, is America the land of opportunity because right now if Washington, D.C., if the Federal Government continues to overregulate, the opportunities and the entrepreneurial spirit that exists in America is no longer going to exist.

I would like to thank the gentleman for bringing this to our attention and taking the time and your time to say hey, enough is enough.

Mr. LANKFORD. I thank the gentleman.

As the husband of an amazing lady and a dad of two amazing two young daughters, I enjoyed the previous Special Order that happened here about Women's History Month. I, as a dad, want to see my daughters be able to succeed and have every single opportunity of every single other American, and so I would like to yield to my colleague from New York so she is able to enter some things into the RECORD.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman for his beautiful words. Certainly the museum will not be achieved without like-minded men who support it.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include for the RECORD an op-ed that MARSHA BLACKBURN and I wrote called ''The Women You Don't Know Yet,'' and a beautiful, beautiful op-ed written by RENEE ELLMERS representing the great State of North Carolina called ''A National Museum For Women's History.''

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANKFORD. I want to continue on this ongoing conversation. How do decisions get made in America?

It is the assumption again that if you are a landowner or a farmer and rancher, you look around your farm and you look for what is best for your land and for your family, as well as for the families around you. No one takes better care of the land than farmers and ranchers all across America.

But it is interesting, as you go across western Oklahoma, you will drive for miles and you will see barbwire fences. At the bottom of it, they will have a small, little ribbon all the way across it. People from outside the State might wonder what that is, but landowners know what it is. That is the Fish and Wildlife Service has stepped onto their private property and said that if you are going to have a fence there in that spot, you have to mark the bottom wire in case a lesser prairie chicken were to be in your area.

So hundreds of miles of fences have now been marked. People have been hired or families have spent their precious time, instead of farming or ranching, instead tagging barbwire in case there is a lesser prairie chicken somewhere in the area, which I remind you, is not an endangered species. It is a species that is being discussed to possibly be threatened at some future point, but it is not listed as threatened. It is not listed as endangered. But millions of dollars have been spent on things like tagging barbwire fences and limiting roads.

□ 2100

Now, landowners have to go to the Fish and Wildlife Service and ask permission for how many head of cattle that they can have in a certain area, in case a lesser prairie chicken happens to be in the area.

It is an interesting day that we have in America, that whether you are farming, ranching, running a plumbing company, or whether you are a contractor, it seems that Washington is the boss of us, and we make decisions based on that.

I would like to be able to welcome in a colleague of mine from my same class, who has been a leader not only in his State legislature, but is now a leader here in this legislature, Mr. ALAN NUNNELEE. I would like to be able to invite him to be able to come and continue on this conversation.

Mr. NUNNELEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Oklahoma for

his leadership in bringing focus to this important issue.

The foundation for our country rests on the shoulders of ''we the people.'' Under our constitutional form of government, we the people are the boss, and Washington is the servant.

Unfortunately, under this current administration, there is not a week that goes by without more evidence of out-of-control bureaucracies attempting to run local businesses through unnecessary rules and regulations.

I could give many examples, but in the interest of time, I will just give one. Columbus Brick Company is located in Columbus, Mississippi. They have been making clay bricks since 1890. Mr. Al Puckett is the fourth generation of that family to run that business.

After they spent substantial sums much money to bring the factory into compliance with new Environmental Protection Agency regulations, the EPA is now threatening new, even more expensive regulations without any input from the public, from the stakeholders, from Congress, or from we the people.

Last June, Mr. Puckett appeared before the House Judiciary Committee. He testified:

> If EPA uses the same approach that they have followed on recent rules, Columbus Brick may cease to exist after almost 125 years of operation. I expect a minimum of having to shut down 2 or 3 kilns. That will mean a permanent job loss of 45 to 50 families in our small rural community.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, it gets worse. These EPA regulations do not result in any significant benefit to the environment. The brick industry in general—Columbus Brick Company in particular—is already operating well within safe levels. Unfortunately, Columbus Brick Company is not unique in the impact this rule would have on small businesses. Many would be forced to close their doors.

Only in Washington are rules handed down to businesses without allowing the affected parties the ability to weigh in before the settlement agreements are adopted. Environmental regulations should be fair, reasonable, and they should balance costs versus benefits.

This body understands this concept, and that is why, in February, we passed the ALERRT Act, which would require the administration to account for the cost of excessive regulations to minimize the impact on small businesses.

Mr. Puckett stated it best:

> We are not asking for the rule to go away. We are asking that the practice of establishing unreasonable deadlines without input from the impacted industries go away.

Mr. Speaker, Mississippians know that the power and drive of America is in the individual, and the great solutions to the great challenges facing our country don't come in Washington, neither do they come in our State capitals. The challenges to our solutions can be found around our kitchen tables and our homes and our churches and our communities.

Unfortunately, it is the mentality that the government is the boss. It has been oppressive on companies like Columbus Brick, but their spirit of survival is what has allowed them to survive for several generations. Washington, and particularly not the EPA, is not the boss of Columbus Brick.

Mr. LANKFORD. I thank the gentleman for Mississippi for being here and being part of this conversation because this does affect every single corner of our Nation.

Everywhere we go, this tends to be the same issue repeated over and over again. How do individuals make decisions and not have to wait for the Federal Government to be able to give them permission to be able to do this?

We could go on and on, but let me just give you several other examples that some people may know well and some people may not know well.

If you are going to put in a traffic light, just a simple installation, maybe a day or two at an intersection, to be able to put in a traffic light at an intersection, somewhere in the vicinity of that, there will be a board that has been placed up by the company.

There will be 24 different posters stapled to that board to give instructions to anyone who happens to be at that job site installing a traffic light for a day or two of all of their rights under the Department of Labor rules—24 posters posted outside somewhere in the vicinity around where they are doing construction on a traffic light.

Does anyone think that is common sense? I would assume not; but yet it is all over the country. Every company that is installing traffic lights or working on roads or bridges or anywhere they may be, they are hauling around this giant board and putting it up because the Federal Government makes them do it. As they install it, they all think the same thing. Do I work for the government, or does the government work for me?

Many banks in America now, after the Dodd-Frank regulations were passed just 5 years ago, when those regulations were passed—or that law was passed and the regulations are now promulgated, banks will tell you, all over the country—small banks, family-owned banks in small rural communities, medium-sized banks, banks that had nothing to do with the meltdown that happened in our economy in 2008 and 2009—these community banks will tell you many of them have a regulator sitting there full time now.

If not full time, multiple times a year, for weeks on end, a government regulator comes and sits down at their bank and goes through every single piece of everything.

Many of these banks will tell you, if they call one of these regulators and say: Hey, I am thinking about making a loan, and I am considering this, I need to know, when you evaluate my bank, what are you going to say on this, many of the regulators will say: Well, I will evaluate it when I see it.

They won't give them proactive advice. They won't actually help them in advance, but they will show up at the end of it and be able to downgrade them if they made the wrong decision.

That is not a government that is designed to serve you. That is a government that we serve. Banks have suddenly become entities of the Federal Government, constantly worried about some Federal regulator coming in and what they may or may not do. Again, Washington is not our boss.

The overtime rules that were just proposed today by the President, it seems like a such a nice thing to do. If someone works overtime, they should get additional pay, but leaving out this simple fact: people all over America worked hourly and worked to get to a salaried position, so then they saw that as a promotion.

Suddenly, the President of the United States is stepping in and saying: I am going to actually demote you again and put you back on an hourly-type situation, that if you make a certain amount, you are going to have to count your hours.

Well, what really happens in real life with that? Well, I can tell you immediately after that rule gets promulgated, Pam Parks, who owns Blue Wave and Silver Wave Boats in Seminole, Oklahoma, contacts me immediately and says: Does the President have any idea what this would mean in real life in a real business?

I can tell Pam probably not because what it will mean in real life for her, what it will mean in real life for her employees, what it will mean in real life for companies all over America are multiple things, that when the President in Washington shows up at a business and says it is obvious you don't take care of your employees, so we are going to force you to do this, and we are going to take over your business, and we are going to run your payroll different than how you are running it, what really happens is salaried workers suddenly step back down to hourly workers, and someone who really wants to succeed and is going to put in the time to do that, the boss has to step in to them onsite and say: you can't work more than 40 hours. I know you wanted to be here and to do extra stuff and try to work your way up the ladder. No, you can't do that; because at a certain pay level, there is a cut off there, and you have to have extra overtime.

Now, someone who may make a little bit more, they can stay extra, they can work their way up the ladder, but someone else now will be prohibited from doing that.

As odd as it sounds, what just occurred was the President just imposed a new ceiling in workplaces all over the country with no one passing a law, with no regulation being promulgated, just a declaration, and everything just changed for a lot of Americans all over

the country, and a new cap was just placed in a lot of places.

People that worked for years to move to salary just got demoted back to hourly, and now, their boss is watching over them. Sadly, that boss is Washington, D.C. That is not right for Blue Wave and Silver Wave Boats in Seminole, Oklahoma. That is not right for businesses all over America.

If I get into an issue that is somewhat controversial, excuse me, but let me count the ways that ObamaCare demonstrates that Washington, D.C., wants to be the boss of every business and of every American.

ObamaCare, when it passed, said to every American: I know that you plan your budget and you plan your life in certain ways. We don't like how you do that. You are suddenly going to do it our way. You are going to buy a product you haven't purchased before, whether you are healthy or not, because we want you to, because we are your boss and we are going to tell you what products you are going to buy. If you want to buy a different insurance policy, I am sorry. That insurance policy is not good enough for us in Washington. You have got to pick the one that we pick in Washington.

That is not American. Now, it is a great thing to make sure that everyone in America has access to health care, but to then go to every family and say: It is going to be more than just access to, it is going to be requirement for, whether it fits your budget or not, and by the way, the government is going to pick what fits your budget.

That means Washington is suddenly the boss of you. In every workplace across the country, Washington, D.C., is now trying to decide which insurance policies work best for them—that is, Washington, not for the people in that company. Washington is not the boss of us. We are individuals that have freedom.

There is a company named Hobby Lobby. It happens to be based in my hometown. It is an absolutely amazing family that has lived out their faith for years. People see Hobby Lobby as this giant company.

Just a few decades ago, Hobby Lobby was in a garage and was a couple of sons cutting out picture frames for their dad, and they were selling these little tiny picture frames and starting their own tiny little frame shop.

That tiny little frame shop is now all over this country and is known to be this great retailer Hobby Lobby. They have practiced faith principles from the very beginning of their company. They close on Sundays. They close early on Wednesdays. They pay well more than minimum wage. They have always had great health care coverage.

They are a company that lives out biblical values in the workplace. They play Christian music even over the loudspeakers at the stores. They are a place that, when you shop, you enjoy shopping there. People love to take care of people there. That is part of their corporate mentality.

It is also a couple of owners and that family that is also opposed to abortion. They have the unusual belief that millions and millions of other Americans believe that children are valuable and that children are important and precious. They happen to have a faith that believes that the child deserves life.

Well, the President disagrees with that faith; so when ObamaCare—literally, the regulations say to that business: You cannot operate your business under faith principles if that faith principle is different than the President's.

Why do I say that? Because if Hobby Lobby did not provide insurance at all—at all to their employees, they would be fined $2,000 per person, per year, if they refuse to provide insurance.

If they provide all insurance with everything included in it that ObamaCare requires, except for four abortifacient drugs—just leave out those four. Based on religious views they don't agree with, those four abortifacient drugs—if they don't provide those four, their fine is $36,500 per employee, per year.

Let me run this past you again: $2,000 per employee if they provide nothing; $36,500 per employee if they provide everything, except those four abortifacient drugs.

How serious is this administration about being the boss of that company and telling them: If your faith practice is different than ours, it is obvious the consequences are shutting down a company?

□ 2115

No one can afford a fine of $36,500. So, basically, the Green family has to choose to either live their faith or to keep their business open, but they can't do both at the same time.

What kind of country is this? What have we become when the simple freedom of religion can be swept aside by a Washington that says: If I don't agree with your faith, you have to change your practice?

Washington is not the boss of our companies. Washington is not the boss of our faith. We have a constitutional right to be able to live out our faith.

I received a letter and information from a great Oklahoma company in Stillwater, Oklahoma. It is Frontier Electronic Systems. It is interesting to be able to read what they are dealing with day-to-day just with Federal regulations. Here is one statement.

They wrote:

A phrase I have borrowed regarding most of these Federal regulations is that they ''do not scale.'' As a company with 113 employees, we are as accountable for compliance as if we had 113,000 employees. Needless to say, we have far fewer resources available—dollars and people power—than a larger employer has to ensure compliance. Also, compliance with many of the regulations requires some level of knowledge and experience in specific human resources specialties—staffing, benefits, et cetera—due to the fact that many of the laws are complicated and interrelated. Many smaller companies are fortunate to have even one experienced HR professional, let alone one that has extensive knowledge in multiple HR specialties.

What are they talking about with that?

Let me just give you an example. Because this great company also occasionally does some Federal contracting, here is the list of the regulations that this company must fulfill. To be a company and to be open in America right now, this is what this particular company has to fulfill. They have to follow these specific regulations:

The Age Discrimination in Employment Act; the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009—the regs that are in there; the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012; the Americans with Disabilities Act; the Black Lung Benefits Act; the Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2009; the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1986; the Copeland Act of 1934; the Consumer Credit Protection Act; the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act; the Davis-Bacon Act; the Dodd-Frank Act of 2011; the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988; the Employee Polygraph Protection Act; the Employee Retirement Income Security Act; the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act; the Equal Pay Act; Executive Order 11246 of 1965; Executive Order 13201; the Fair and Accurate Credit Transactions Act; the Federal Corrupt Practices Act; the Fair Credit Reporting Act; the Fair Labor Standards Act; the Family and Medical Leave Act; the Federal Employees' Compensation Act; the Federal Insurance Contributions Act; the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act; the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act; the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act; the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act; the Hiring Incentives to Restore Employment Act of 2010; the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986; the Immigration and Nationality Act; the Jury Service and Selection Act; the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act; the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2007; the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act; the McNamara-O'Hara Service Contract Act; the Mental Health and Addiction Equity Act of 2008; the Mental Health Parity Act; the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act; the National Labor Relations Act; the Newborns' and Mothers' Health Protection Act of 1996; the Norris-LaGuardia Act of 1932; the Occupational Safety and Health Act; the OSHA Hazard Communication Standard; the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act—that is a big one; that is ObamaCare—the Pension Protection Act of 2006; the Pregnancy Discrimination Act; the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; the Sarbanes-Oxley Act; the Sherman Anti-Trust Act of 1890; title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; the Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures of 1978; the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment

Rights Act of 1994; the Veterans Benefits Improvement Act of 2004; the Vietnam Era Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act; the Walsh-Healey Act; the War Hazards Compensation Act; the Women's Health and Cancer Rights Act of 1998; the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act; and the Workforce Reinvestment and Adult Education Act.

Can anyone keep up with that? This business has to. With 113 employees, how many people does it take just to keep up with those regulations?

Mr. Speaker, we have a problem. We have a Washington, D.C., that has become arrogant. I don't think it is intentional. Quite frankly, I think everyone is trying to be very kind—overly kind—and they stack on one regulation on another, and there suddenly becomes a day when no company can keep up with this.

The attitude is simple: we know better than you. You won't run your company like it should be run, so we are going to come tell you how to run it. You won't run your family like it should be run, so we are going to tell you how to run your family farm. You won't run your bank like it should be run, so we are going to come run it for you. You won't run your insurance company like it should be run, so we are going to come run it for you. You mistreat your employees, so we are going to take over your health care system, and we will run it for you.

Mr. Speaker, that is not what we are as Americans. We are a nation that became strong because we are a nation that is free. We changed the world with a simple work ethic and the ability for people to be able to achieve success. That did not include a laundry list of protections from the Federal Government that swallow up a business.

Is there anything wrong with the government's setting the boundaries for business? No. It is part of the role of government. But when it becomes this, we are drowning. Now, suddenly, Washington is the boss of us, and this has got to turn around.

Mr. Speaker, simple decisions have to be made.

Can States do things that the Federal Government is currently doing?

Yes, there are things the Federal Government is doing it has no business doing. They are the responsibility of a State.

Should families go back to making decisions and businesses making decisions?

Yes, they should. That means there is risk. With risk comes great reward. We became the strongest and most prosperous nation on the planet because our people were not afraid of risk and the rest of the world was. We can get back to that, but we have got to make a simple decision: Is Washington the boss of us or are the American people the boss of Washington?

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

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows;

S. 2137. An act to ensure that holders of flood insurance policies under the National Flood Insurance Program do not receive premium refunds for coverage of second homes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 14, 2014, at 9 a.m.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

> ''I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.''

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 113th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

DAVID W. JOLLY, Thirteenth District of Florida.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

4980. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's final rule — Prohibition Against Federal Assistance for Swaps Entities (Regulation KK) [Docket No.: R-1458] (RIN: 7100-AD96) received February 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4981. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Schedule of Controlled Substances: Placement of Alfaxalone into Schedule IV [Docket No.: DEA-370] received February 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4982. A letter from the Chief, Policy and Rules Division, OET, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Part 15 of the Commission's Rules to Establish Regulations for Tank Level Probing Radars in the Frequency Band 77-81 GHz; Amendment to Part 15 of the Commission's Rules to Establish Regulations for Level Probing Radars and Tank Level Probing Radars in the Frequency Bands 5.925-7.250 GHz, 24.05-29.00 GHz and 75-85 GHz; Ohmart/VEGA Corp., Request for Waiver of Section 15.252 to Permit Marketing of Level Probing Radars in the 26 GHz Band [ET Docket No.: 10-23] [ET Docket No.: 10-27] received February 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4983. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Retrospective Analysis under Executive Order 13579 [NRC-2011-0246] received February 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4984. 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 Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Trip Limit Reduction [Docket No.: 0010052281-0369-02] (RIN: 0648-XD134) received March 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4985. 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 Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Shrimp Fishery Off the Southern Atlantic States; Closure of the Penaeid Shrimp Fishery Off South Carolina [Docket No.: 120919470-3513-02] (RIN: 0648-XD122) received March 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4986. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area; Amendment 102 [Docket No.: 130306200-4084-02] (RIN: 0648-BD03) received March 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4987. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Herring Fishery; Amendment 5 [Docket No.: 100203070-4003-02] (RIN: 0648-AY47) received March 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4988. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's ''Major'' final rule — Endangered Fish and Wildlife; Final Rule To Remove the Sunset Provision of the Final Rule Implementing Vessel Speed Restrictions To Reduce the Threat of Ship Collisions With North Atlantic Right Whales [Docket No.: 110819518-3833-02] (RIN: 0648-BB20) received March 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4989. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety

Zone; BWRC Southwest Showdown Three; Parker, AZ [Docket No.: USCG-2013-1034] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4990. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone, Vessel Movement, Christina River; Wilmington, DE [Docket Number: USCG-2013-1002] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4991. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Bone Island Triathlon, Atlantic Ocean; Key West, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0905] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4992. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Houma Navigation Canal, Mile Marker 35.5 to 36.5, and Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Mile Marker 59.0 to 60.0, West of Harvey Locks, bank to bank; Houma, Terrebonne Parish, LA [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0880] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4993. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Olympus Tension Leg Platform [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0070] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4994. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca S.A. Turboshaft Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-1003; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-33-AD; Amendment 39-17724; AD 2014-01-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 10, 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 XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 1786. A bill to reauthorize the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–380, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1786 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 4225. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a penalty for knowingly selling advertising that offers certain commercial sex acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 4226. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to exclude a loan secured by a non-owner occupied 1- to 4-family dwelling from the definition of a member business loan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ENYART, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. GRAYSON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HOLT, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 4227. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and other statutes to clarify appropriate liability standards for Federal antidiscrimination claims; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, the Judiciary, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. BARBER, and Mr. DAINES):

H.R. 4228. A bill to require the Department of Homeland Security to improve discipline, accountability, and transparency in acquisition program management; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SALMON, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida):

H.R. 4229. A bill to seek international sanctions against the Government of Venezuela with respect to foreign persons responsible for or complicit in ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing, the commission of serious human rights abuses against citizens of Venezuela, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Ways and Means, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUNYAN (for himself and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 4230. A bill to limit the retirement of KC-10 aircraft; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 4231. A bill to prohibit United States assistance to the East-West Center; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. GABBARD (for herself and Mr. GIBSON):

H.R. 4232. A bill to clarify the cancellation of loans of members of the Armed Forces under the Federal Perkins Loan Program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself, Mr. HURT, and Mr. ISRAEL):

H.R. 4233. A bill to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor posthumously to Lance Corporal Jordan C. Haerter and Corporal Jonathan Yale of the Marine Corps for acts of valor during Operation Iraqi Freedom in April 2008; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUCSHON (for himself and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 4234. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to reduce the shortage of psychiatrists in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs by offering competitive employment incentives to certain psychiatrists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa):

H.R. 4235. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to remove the maximum payment amount for certain qualified losses under the Traumatic Injury Protection under the Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 4236. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the Truth in Lending Act to clarify the application of prepayment amounts on student loans; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee (for himself and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 4237. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the volume cap for private activity bonds shall not apply to bonds for facilities for furnishing of water and sewage facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 4238. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for requirements for employers of H-2B nonimmigrants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 4239. A bill to provide drought assistance to the State of California and other affected western States; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Budget, Agriculture, Energy and Commerce, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico (for herself, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. VARGAS, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 4240. A bill to expand access to health care services, including sexual, reproductive, and maternal health services, for immigrant women, men, and families by removing legal barriers to health insurance coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period

to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. GRIMM, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. KEATING, Mr. WOLF, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HIGGINS, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 4241. A bill to withdraw approval for the drug Zohydro ER and prohibit the Food and Drug Administration from approving such drug unless it is reformulated to prevent abuse; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NOLAN (for himself and Mr. PAULSEN):

H.R. 4242. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the import of donated firefighting and rescue and relief equipment and supplies free of duty and other restrictions for purposes of inspection and subsequent donation and export of such equipment and supplies to countries and organizations in need, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4243. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to permit commercial filmmaking and photography on the United States Capitol grounds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PETERS of Michigan (for himself, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 4244. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the small employer health insurance credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 4245. A bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995, and the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 to improve access to information in the legislative and executive branches of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, House Administration, the Judiciary, Ethics, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California):

H.R. 4246. A bill to provide construction, architectural, and engineering entities with qualified immunity from liability for negligence when providing services or equipment on a volunteer basis in response to a declared emergency or disaster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUIZ (for himself, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. ENYART, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. HECK of Nevada):

H.R. 4247. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that disabled veterans with a disability rating greater than or equal to 70 percent receive preference with respect to employment in the competitive service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. TAKANO (for himself and Mr. FLORES):

H.R. 4248. A bill to require institutions of higher education to disseminate information with respect to the completion rates, employment rates, and retention rates of recipients of GI Bill funding; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. POLIS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 4249. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to expand and improve Federal programs to reduce child hunger; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WHITFIELD (for himself and Mr. DINGELL):

H.R. 4250. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide an alternative process for review of safety and effectiveness of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRIMM:

H. Con. Res. 93. Concurrent resolution directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make technical corrections in the enrollment of H.R. 3370; considered and agreed to. considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. NOLAN):

By Mr. KILDEE:

H. Res. 517. A resolution raising a question of the privileges of the House.

H. Res. 518. A resolution expressing support for designation of March 2014 as ''Multiple System Atrophy Awareness Month'' to increase public awareness of this progressive neurodegenerative disorder that affects the autonomic functions of the body; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. LEE OF CALIFORNIA (for herself, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. HOLT, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. TITUS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. BASS, Mr. BARBER, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN):

H. Res. 519. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Professional Social Work Month and World Social Work Day; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

175. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina, relative to a Concurrent Resolution memorializing the Congress to enact legislation revising or requiring revisions of the Southeastern United States federal outer continental shelf administrative district boundaries established by BOEM of the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

176. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Ohio, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 5 urging the Congress to propose a balanced budget amendment to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

177. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of New Mexico, relative to Senate Memorial No. 2 calling upon the New Mexico Congressional Delegation in Washington D.C., to vote in favor of legislation that would remove the deadline for ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 4225.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution: ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

Additional authority derives from Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution: ''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 4226.

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

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution to regulate commerce.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California:

H.R. 4227.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina:

H.R. 4228.

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

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8, Clause I of the Constitution enumerates to Congress the power to ''provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.'' This legislation sets out parameters reforming the way that the Department of Homeland Security purchases the equipment and services it needs to defend the homeland.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 4229.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. RUNYAN:

H.R. 4230.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 4231.

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

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7—''No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.''

By Ms. GABBARD:

H.R. 4232.

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

The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 4233.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 4234.

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

Article 1, Section 8: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 4235.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 4236.

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

Article I, §8

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 4237.

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

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 4238.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 which states that the Congress has power ''to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States . . .''

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 4239.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Office thereof.

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7: No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 4240.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 4241.

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

Article 1 section 8 Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 4242.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, which states that ''The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4243.

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

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PETERS of Michigan:

H.R. 4244.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 4245.

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

Section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 4246.

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

Clause 3, of Section 8, of Article I of the Constitution, which states that the United States Congress shall have power ''to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 4247.

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

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 4248.

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

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

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 4249.

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

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 4250.

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.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 6: Mrs. CAPITO and Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 46: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 118: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 182: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 184: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 455: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 562: Mr. PETERS of Michigan.
H.R. 594: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 597: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 647: Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. SCALISE.
H.R. 755: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 863: Mr. LATTA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 935: Mrs. NOEM.
H.R. 953: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 958: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 962: Mr. MAFFEI and Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 1008: Mr. MCALLISTER.
H.R. 1074: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 1084: Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 1091: Mrs. WAGNER and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H.R. 1098: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 1150: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 1173: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 1175: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 1249: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 1250: Mr. FINCHER.
H.R. 1286: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 1318: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. STOCKMAN, and Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 1343: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
H.R. 1354: Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. JOYCE.
H.R. 1431: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Ms. HANABUSA.
H.R. 1566: Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 1652: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. KILMER, and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1728: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1736: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 1750: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 1761: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Ms. HANABUSA.
H.R. 1832: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 1838: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa and Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 1851: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1893: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 1913: Mr. DUFFY.
H.R. 1920: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 2084: Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 2130: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 2144: Mr. TONKO and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 2160: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 2291: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 2302: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 2376: Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 2377: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. DENT, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 2387: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 2459: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 2523: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts and Mr. SCHRADER.
H.R. 2536: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 2537: Mr. STOCKMAN.
H.R. 2591: Mr. CAMPBELL.
H.R. 2773: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 2825: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 2901: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2919: Mr. PETERSON and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 2932: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Ms. WATERS, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. KIND, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. YODER, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 2939: Mr. BARBER, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. MCHENRY.
H.R. 2959: Mr. JOYCE, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 2992: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
H.R. 2995: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 2996: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 3086: Mr. REED, Mr. HURT, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. DAINES, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. YODER, and Ms. JENKINS.
H.R. 3155: Mr. LANCE and Mr. LONG.
H.R. 3179: Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 3180: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 3186: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
H.R. 3222: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 3305: Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 3318: Mr. ENYART and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 3384: Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 3392: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 3395: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
H.R. 3461: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
H.R. 3481: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KLINE, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. COOPER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. COOK, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 3489: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 3494: Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 3505: Mr. RIBBLE and Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 3525: Mr. PITTENGER.
H.R. 3544: Mr. SCALISE.
H.R. 3546: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 3560: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
H.R. 3600: Mr. MARINO, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 3601: Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 3678: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 3686: Mr. SALMON and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 3698: Mr. CONAWAY.
H.R. 3749: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 3782: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 3836: Ms. JENKINS, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. TURNER.
H.R. 3867: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. GARCIA.
H.R. 3877: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 3897: Mr. NEAL, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 3930: Mr. BARTON, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. COTTON.
H.R. 3965: Mr. VISCLOSKY.
H.R. 3988: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 3992: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 4026: Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 4031: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 4035: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 4041: Mr. MORAN and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 4042: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 4045: Mr. BERA of California, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 4057: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 4060: Mr. ROYCE and Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 4092: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 4107: Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 4117: Mr. PIERLUISI.
H.R. 4119: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 4135: Ms. JENKINS, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 4139: Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. HUNTER, and Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 4148: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. FARR, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 4149: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 4151: Mr. COOK.
H.R. 4154: Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 4162: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 4188: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. BARBER, Mr. REED, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 4193: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 4209: Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. HOLT, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 4213: Mr. PETERSON.
H. J. Res. 68: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H. Con. Res. 61: Mr. VARGAS and Mr. BERA of California.
H. Con. Res. 91: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H. Res. 30: Mr. KIND.
H. Res. 109: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. PERRY.
H. Res. 418: Mr. PETERSON.
H. Res. 428: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H. Res. 456: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. WALZ.
H. Res. 484: Mr. ELLISON, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. RANGEL, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H. Res. 494: Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. HALL, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. NOLAN.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

72. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City of Lauderdale Lakes, Florida, relative to Resolution No. 2014-09 supporting the Congressional Democrats' proposal to raise the minimum wage to Ten and 10/100 ($10.10) Dollars per hour; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

73. Also, a petition of Patchogue-Medford Schools, Patchogue, New York, relative to three resolutions passed buy the Board of Education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 13, 2014 No. 42

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JOHN E. WALSH, a Senator from the State of Montana.

PRAYER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Today's opening prayer will be offered by our guest Chaplain Dean Chambers, who is the associate pastor of Mount Pleasant Baptist Church, Elkview, WV.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Our heavenly Father, we come before You humbly to thank You for the awesome privilege it is to live in this great Nation. Thank You for all the many blessings You have given us past and present, as well as the continued blessings of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness as we continue toward the future.

We ask that You protect us from all who threaten the cause of liberty. We especially pray that Your hand of protection be upon all those serving in our Armed Forces and all those who serve the cause of freedom around our world.

In this assembly today, we invite Your leadership and guidance as the affairs of state are pursued. I ask also that You give to each person wisdom and understanding for the decisions that are made. In times of debate and difference, may we remember that at the end of the day we are, indeed, ''one Nation under God.''

May the love of God the Father, the grace and mercy of the Lord Jesus, and the communion of Your spirit rest upon the Members of our Senate today.

In Jesus's Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 13, 2014.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN E. WALSH, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. WALSH thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 10:30 a.m. this morning, with the Republicans controlling the first half and the majority controlling the final half.

Following morning business, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1086, the child care and development block grant reauthorization bill.

We did extremely well yesterday. I expect more rollcall votes on it today. We are also working on an agreement on flood insurance, we are working on additional executive nominations, and we are seeing what we can do on minimum wage. We have Ukraine sanctions out there someplace, and we are trying to put it all together. We hope we can finish that today, but it is not guaranteed.

Senators will be notified with as much notice as possible when votes are scheduled.

CAMPAIGN DISTORTION

Mr. REID. Over the last couple of weeks I have taken some heat from Senate Republicans and conservative pundits for exposing two multibillionaires. These are two oil barons, and they are trying to rig the political system to favor the rich and especially favor themselves.

After the 14th statement adverse to me issued by a spokesman for the Koch brothers, it seems abundantly clear I have gotten under their skin.

As the saying goes, from the great Senator Pat Moynihan: ''Everyone is entitled to his own opinion, but not to his own facts.''

But I had guessed the Koch brothers have been able to buy their facts over the years, not paying any attention to whether they are true or false. This week media outlets from New York, and especially the New York Times, to the Washington Post, to the Detroit News, revealed the truth. The truth is millions in political ads sponsored by these two multibillionaires are misleading at best and outright false in many instances.

The truth is the Koch brothers are willing to do anything, even exploit Americans suffering from cancer, to advance their campaign of distortion.

I am not afraid of the Koch brothers. None of us should be afraid of the Koch brothers. These two multibillionaires can spend millions of dollars of their money rigging the political process for their own benefit, but that doesn't mean we have to lie down and take it—because we are not going to. They may believe that whoever has the most money gets the most free speech. That is wrong, it is unfair, and it is untrue. I will do whatever it takes to expose their campaign, their campaign to rig

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

the American political system to benefit the wealthy at the expense of the middle class.

A number of Republican Senators have rushed over here to defend the Koch brothers. That is hard to comprehend, but they have done it. If someone asked me—and no one has, but I will give my opinion anyway—billionaires seem perfectly capable of defending themselves. They do it with hundreds of millions of dollars. I am sure it has over the past couple of years reached close to $1 billion spreading these falsehoods. Remember, they don't just do it under the phony banner of Americans for Prosperity, they divert money to a lot of other organizations; for example, millions of dollars to the chamber of commerce, which runs ads against Democratic Senators.

They are capable of defending themselves. But when Senate Republican Senators rush to defend the Koch brothers, they are also defending the Koch brothers' radical philosophy—and it is radical. How do we know it is radical? Because they said it is radical. They said so. I am not making those words up. One of the brothers kept harping on the fact that he had a radical philosophy, and they do.

I ask my Republican colleagues in the Senate, is even one—is even one—willing to stand and disavow the Koch brothers' radical agenda? It is radical. It is radical because they say it is radical—and it is radical. All we have to do is look at it.

Will Senate Republicans reject the Koch brothers' radical plan to privatize Social Security?

Will they come to the floor and reject the Koch brothers' radical plan to end Medicare as we know it?

Will Senate Republicans reject the Koch brothers' radical plan to end the guarantee of affordable, quality, health care and put insurance companies back in charge so tens of millions of Americans are again one heart attack or car accident away from bankruptcy?

Will Senate Republicans reject the Koch brothers' radical plan to allow insurance companies to deny coverage for a child with a heart murmur, a survivor of breast cancer, a teen who suffers from acne or absolutely anyone with a preexisting condition no matter how minor?

Will Senate Republicans reject the Koch brothers' radical plan to eliminate minimum-wage laws and workplace safety standards? That is what the Koch brothers want.

Will Senate Republicans reject the Koch brothers' radical plan to decimate America's public education system? That is what they want.

Will Senate Republicans reject the Koch brothers' radical plan to roll back environmental safeguards and give themselves the unfettered right to pollute our air and water? We have to look out for our children and our grandchildren having pure water to drink, good air to breathe—not with the Koch brothers. That isn't what they want.

Will Senate Republicans reject the Koch brothers' radical plan to give more tax breaks to the richest of the rich—to profitable oil companies, corporations who ship jobs overseas, and billionaires who pay lower taxes than their secretaries?

Not one Republican stepped forward, so obviously they must agree with the Koch brothers' radical philosophy. Republicans are willing to defend the Koch brothers on the floor of this Senate, but are they willing to defend the Koch brothers' radical agenda as well? I guess that is what they are doing by coming to the floor.

If Republicans don't support the Koch brothers' ''survival of the richest'' philosophy, all they have to do is say so because the truth is it will be terrible to allow the Koch brothers to buy Congress and to buy our country. And that is what they are trying to do.

It would be catastrophic to allow the Koch brothers' Congress to devastate the American middle class with their richest-take-all policy agenda.

This discussion isn't only about fairness or the democratic way. This discussion isn't only about the inherent danger in allowing two multibillionaire oil barons to buy America's political system. This is also about how these two multibillionaires would use a political system, once they have bought it, and how they would abuse it in order to add zeros to the bottom line while hurting middle-class families.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority leader is recognized.

U.S. TRAGEDIES

Mr. MCCONNELL. I begin this morning by extending my sympathy to families of the victims in yesterday's explosion in Harlem. News reports suggest a truly tragic loss of life and a lot of injuries, so it is a very sad day in New York today.

As usual, in a catastrophe such as this, the response from firemen, police, and first responders was both quick and courageous. Many ordinary citizens who just happened to be in the area showed a lot of humanity and a lot of heroism too.

We are grateful for them and we are all hoping and praying for a fully speedy recovery for those who were injured. These kinds of tragic accidents always take a big toll on the communities where they take place.

A few months back there was a horrible house fire in western Kentucky that took the lives of eight children and their mother. It was devastating to the entire community and still is, so we are thinking of them also today.

ANTI-FREE SPEECH

Mr. MCCONNELL. I wish to take a moment to address anti-free speech legislation the Obama administration has made a priority for this term. It is a regulation that comes in the wake of an unprecedented IRS attack on Americans' civil liberties and it represents a direct assault on the First Amendment.

First, let's be clear. This is not some partisan issue. Right across the political spectrum the American people agree this is a terrible idea. That is probably why it has generated more public backlash than any similar regulation in our entire lifetime.

Americans on the left hate it. Americans on the right hate it. Unions, business groups, environmentalists, conservatives, the ACLU, all of them have expressed concern. It is very rare to see a coalition that broad agree on anything in this town. Yet it is easy to see why Americans would be so united in opposition to this regulation.

The First Amendment exists to protect political speech. That was what the Founders had in mind when they wrote First Amendment political speech. The government should be doing everything it can to protect that right, not hurt it.

That is why we saw a record number of Americans register their complaints with the IRS. In fact, there were more than 140,000, comments—140,000 comments—on this regulation, which I hear is the highest number ever received in the agency's entire history. And let's not forget the IRS has a long way to go to regain public trust these days. Too many Americans look at the agency and see an instrument of political harassment rather than a bureau of tax processors. So if the agency wants to regain trust and return to its true mission, then it simply has to get out of the speech regulation business altogether. The IRS needs to get out of the speech regulation business altogether, and the Obama administration can do that.

Look. The administration ran this idea up the flagpole. In the midst of a historic crisis of public confidence at the IRS, it decided to upend more than half a century of practice and rewrite the rules on how Americans could express themselves, how they could be heard. They asked for comments, and the American people let them know what they thought in over 140,000 comments, almost all of them in opposition.

This regulation needs to go. This regulation needs to go, and it needs to go now. It is in the administration's power to make that happen. All it has to do is to listen to the American people who are speaking out in record

numbers—record numbers—and put an end for good to the idea that the law should be used to harm political enemies.

Let's protect the First Amendment and restore integrity to the IRS at the same time by withdrawing this awful regulation.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

CAPTAIN DAVID I. LYON

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I wish to speak about a U.S. airman lost in battle who has left behind a saddened but grateful country. Capt. David I. Lyon of Sandpoint, ID, was killed in action on December 27, 2013, in Kabul, Afghanistan, when his convoy was intentionally and deliberately attacked by the enemy with explosive devices. Captain Lyon's mission was an advisory one for the Afghan National Army Commandos. He was 28 years old.

For his service in uniform, Captain Lyon received several medals, awards, and decorations, including the Bronze Star, the Purple Heart, the Meritorious Service Medal, the Air Force Combat Action Medal, the Meritorious Unit Award, the Air Force Outstanding Unit Award, the Air Force Organizational Excellence Award, the Air Force Good Conduct Medal, the National Defense Service Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, the Small Arms Expert Marksmanship Ribbon, and the Air Force Training Ribbon.

As a cadet at the U.S. Air Force Academy, David was a star track and field athlete. As a team captain who is still ranked third all-time in academy history for indoor and outdoor shot put, his teammates gave David the nickname ''Leonidas''—after the ancient Greek warrior-king of Sparta—for his courage against fearful odds.

''Oh captain, my captain, Leonidas, we salute you. You will never be forgot,'' says Scott Irving, who was David's assistant coach. David ''knew the risk he was taking and embraced it without hesitation or fear,'' Scott adds. ''That's another Leonidas trait, I would say.''

David's wife, Capt. Dana Lyon, is an officer in the U.S. Air Force and an Air Force Academy graduate, where she herself was a two-time NCAA champion in the javelin throw. Her family hails from Lexington, KY, and I had the honor of speaking with them and hearing firsthand about David's service and tragic sacrifice.

''Dave was known as a tender warrior and a protector,'' says Rick Pounds, Dana's father and David's father-in-law. ''He was lighthearted and a gentle giant. Kind and compassionate to everyone he met, Dave's smile would light up a room. If my daughter would have given me the task of 'go find me a husband anywhere,' he is who I would have picked.''

''Dave loved the principles upon which our country was founded, and died in defense of them,'' Rick continued. ''More importantly, he was a faithful follower of our Lord and savior Jesus Christ, in whom our liberty and freedom is derived.''

David attended the Air Force Academy, where he graduated in 2008. While there, he was a 3-year letter winner for the track and field team. He became a Mountain West Conference champion and was named to the National Strength and Conditioning Association All-American Team and received the Laura Piper Ironman Award. This award is named for a 1991 Air Force Academy graduate and former track and field star who was killed in action in Operation Desert Shield in Iraq. David's shot put throw of 57 feet, 11 inches earned him a place in the academy's record books.

''That gives you a sense of his intensity and his drive and his determination,'' said Scott Irving. ''When he was team captain, he would get upset with other[s] . . . if they didn't give everything they could give—it bothered him if they didn't try to take their God-given talents to the highest level. That was David, day in and day out.''

After graduation from the academy, David excelled in his Air Force career. Lt. Col. James Lovewell, his former squadron commander, recalls how much David impressed him. ''The consistency of his character showed across many facets of his life,'' Lieutenant Colonel Lovewell says. ''He was very humble and tireless in serving others. He had a superb work ethic. He was a servant leader—he served people just as much as he led them.''

Assigned to the 21st Logistics Readiness Squadron at Peterson Air Force Base, Colorado, David was picked over more senior officers to become the group commander's right-hand man. He worked above and beyond what was asked of him.

''I joked I was going to start calling him 'Boomerang,' because he would come into work and I told him there's nothing more he could do, and invariably he would just come back,'' said Lieutenant Colonel Lovewell. ''He was sticking around to make sure I was taken care of.''

David and Dana were both serving their country in Afghanistan at the same time. David worked in logistics, Dana in acquisitions. ''He would always talk about how proud he was of her over there, taking care of the mission, as he was,'' Lieutenant Colonel Lovewell recalls.

Just before David's tragic death, the couple were able to have Christmas dinner together one final time.

''Every day was always the best day of my life with him, so every day just got better,'' Dana said. ''The last 2 days were the best 2 days we've spent together.''

Because they were based in Colorado Springs, David and Dana maintained their ties to the Air Force Academy. They coached and mentored young athletes, sponsored cadets, and volunteered with the Air Force Wounded Warrior Program. They had members of the academy track and field team over for meals. David also enjoyed camping, hiking, lifting weights, and listening to country music with the windows down with his wife.

Dana's brother Eric Pounds is also an Air Force captain and admired his brother-in-law both as a dedicated airman and a beloved member of the family. ''They both loved the Air Force,'' Eric says of his sister and brother-in-law. ''They both wanted to fight, and they both wanted to protect their country. [David] did that at home, and he did that in the Air Force. He was a protector and a provider, and I'm just really proud of him.''

We are thinking of David Lyon's beloved ones today, including his wife Dana; his parents Bob and Jeannie Lyon; his brother Sean Lyon; his parents-in-law Rick and Nancy Pounds; his grandparents Ray and Imogene Davis; his step-grandmother Beth Davis; his brothers-in-law Eric Pounds and Darren Pounds; and many other beloved family members and friends.

It was my honor to speak with the family members of Captain Lyon, just as it is an honor for me to share his story with my colleagues in the Senate today. I know we as a nation send our condolences to this brave military family for the loss of such an incredible husband, son, friend, and dedicated airman. I want them to know the Senate has paused today in memoriam to Capt. David I. Lyon to pay tribute to his life of service and sacrifice half a world away. He will be remembered, and he will be missed by those who knew him and loved him.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 10:30 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first half.

The Senator from Wyoming.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, tomorrow President Obama is scheduled to sit down for an interview with a health care Web site called WebMD. The President will take questions about his health care law, and he is going to try one more time to convince people across the country that his health care law hasn't really been a complete disaster.

It is a little bit ironic that the President will be doing this interview because under his health care law, before we know it, healthcare.gov is going to be linking directly to WebMD. People are going to have to spend a lot more time on Web sites like that one because the President's health care law is going to make it tougher for many of them to see a real health care provider.

America is facing a looming shortage of doctors, nurses, and physician assistants. When President Obama and Democrats were ramming ObamaCare through this Congress, they focused on hiring IRS agents—agents to force Americans to buy expensive coverage—instead of training more doctors and nurses to deliver care to patients.

Now, according to the Association of American Medical Colleges, we are looking at a shortage of 90,000 physicians by the end of this decade. About half of those are family physicians, primary care providers, and about half of them specialists. We see the same numbers, if not even higher shortages, in terms of nurses.

There is an old proverb: ''Physician, heal thyself.'' Well, apparently the slogan of ObamaCare is now going to be ''Patient, heal thyself.''

The old doctor-patient relationship is going to be gone. Medicine as we know it is going to continue to change. Even when you can get time with your doctor, there is going to be a lot more of that time spent with the doctor looking not at you but at a computer screen because of the law, and that is because of the burdensome new rules and the recordkeeping requirements under the law.

As more people try to get appointments with fewer doctors, some Americans are going to start seeing actual rationing of care. Here is how one economist described it in a blog post for the New York Times. He talked about the health care law's limits on payments to doctors and other providers, and he wrote:

> If patients are lucky, the demand for doctors will be low enough that the limits will not matter. But if the new law results in a significant net increase in physician demand, the payment limits will help remind us of Soviet-era limits on the price of bread, with queues and black markets to follow.

We know the President's Web site back this past fall was a complete failure. Four days before it was unveiled the President said: Oh, it is going to be easier to use than Amazon. The rates will be cheaper than your cell phone bill. You will be able to keep your doctor.

But the Web site was just the tip of the iceberg. People are seeing higher premiums.

It is interesting, Mr. President, as I was putting this together and thinking about what remarks I would make, I hadn't even seen this morning's newspaper. Today in the Wall Street Journal—Thursday, March 13—Secretary of Health and Human Services Kathleen Sebelius says: Higher premiums likely in 2015.

Higher premiums. What did the President promise? He said premiums would go down by $2,500 per family.

So the Web site is just the tip of the iceberg. People are seeing higher premiums now, and now the Secretary of HHS says there will be higher premiums again in 2015.

People have received notices of cancellation—over 5 million across the country. Many people can't keep their doctor and are worried about fraud and identity theft which has been reported as a result of the Web site and is ongoing. Then, of course, there are higher copays and higher deductibles—more money out of patients' pockets.

There is a report which brings this additionally to the fore in terms of concerns the people are having from people who supported the health care law originally. This report was put out last week by a major labor union discussing how badly this health care law is hurting its members.

To put this into perspective, this is a labor union which actually supported then-Senator Obama and endorsed him when he was running for President a number of years ago, and they supported the health care law. Now this union has come out with a report which says: The law's unintended consequences will hit the average hardworking American where it hurts—in the wallet.

We can go through this report called ''The Irony of ObamaCare Making Inequality Worse.'' To read from this:

> The ACA threatens the middle class with higher premiums, loss of hours, and a shift to part-time work and less comprehensive coverage.

It goes on with examples of various individuals who are members of this labor union whose lives are being hurt by the President's health care law. One, a woman from the majority leader's home State, talks about her job as a housekeeper and how, if she tries to buy the Obama health care program, the Web site says she would have to pay $8,057 a year more to keep the insurance she has now—which is a $3.87 per hour pay cut for her. She said, ''We work hard for our insurance. Why should we have to take a cut in pay for it?''

This is not what the President promised. So it is not a surprise that even the unions that had endorsed the President and supported the law are unhappy with what they see as the true results of the health care law.

The Democrat majority leader has said all the horror stories about the health care law are untrue. Is he also saying these union leaders and the people who have been made reference to in the union report are lying? Is this what the majority leader is saying? Is that what he is saying about this woman from his own State?

According to the media report, the union said the law ''will inevitably lead to the destruction of the health care plans we were promised we could keep.''

Everybody remembers the President's promises. They remember what the President said. Everybody remembers the President's statement: ''If you like what you have, you can keep it.'' The press has called it ''The Lie of the Year.''

More than 5 million Americans received cancellation letters from their insurance companies. It turned out to be so embarrassing that President Obama had to delay the rules which caused it. It has continued to be a big problem, so the administration is delaying the rule again—not just until after the 2014 election but with the potential of going beyond the 2016 election as well.

Here we go, dozens of delays. This is a calendar of 2013 and 2014. There are more delays to come—another delay, another lawless ObamaCare rewrite.

The Obama administration continues to announce delays. We have seen one change after another to major parts of the law which are now ''politically inconvenient'' for the President.

Republicans warned that these were real problems and that they would hurt hardworking Americans all across the country. I was on the floor during all of the debates, talking about the problems to come with the health care law, offering solutions, offering suggestions—every one of them rejected because Democrats just didn't care.

They only cared the second they realized that all their grandiose plans were actually causing more problems than they ever anticipated because they didn't listen.

The President had an event last week where he said that the law is ''working the way it should.'' This is what he said—''working the way it should.'' Is it working the way it should after he made all of these changes? Is that what he means—''working the way it should.''

So if it is working the way it should, why has the President had to change it so many times? Does he not know what the rest of his administration is doing? Does he not know what the rest of this country is seeing? Is the President delusional or is he just in denial?

The American people want to know, and they deserve to hear from the President when he does this WebMD interview. When President Obama sits down to talk with WebMD on Friday, I hope they ask him about all of these delays and the changes he is making to the law. I hope they ask him whether he believes it is really working the way it should, which is what he said last week. I hope they ask him about how his health care law is going to reduce the time people get to spend with their doctors—if they can even keep their doctors. I hope they ask him about some of the ways the law is hurting Americans and America.

I hope the President answers that he is finally ready to make some of these delays permanent, to start over again, to work in a bipartisan way, to try to help patients get the care they need

from a doctor they choose at a lower cost. This is what health care reform was supposed to be about in the first place.

It is so interesting. Just pick up the papers. Yesterday, March 12, the Washington Post: ''Health Exchange Signups Slowed in Past Month.'' The New York Times: ''Health Care Enrollment Falls Short of Goal, With Deadline Approaching. Signing Up for Insurance, But Well Below Targets.''

Then, so many questions are asked of the White House and the Secretary of Health and Human Services. The headline in Politico today: ''W.H. Playing Dumb on ACA Enrollments, Insurers Say.''

I think the President needs to come clean with the American people and tell them about what a disaster his health care law has become, how it has impacted their lives, how few people have actually been able to sign up—or have been able to but have found the cost is too high for them to sign up—and admit to the American people that when they talk about some of these numbers of sign-ups, many of those are people who got cancellation notices. They are not newly-insured individuals.

A study out last week shows that only about one in four people who have actually signed up on the Web site didn't have insurance before. So the people this was intended to help are not being helped. Many people are being harmed.

It is time to work together to help patients get the care they need from the doctor they choose at lower costs.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, across the country every day millions of Americans are working in low-wage jobs, going back to school to increase their skills in order to pay their bills and take care of their families. They do their best to balance work and family obligations, but too many moms and dads really struggle with the high cost of quality, safe childcare.

One out of three families with young children earns less than $25,000 a year, and childcare can cost $4,800 to $16,000 a year. In many parts of the country childcare for two children now exceeds average rental payments.

According to a recent report by Child Care Aware America, in more than half the States—including my own State of Illinois—it costs families more to put an infant in childcare than to cover tuition and fees in a public college. In many parts of the country, childcare for children now exceeds average rental payments. Low-income families spend almost half their salaries on childcare. It is a significant part of the family's budget. Child care and development block grant is an important program that helps low-income working families with the cost of childcare and afterschool programs. This program serves more than 1.6 million children in the United States every month. In Illinois, more than 50,000 children receive support.

As we learn more about the significance of the first few years in the life of a child's development, it is not enough just to improve access; we have to improve the quality of childcare for young children. Children in their early years are facing some of the most important moments of development, and their experiences in the first few years could literally shape their young lives. Early childhood education gives kids the solid foundation they need, not just to kindergarten but beyond. Working parents who don't have good options for quality childcare face an unfair dilemma.

Just ask Tabatha Okamoto of Chicago, IL. Tabatha has faced the challenge of finding adequate childcare for her son since he was an infant. On days when she cannot find a spot in a childcare center she hopes that maybe a family member or maybe a neighbor will be able to take care of him. She worries about losing her job, and she was almost fired because there were so many days she was late because of childcare issues.

Even when she finds reliable childcare, she still has a tough time figuring out how to pay for it. Tabatha is a good mom, but she has a lot of expenses and a low-income job. She pays her rent, health insurance, and other bills and $800 monthly for her son to attend Little Fox Day School in Lincoln Square Center. It would be too much for her to handle on her own. Because of this program being debated on the floor of the Senate, Tabatha's out-of-pocket costs are now between $250 and $375 a month for this daycare at Little Fox Day School. It is less than half. It is still a sacrifice to come up with $250 to $400 a month, but at least she has a fighting chance to make sure her son has good daycare. More importantly, this program is giving Tabatha the peace of mind to know her son is in the right place when she goes to work every day.

It has been more than 20 years since we started this block grant. We need to update it. The grant program before us on the floor today, the child care and development block grant, would make much-needed updates to the law, expanding access to toddlers and infants and lower income families, strengthening health and safety standards and training, and ensuring the program is meeting the needs of children with disabilities, and expanding background checks for childcare providers.

I want to thank Senators BARBARA MIKULSKI and TOM HARKIN, who have been champions of children and working Americans, for all the work they put into this bill. I want to thank Senator RICHARD BURR on the other side of the aisle and LAMAR ALEXANDER as well for making this a true bipartisan effort.

I hope my colleagues will join me today when this bill comes up for a vote. This is the kind of bipartisan bill we all should support. Working moms and dads need peace of mind knowing their kids are in a safe place that would help their children develop in the right way.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I take this time to talk about the child care and development block grant bill that is before us and will be before us soon. I want to congratulate my colleagues, Senator MIKULSKI for her leadership on this bill, and Senator HARKIN, Senator ALEXANDER, and Senator BURR. This is truly a bipartisan effort, and we very much appreciate the child care and development block grant. It is critically important.

The last time we authorized this program was 1996. I know that very well because I was serving in the House of Representatives at the time and had the opportunity to be the ranking member on the Human Resources Subcommittee in the Ways and Means Committee that was considering welfare reform and childcare, and how we could reward families for work, and how our welfare system could become a transitional program rather than a permanent program that would allow people, particularly moms, to be able to get into the workforce, stay in the workforce and climb up the economic ladder.

As part of welfare reform we recognized we had to do things about the major cost concerns of someone, a mom, giving up her welfare in order to go to work. One of those issues was health care. We passed transitional health care for people coming off of cash assistance. We also had to deal with childcare, because childcare is an extremely costly part of being able to get into the workforce.

In 1996 we consolidated many programs that were out there. We coordinated eligibility. There were different eligibility rules for many of these programs. We simplified the rules so we could get maximum dollars of help for people who entered the workforce. The goal was self-sufficiency through education, training, and being able to get a job.

Today, under the CCDBG, under the Child Care and Development Block Grant Program, there are 1.6 million eligible children. It is not just a safe environment for those children, because 70 percent of their parents are working—not just a safe environment,

it is early childhood education. These children who are in childcare will do better later in life. There have been many studies that verify this.

This is a win-win situation, providing a safe environment for children so their parents can work and educational opportunity for the children at the same time. It pays off big-time for the workforce. A TANF study showed that parents who had their children in childcare for 2 years or more were more likely to remain in the employment field. So it provides stable employment, help for the child, and a win-win situation.

The eligibility for the program is it cannot exceed 85 percent of the State median income, to give you an idea of the type of people we are talking about who benefit from this program.

In Maryland, for a family of two the maximum income is $24,000 and for a family of four the maximum income is $35,000. In my State, Maryland, the average cost for childcare for an infant is about $12,000 a year. For a child over 4 years of age, it is about $9,000 a year.

We heard about the income levels and how a family is eligible for this program. It is clear that low-wage families cannot afford childcare on their own. We need to help, and that is what this program does, so that they can move up the economic ladder and not be a burden on the cash-assistance program.

Today, as we did prior to 1996, we have combined discretionary and mandatory programs for our childcare. Today discretionary spending is at $2.36 billion and $2.9 billion in mandatory spending.

The legislation before us also makes improvements, as it should. It allows the States to develop 13 specific health and safety standards, such as first aid and CPR, and SIDS, sudden infant death syndrome. It is keeping our children safer in childcare by having safety standards that are developed. It requires the States to do inspections of childcare centers, comprehensive background checks for those who are involved in childcare, online information, more transparency in the program, and additional State flexibility on how they can set priorities within the childcare program. That is exactly what federalism should be.

The Federal Government establishes a broad policy that we want to see families self-sufficient, we want to make sure there is a safe environment for children, and we want to make sure we do this in a way that is consistent with our national priorities. We also need to give flexibility to the State and local governments to be able to set their priorities to meet the needs of their citizens, and that is what this bill does.

I will take a moment now to give real-life examples of how this program is critically important to our community. A great example is the Judy Centers of Maryland. We have 25 Judy Centers in Maryland. They are named after Congressman STENY HOYER's wife Judy, who died of cancer in 1997. Judy was a longtime advocate for quality early childhood education and comprehensive family support services. I knew Judy very well, and she was an incredibly dedicated leader and advocate for our children.

I have a couple of specific examples from the Judy Center as to how the Child Care and Development Block Grant Program is critically important to their existence. According to the testimony given before a committee, Judy Center employees discovered a dad who lost his job and a mom who only worked part time. They could not make ends meet or look for jobs or go on interviews because they had no childcare for their 2- and 3-year-old children. The Judy Center enrolled them in KinderCare, a childcare partner, and provided tuition assistance.

Since they lost their health insurance when their dad became unemployed, they were given an application for the Maryland CHIP program, the health insurance program. The 3-year-old had a behavioral issue and was referred to the Judy Center behavioral specialist, who worked with her extensively. She also received tutoring services.

Dad is now employed full time. Thanks to safe childcare, dad is now employed full time. After much encouragement, mom enrolled in adult education classes and received her GED. She has also completed a medical assistance program and is now enrolled in the College of Southern Maryland to pursue an associates degree. The children are now in elementary school and are doing well in school.

I could give many more examples like this family. I could talk about many other success stories that would not have been possible without the Child Care and Development Block Grant Program, and that is why it is critically important that we reauthorize the program.

I see my colleague from Maryland is on the Senate floor. I congratulate her for her leadership in getting this bill to the floor—not just getting this bill to the floor, which is important, but doing it in a way that we can get it passed in the Senate and accomplish our objectives so we can get women into the workforce and have early childhood education to help children succeed in life. We can help American families and strengthen America.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, before my colleague leaves the floor, I want to express my appreciation for his statement today and in particular when he spoke about the Judy Center, which has meant so much in Maryland to show the way childcare should be addressed. The Judy Center is a family-oriented organization that is focused on children. Their so-called wraparound services help the child not only with all that is necessary in a well-run childcare facility, but they also work with the family, strengthen the family, and help the family by giving them information about other opportunities to improve their life, such as educational benefits. I think it is a national model. If I had my way, I would like to adopt the Judy Center model throughout America.

Again, I thank the Senator for speaking about the Judy Center.

I also thank my friend for his steadfast advocacy for children, the way he has worked for the children's health program, particularly focusing on the dental services for that little boy Deamonte, the child who died. He is a real fighter.

Senator CARDIN is also well known for getting rid of lead paint poisoning in Maryland. So now he wants the lead out of bureaucracy and the lead out of the Senate. Again, I thank him for his comments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the bill.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT ACT OF 2014

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1086, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1086) to improve the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Harkin amendment No. 2811, to include rural and remote areas as underserved areas identified in the State plan.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I am going to give a recap of where we are and then note the absence of a quorum as we sort through our amendments.

This is the second day of the Senate's consideration of S. 1086, the child care and development block grant reauthorization on which 1.5 million American children depend, including 20,000 children from the State of Maryland. We have been working on this bill for over 2 years, and now it is our second day of moving this legislation.

We have made an impressive amount of progress. Yesterday the Senate agreed to nine amendments—three by rollcall vote and six by voice vote. We had a great group of bipartisan amendments. Of the nine amendments that were adopted, three were sponsored by Republicans, two were sponsored by Democrats, and four amendments were bipartisan. The amendments yesterday improved the underlying bill. They streamlined Federal early learning programs; made sure tribes get the funding they need; required States to develop childcare disaster plans; and ensures that CDBG, as it is known, also

serves an often much-overlooked population—foster care.

We also had a healthy debate on the floor in which women Senators came down to show their support for this bipartisan bill. Today we hope to continue our due deliberation of amendments.

Last night we identified approximately 29 to 30 amendments that remain. It is the hope of the chair and ranking member that sometime today—around 11:30 a.m., before the lunch—we will move to votes. We expect to have voice votes, possibly a rollcall vote, and I will give a further progress report. The timeline for all amendments is closed. We are now sorting through those amendments to see which we can adopt by agreement or adopt by a voice vote so we can move ahead.

I also say to my colleagues, there are many who have excellent ideas about childcare issues, and some are relevant to children but not necessarily relevant to this bill. As we wrap up the legislation, we hope to focus only on germane amendments to the bill today, and those other ideas, as meritorious as they are for consideration, that they either be withdrawn or find another vehicle for discussion and consideration.

We thank our colleagues for the quality of the amendments that have been brought forth. It shows that the Senate—on both sides of the aisle—has been thinking about children and has actually been listening to this compelling need around childcare and its availability and affordability, its safety and helping children get their education. Not all of the amendments—although they are focused on children—are relevant to the block grant, which is a voucher program to help low-income women qualify for childcare.

I will give further updates as the morning progresses and we sort through this. In the meantime, we invite Senators to come to the floor and talk about this very important topic facing American families.

I note the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, let me begin by commending my colleagues Senator MIKULSKI, Senator HARKIN, Senator ALEXANDER, and Senator BURR for their hard work to reauthorize the child care development block grant. This is a modest piece of legislation and I urge my colleagues to support it.

The main point I wish to briefly make this morning is that even if this modest piece of legislation passes, it will not begin to address the very serious problems we face in childcare in our country and, even more importantly, in childhood poverty.

The United States is the wealthiest Nation in the history of the world. Unfortunately, despite our great wealth, we have the most unequal distribution of wealth and income of any major country on Earth. We have more people today living in poverty than at any time in the history of our country. Most significantly, and related to the discussion we are having about childcare today, the United States of America has, by far, the highest rate of childhood poverty of any major country on Earth. In my opinion, we have a moral responsibility to address that issue and we should put our energy and our minds to focusing on how we eliminate childhood poverty in America.

I will be offering an amendment today which is a very simple amendment. My amendment says the President of the United States should submit a plan to Congress which substantially reduces childhood poverty over the next 5 years. That is the amendment—that the President of the United States submit a plan to Congress which substantially reduces childhood poverty over the next 5 years. I hope and expect we would have unanimous support for this amendment.

As the Presiding Officer will recall, not too long ago, during the Winter Olympics at Sochi, Americans there were shouting out to our great athletes: ''USA, USA! We are No. 1.'' That was something I think many of us in America supported. We wanted our athletes in the Winter Olympics to be No. 1.

While we want to be No. 1 in terms of our athletic prowess, while we want to be No. 1 in terms of our scientific and intellectual accomplishments, while we want to be No. 1 in terms of economic growth and prosperity, we surely do not want to be No. 1 in the world in terms of childhood poverty. That is where we are today, with almost 22 percent of our kids living in poverty.

The reason, quite obviously, we do not want to be No. 1 in terms of childhood poverty is not only the moral issue of turning our backs on millions and millions of our most vulnerable people—kids who are 6 months old, kids who are 2 years old, kids who are 8 years old; human beings who cannot fend for themselves—it seems to me, as a caring people, we have the moral responsibility to make sure all of our children receive the basic necessities of life and not live in poverty.

I think there is a moral obligation to make sure we eliminate childhood poverty, but there is also an economic reality as well. I will get to that in a minute. But the first point to be made is that when we look at childhood poverty in America, which is 21.8 percent, we should examine what is going on in other countries.

Is it possible to go forward and significantly reduce or eliminate childhood poverty? The answer is yes. All we have to do is look around the world. In Denmark, child poverty is 3.7 percent. In Finland, it is 3.9 percent; in Norway, it is 5.1 percent; in Iceland, it is 7.1 percent; in Austria, 8.2 percent; Sweden, 8.2 percent; Germany, 9.1 percent; in South Korea, 9.4 percent; in the United Kingdom, 9.4 percent; France, 11 percent; New Zealand, 13 percent; Poland, 13.6 percent; Canada, 14 percent. But in the United States of America, the childhood poverty rate is 21.8 percent.

As I mentioned a moment ago, this is clearly a moral issue. A powerful Nation which, in recent years, has seen huge increases in the number of millionaires and billionaires, we should not be a society in which almost one out of four of our kids gets their nutrition from food stamps. We should not be a society where a significant number of young people are dropping out of high school, standing out on street corners and destroying their lives.

This is not just a moral issue; it is an economic issue. My colleagues, please tell me what kind of economic future we have when we are competing against countries around the world which are doing a better job than we are in providing the intellectual and emotional support their kids need; that are doing a better job than we are in educating their young people. How do we compete against these countries in the very competitive international global economy? Do we say to the young children who are living in poverty: Sorry. We can't afford to provide the preschool education you need; we can't afford to provide the childcare your parents need for you, and we are really sorry the odds are that many of you may drop out of school and that some of you will end up in jail.

We have more people in jail in the United States of America than in any other country on Earth. Clearly, one of the reasons for that has to do with the fact that we have the highest rate of childhood poverty in the industrialized world. We pay for these things one way or we pay for them another way. The way we are paying for it is by spending $50,000 or $60,000 a year incarcerating huge numbers of people rather than making sure our kids get the nourishment—intellectual, emotional, nutritional—they need in order to do well in life.

It is important for us to look at what happens around the world, to see what we can learn, and to see what is working well around the world. It is important for us to learn and to understand that in countries such as Denmark, Finland, and Norway, where childhood poverty is very low, childcare is free to all of its workers. Workers in these countries get paid maternity leave. That means when a mom has a baby, she has the opportunity to stay home with her baby during the most important months of a baby's life and not have to worry about going to work and making a living, because those societies have said the right thing—that they want kids and mothers to bond and fathers to bond well, for those kids to do well. In this country, if a person

is low income and working class and they have a baby, they have to get to work right away, because if they don't have that income, how do they take care of their families? Those countries have done the right thing and it is important to learn from them.

In many countries around the world, workers get allowances from their governments to take care of their children. Their workers are guaranteed a 4-week paid vacation. Health care is a right and not a privilege for their citizens. In France, for example, if both parents go back to work after having a child, they are entitled to receive strong childcare benefits. In Germany—hard for us to believe—but if children get sick, their parents get up to 25 days of paid leave to stay home and take care of those children. These are just a few of the many benefits people in other countries—our competitors—receive. Maybe we can learn something from them.

Unfortunately, workers in our country—in this great Nation—have none of those benefits. Here is what has happened as a result. More than one in five children in America lives in households that lack consistent access to adequate food because their parents don't make enough money. In other words, the number of millionaires and billionaires is growing—more and more income in wealth inequality—and millions and millions of families today who are raising kids are wondering how they are going to have enough food on the table to provide basic nutrition to those kids. Should that be happening in the United States of America?

The number of homeless children living in America has gone up by 73 percent since 2006. In every State in the country, including my State of Vermont, there are families living with their kids in cars or in emergency shelters. Is that the way we give kids the opportunity they need to advance in their lives?

The psychologists tell us over and over that the most important years of a human being's life in terms of intellectual and emotional growth are those years between 0 and 4. Yet, in this country today, less than half of 3- and 4-year-olds are enrolled in preschool. Ninety-six percent of infants and toddlers living in low-income families don't receive the early education they need through the early Head Start Program. More than 220,000 American children are currently on waiting lists for childcare assistance. And on and on it goes.

What does this mean in English? This is what it means. It means in Vermont, in New Jersey, in Maryland—it means in States all over this country—a mom and dad wake up in the morning with a 3-year-old and they are worried about the quality and affordability of the childcare they can find for that kid. So they go to work and they are saying, what is happening? I have to go to work. I can't stay home with my child. We need to make money. Yet, I cannot find quality, affordable childcare for my child. And in this country that is exactly what we should be providing.

According to a recent study by the Children's Defense Fund, childhood poverty costs this Nation at least $500 billion each and every year in extra education, health and criminal justice expenses, and in lost productivity. In other words, rather than learning what other countries are doing—investing in our kids, nurturing our kids, making sure our kids get the great education they deserve—we turn our backs on millions of kids and then we are shocked—just shocked—that they turn to drugs or crime or self-destructive activity, and we spend a fortune incarcerating them. Think about all of the intellectual and emotional destruction that takes place in this country because we ignore the needs of our children.

We hear our fellow Senators come to the floor and talk about how the United States is the greatest country on Earth, and I share that sentiment. But I do not believe the greatest country on Earth should have, by far, the highest rate of childhood poverty in the industrialized world.

The amendment I have offered is a very simple amendment. I hope it is accepted. I hope it will be supported unanimously. I hope it will allow us to go forward.

What the amendment says, again, is very simple. It says the President of the United States should submit a plan to the Congress which allows us to substantially reduce childhood poverty in the next 5 years. That is it.

With that, I yield the floor and hope very much this amendment is adopted. Thank you.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, we are in the process of sorting out the amendments that are pending, again, to see what we could accept by UC, what we could accept by voice vote, and those that might require a rollcall vote. The chairman and the ranking member of the committee, Senator HARKIN and Senator ALEXANDER, are discussing this, and we are looking forward to some type of votes on or about 11:30 a.m.

But I see there are a lot of amendments out here about streamlining this and duplicating this and others—very thoughtful—but I wish to clarify exactly what is the Child Care and Development Block Grant Program. This is a program that meets a particular need to help people have access to childcare, and we are strengthening the quality requirements. It does not solve all of the childcare problems in the United States of America.

The overall need of childcare for both poor women and middle-class women or families is well known. It is one of the agonizing choices families need to make.

The Child Care and Development Block Grant Program—and this is why we are looking at a variety of other issues. We have on the books the childcare tax credit bill, where many of us hope to expand the deduction. Senator GILLIBRAND has others. But today we are focusing on the child care and development block grant. It is the primary Federal grant program to provide childcare assistance for working families.

It was passed originally in 1990, under George Herbert Walker Bush. Before 1996, there were four childcare programs for low-income families. All of them had different eligibility criteria and work requirements—exactly what we have talked about here, the need to streamline. Three were targeted to families in or at risk of being in the welfare system. One was targeted to low-income families outside of welfare.

But in 1996 under welfare reform, on a bipartisan basis, we created one unified program to serve low-income families with one set of eligibility criteria and work requirements. It was then streamlined. The overarching purpose of the childcare bill in welfare reform was to give parents aid, substantial assistance, so they could go from welfare to work or get the training to go to work.

It has been a very successful program—a very successful program. One and one-half million children in America benefit from it; 20,000 in Maryland alone—a substantial waiting list if we had more vouchers.

What we are doing in this bill is reauthorizing, following the spirit of 1996, streamlining and taking now what we know—new knowledge and best practices of how to help children in childcare be able to be safe, have a sense of security and stability, and then also enhance their ability to learn. We know now—all the research shows—from infancy to age 5 is one of the greatest growth spurts for brain development in a person's life. Vocabulary development and so many other things occur.

So what our bill does is help improve that, but we do not so overmandate to the States that we do not allow for local flexibility. So we are trying to streamline the bill, have a better emphasis on quality, without stringent new Federal mandates, and at the same time streamline this legislative process by moving through our amendment process.

I now look forward to conferring with my colleague. Members should stay tuned. If they would like to speak on this or the matter of childcare, we welcome them. We have had an open amendment process. We have had an open dialogue. We have had an open floor. I think this has been very constructive.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BURR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold?

Ms. MIKULSKI. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I thank my friend and colleague for withholding on that quorum call.

We have made tremendous progress. Our joint staffs worked well into the night with Members who have amendments to this bill that they think improve the bill. We have worked aggressively to try to work out as many of those as we possibly can, and I am here to report to our colleagues we have made tremendous progress. We have processed, since we started yesterday, a number of amendments and this bill has become better. We still have several on both sides that we are still working on with our Members to try to accommodate their intent with language that is acceptable and continues to improve this bill, and we will do that.

Let me say to our colleagues who still might have amendments, if you have them, we need you to come to the floor. We need you to offer those amendments. If you have amendments that have yet to be cleared, I would urge you to come to the floor and work with Senator MIKULSKI and myself and our staffs to figure out how we can process those in a timely fashion.

It is our intent that in approximately 1 hour, with agreement from our leaders, we would move to votes—both recorded and voice votes—on all amendments that remain on this bill in the hopes that Members could then leave to go to their caucus lunches, and after returning from those lunches, hopefully, we would be in a position to have final passage on this legislation; again, that is with the chairman's, the ranking member's, and the leaders' blessings, but that is certainly the intent of Senator MIKULSKI and myself.

We can only do that if, in fact, those Members who want to offer amendments offer them and those who still have some to be worked out come and try to work out those differences.

I urge my colleagues now, we have over an hour before we intend to move to a period where we might process the remainder of the amendments. We would like to be in a situation where we can give certainty—at least as it relates to the disposition of this bill—to our Members that we would finish shortly after the lunch. I encourage all of our colleagues, if they have interest in this bill, come to the floor. Work with us.

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.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I want to give an update. We had originally thought we would be voting around 11:30. We are going to delay that until on or about 12:15—nothing fixed, nothing mandatory. People have said: Well, what are you all doing? Look at the Senate floor. Where is the action? This is a compelling issue.

Actually, there is a lot of action going on in the sense that we are reviewing over 20 amendments that are still outstanding to see what could be accepted by unanimous consent, what could be accepted by a voice vote, and what requires a mandatory rollcall vote. So there is a lot of discussion going on, and Senators and their staffs are talking.

It is not to be debated; it is to be discussed right now. I think it is so healthy. This is one of the first times in a couple of years where we have had an open amendment process. In some ways we are getting adjusted to how that actually works. This is terrific. So just because you do not see Senators in intense debate, there are intense conversations about how we help children, how to not create new bureaucracies, how we have the sense that all this is child focused and yet not creating lots of new mandates or whatever.

So this has been really very good. I compliment Senator HARKIN, who is the chair of the full HELP Committee. It is under his leadership that Senator BURR and I held some hearings. His advocacy for children is so well known. If we can move this bill today, we will have accomplished two major goals. We would have reauthorized the Child Care and Development Block Grant Program, made improvements and new reforms, and refreshed the program.

At the same time I think we have improved the process in the Senate to show we can govern by moving bills, by offering amendments, by discussion and by debate. But we could not have done it had Senator HARKIN not been willing to establish such a great tone with Senator ENZI and Senator ALEXANDER while Senator BURR and I did this.

This is the way the Senate ought to be. There were differences. But differences do not mean that you have to be filled with rancor and ranting all the time. At the end of day, when all is said and done, people want us to get more done and less said.

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. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, a lot of work has gone into this bill. The person who led that whole work for a 2-year period of time was Senator MIKULSKI. I happen to be chair of the committee. But it was Senator MIKULSKI and Senator BURR, working together, who really have brought this to fruition. It is a good bill.

Senator ALEXANDER always says that our committee probably has the biggest divergence ideologically of any committee in the Senate. Yet we have reported out, I think, 19 bills out of our committee, 10 of which have been signed into law during this Congress. We are able to do that because people work together. We work things out.

That is what has happened with this bill. There are a lot of crosscurrents on this bill. There are a lot of items that Senator MIKULSKI would like to have had in the bill, that I would have liked to have had in the bill, and I am sure I can say the same thing for the Republican side.

But over a 2-year period of time—I know it has been at least that—Senator MIKULSKI has worked on this. We made our agreements, and we worked it out to the point where the bill passed our committee unanimously. We have, as I said, a wide divergence of ideological views on our committee. So, here is a bill that passed unanimously. We will have an open process here of debate, deliberation, and amending.

I think at this time we have a pretty defined universe of the amendments, unless something else pops up that I did not know about.

We are working on those. The staffs are working on those now with the Senators. With any legislation that comes through, let's face it, as Senators we probably would like to change something here or there. I understand that. I have been in the Senate a long time, and I know I have wanted to add an amendment to something to change it, to do something different, maybe, that I cared about.

But in the interests of the broader perspective of the legislation at hand, I didn't offer it. I would wait until some other point in time to offer it or perhaps to offer a different pathway. That is what I am asking Senators on both sides of the aisle to think about.

We have a great bill. It is sorely needed. It updates a law that hasn't been changed. I know Senator MIKULSKI has told us many times, and it bears repeating. We have not addressed this since 1996, and a lot has changed since 1996 in terms of childcare.

This bill updates, modernizes, and does some things that will move us ahead and better this country in terms of the child care and development block grant program.

I know that different people have different ideas, saying: Well, I would like to change this or modify that. I get it; I understand that.

But if there is a problem in terms of bringing an amendment up that might jeopardize the bill, I ask Senators to consider whether their interests, whatever it might be, and I am not saying it is not legitimate, but if it upsets the

balance we have worked out in this committee with this broad, ideological spectrum, I ask them to reconsider whether they would want to jeopardize this bill, which we are so close to passing. I think we could actually pass this bill this afternoon.

I ask Senators, if they have those kinds of amendments, to reconsider maybe the broader implications of this legislation and whether they would want to jeopardize it for their legitimate interests, as I said. I don't deny any Senator the right to offer an amendment and to push an interest that he or she might have. Some of them I might agree with. But if it really jeopardizes the bill, then I would have to say, no, I wouldn't support it because of the broader interests of getting the bill passed.

Senator MIKULSKI and her staff, Senator ALEXANDER, Senator BURR, and my staff, we are working together on this. I still hope we can bring this bill to fruition sometime early this afternoon.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. I come to the floor today to thank the bipartisan leadership that has brought us to the place where we are considering reauthorizing this important child care and development block grant bill.

In my home State of Washington there is a young woman named Janelle who is a single mom. She lives in southeast Seattle and was looking for opportunities to support her family. But before she could go back to school or participate in a job-training program so she could advance her career, she had to find affordable childcare for two of her children.

Thankfully, with the assistance of this Child Care and Development Block Grant Program, she was able to get some subsidies to help cover the costs. She now works. She works part-time, and she is attending school and becoming a surgical tech.

This Federal grant program expands opportunities to parents such as Janelle and so many families across our country by helping them with the cost of childcare. That is why I support this effort to reauthorize the Child Care and Development Block Grant Program.

We all know the cost of childcare has soared in recent decades. The Census Bureau found that childcare costs have nearly doubled since the 1980s, and that high cost hits low-income families especially hard. For working families who live below the poverty line, the cost of childcare can eat up more than 30 percent of their monthly income. For single parents, if they only have one income, it is an even bigger burden. When low-income parents don't have access to reliable and affordable childcare, they can't work. They can't go back to school. They can't advance their skills with job training. They are stuck.

That, as we know, is particularly problematic for women. Women are more likely than men to cut back their hours at work or quit their jobs all together so they can take care of their children.

In the long run, that puts women on an uneven playing field with their male counterparts, both in terms of earnings and of opportunities to advance in the workplace.

We have to break down those barriers. We need to make sure that working doesn't become cost prohibitive for parents, and we have to strengthen access for low-income families so they can get affordable, quality childcare.

This bipartisan Child Care and Development Block Grant Act is part of the solution. These grants expand opportunities for parents with low income. It allows them to work, to go to school or to get job training—all with the peace of mind that their kids are taken care of in a safe childcare center.

In 1990 President George H. W. Bush signed this grant program, as we know it, into law. Today it helps 1.6 million kids get childcare.

To participate a parent has to have a job or be enrolled in school or in a job training program. That has helped countless parents across our country.

I want to mention a woman who has contacted us. She is a single mom whose name is Star. She lives in Skagit County, a rural part of my State. She wants to advance her skills to support her family, as so many people do today.

With this assistance she is able to go to a community college 1 hour away from home, knowing that her kids are OK in a reliable childcare program. There is nothing more important to a parent than the safety and well-being of their child. I have said many times: You do a better job at work if you know your kids are safe. If you are worried about whether your kids are OK, you can't do a good job at work. Reauthorizing this program is a critical part of this, and it helps parents such as Star feel comfortable when they are away from their kids.

In this reauthorization bill we are looking at ways to improve these grants. We know that stability is critically important for a young child's development. But before kids could lose their spot in childcare, if their parents didn't meet the eligibility requirements, even temporarily, that disruption in care is exactly what we need to work to avoid.

I have seen this a lot in my work on behalf of foster kids, military students, and homeless children. These are highly mobile populations. Now with this legislation and the work that has been done, we have ensured that these kids have a mandatory 12 months to access that care so they don't have that disruption of stability in their lives. That is critically important.

This bill also reduces barriers for homeless families to access childcare and will train more childcare providers in identifying and serving homeless kids and families so they can get the support they need. I truly appreciate the inclusion of those provisions.

For many families it can be very difficult, as we know, to find quality childcare. This legislation authorizes a toll-free hotline and a Web site so parents can get and find good-quality care in their own community. Those provisions are why I am such a strong supporter and so delighted we are at the point where we are able to pass this critical piece of legislation.

Let me end by saying in Washington State there is a young couple named Edward and Constance. They are struggling to make ends meet on a very low income. They are working, and they are studying to ensure that times won't always be as tough as they are today. Because of childcare assistance with this grant money, Edward now works full time. When Constance is not working at her part-time job, she is training to become a dental assistant. Supporting parents such as this couple, giving them these opportunities to make sure their kids are in a safe, quality childcare program is what the grants are about in this program.

I urge our colleagues to support this legislation, and again, I thank the Senators who have participated in making this a strong bipartisan proposal.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the Senator from Washington for her comments and her leadership in the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, as well. She has been a consistent spokesman for children, especially for homeless children.

I want to make an observation about the Child Care and Development Block Grant Program that the Presiding Officer from New Jersey will especially find of interest because of his work with children and schools in New Jersey. We have heard this morning a great deal of support for the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act, which is a very remarkable piece of legislation in terms of the way it is structured, if we think about it.

It has been around for about 20 years, but it takes 5 to 6 billion Federal dollars each year and gives it to States—a block grant with a lot of flexibility. Then the money is distributed as vouchers to individual parents—low-income women, mostly—who then choose among thousands of certified childcare centers. That, I would argue, while it was done 20 years ago, fits the Internet age.

Newt Gingrich—and I have sometimes accused Newt of being Vesuvian in his qualities because he has such a steady flow of new ideas—has done some very interesting work recently. He quotes a computer programmer named Tim O'Reilly who made a suggestion for how the Internet could transform government. Mr. O'Reilly said:

The best way for government to operate is to figure out what kinds of things are

enablers of society and make investments in those things. The same way that Apple figured out, ''If we turn the iPhone into a platform, outside developers will bring hundreds of thousands of applications to the table.''

In a way, the developers of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Program in the early 1990s, under the first President Bush, were ahead of their time because, rather than having a big burdensome program run from Washington with lots of rules made here, we have a piece of legislation that survived for more than two decades and that helps 1.5 million children this year.

It enables people such as the mother in Memphis I talked about on the floor yesterday who became eligible for a childcare voucher in Tennessee. She was at LeMoyne-Owen College studying for her business degree and was able to place her infant in a childcare center of her choice. The State gave her $500 to $600 a month for a voucher—infant care is more expensive. She earned her degree and is now an assistant manager at Walmart. She now has a second child in the same childcare center—but she can afford to pay for it herself.

That is a perfect example of enabling her, using taxpayer money, to move up the economic ladder, to reach the American dream and succeed. Rather than making her do it or mandating her to do it, we enabled her to do it.

We also do this—and we have done it very successfully since World War II—with college grants and loans, which also have virtually unanimous support in the Senate on both sides of the aisle.

Beginning with the GI bill for veterans in 1944, we have given vouchers to veterans, and those vouchers follow them to any educational institution of their choice. At the beginning, many of them went to high schools. Some of them went to colleges overseas.

That was the beginning of our current system of Federal Government support for grants and loans, and now half of our college students have a Federal grant or a loan to help pay for college. All of those grants and loans follow them to the institution of their choice. That is a lot of money. It is over $100 billion in loans—new loans—every year. It is $33 billion in Pell grants each year.

We followed Tim O'Reilly's suggestion there as well. We haven't set up a lot of complicated Washington programs and managers. We have simply said this. If you are eligible and go to an accredited institution—whether it is public, private, for-profit, nonprofit, Yeshiva, Notre Dame or Rutgers—the money will follow you to the college of your choice. That is what we have done since World War II with college students—and since the era of George Walker Bush, with children—we have given them tickets to the institutions of their choice.

But what have we done in the middle? We have vouchers for college students and vouchers for very young children, but what about students who go to elementary school? And what about students who go to high school? Especially, what about students who are low-income students who are trapped in failing schools? Our childcare vouchers are for low-income parents, mainly women. Our vouchers for college students are for low-income students. We call those Pell grants. But we give our K–12 money to the schools instead of allowing it to follow students to the schools of their choice.

I have always wondered, if we have had such success with the GI bill and the Pell grant and the student loan and the childcare voucher, why don't we try it with kindergarten through the 12th grade? Many enterprising mayors and Governors have tried that, usually facing a lot of resistance from people who see something un-American about vouchers. It is not very un-American if it is the GI bill, not very un-American if it is a Pell grant, not very un-American if it is a childcare voucher, but something somehow is wrong with it if you are in third grade or the seventh grade or the ninth grade.

So I have introduced something called Scholarships for Kids, which is almost like the child care development block grant for students who are in elementary and secondary schools. It would take 80 Federal education programs that spend about $24 billion a year and say to New Jersey or Tennessee or Iowa: You can take all that money, whatever your share of that is, and create a $2,100 scholarship for every single child in your State below the Federal poverty level, and it can follow that child to whatever school in your State the child attends.

If you live in a city or a State where you want the child to be able to go to any accredited institution, public or private, the way we do with Pell grants, you may do that. If you believe that Federal dollars for elementary and secondary schools should only go to public schools, you may do that. You may design the program however you want to do it in your State. But the idea would be that we would enable low-income children, the ones who are below the Federal poverty level—and there are 11 million of those in our country—we would allow you to pin $2,100 to their shirt to follow that child to school. I think we know what would happen if we were to do that. Those children may need to be in school longer each day. They may need a meal. They may need to be there during vacation time. They may need to be there in the summer. And if the teacher has the extra money and the freedom to use it, that gives that school more autonomy and that helps that child succeed.

Does every school succeed at the same rate? No. Not every college succeeds at the same rate. Not every childcare center succeeds at the same rate. But if we have 70 years of experience with colleges of creating autonomy and choice and letting the money follow the students to the school—and people all around the world tell us we have the best system of colleges in the world—why don't we try it with our schools?

I see the Senator from Oklahoma, and I will wind down so he can wind up. I thank him for his contribution to the debate.

While we are in the middle of so much testimony about what a great thing the child care development block grant is—vouchers to little children who are poor—and while we all believe Pell grants are a great idea—vouchers to college students who are low income—should we not think about doing exactly the same thing with elementary and secondary school students as a way to help them succeed? And not as a Federal mandate but simply giving Governors and State legislators and educators the opportunity to say: Give us that share of our $24 billion. Give every one of our children who is below the Federal poverty level $2,100 each and let us decide how it follows them to the school they attend.

So I wanted to make that observation. And I am delighted to know the Senator from New Jersey is presiding today because of the work he has done in his State in that area.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma wish to speak?

Ms. MIKULSKI. Oh, I am sorry, I thought the Senator from Oklahoma was involved in a conversation with the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. COBURN. I was, but I would like to speak, if I might.

Ms. MIKULSKI. No way we want to inhibit the Senator's ability to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I was going to call up amendment No. 2829, but I have chosen not to do that because of the plan of the manager of the bill to table it. So I will talk about what it is and make a few observations.

Four years ago we got the GAO to start a process on duplication, to look at what we are doing in a multitude of areas across the whole Federal Government. That will be finished, and for the first time it will have taken a complete look. We will see it at the end of this month, the first part of the fourth report.

One of their findings was, according to early learning and childcare programs, within 8 different departments there are 45 separate programs—8 different departments within the administration, 45 separate programs, spending $16 billion a year. So the amendment I was going to offer would have forced us to do the metrics to look at what our outcomes are. It would have forced us to consolidate programs, other than major programs such as this one we are debating today, which has been markedly improved and enhanced.

Now, I don't want to put the Senate through a timely vote when I know what the outcome is going to be, so I won't call up that amendment. But I would remind my colleagues that the only way we are really ever going to get control of our budget is to do the hard work of eliminating duplication, so that when we have a program, such as the one the manager of the bill has on the floor today, it is really directed, it is focused, it has metrics, and we know what we are getting for what we are spending.

Most people don't realize we have 45 of these programs in 8 different departments spending $16 billion a year.

So I hope we will consider that this is a great movement on this one particular bill, and I congratulate the people who worked on it—Senator HARKIN and his staff, Senators BURR and ALEXANDER and their staff—because I think they have done a good job. But it is not enough because we are still going to have 44 other programs and we are still going to have programs that don't have a metric on them. We are spending money on them, and we don't know if they are accomplishing what we want them to accomplish.

The whole purpose of the amendment was to force us to do that. I understand that is not going to move, and I am fine with that. I will work in every other way behind the scenes to try to accomplish the same purpose.

Mr. HARKIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. COBURN. I yield for a question.

Mr. HARKIN. First of all, I just want to say—and I mentioned it on the floor the other day—that I spent this weekend in Iowa at two early learning centers, and what became clear to me was the number of different conduits of funding and the different programs, qualifications, requirements, and paperwork.

I said at the time: I am confused.

The man at the center said: If you think you are confused, how do you think we feel about it?

That is why I was very supportive of the amendment offered by Senator ENZI. The Enzi amendment was a mandate on HHS, I believe, to take a look at all of these things and have a report back within a certain amount of time—I think it was 1 year—on how we can better coordinate these.

I agree with the Senator. There are way too many conduits into childcare, and it is horribly confusing, and there are all these different requirements that overlap, and this just causes confusion.

I wanted to ask the Senator if he had looked at the Enzi amendment, which gives us some time, and I can assure the Senator that our committee—and I am sure I can speak for Senator BURR on this on the Republican side—will be riding herd on this because I think we all agree with the Senator from Oklahoma that it has to be fixed.

Mr. COBURN. To answer the Senator's question, I supported the Enzi amendment. I don't think it went far enough because you are not going to look at some of the programs that are outside the purview of the Senator's committee. We have eight different Federal departments running these programs. They come from eight different sets of authorizations.

So the point is that I am going to work behind the scenes with Senator BURR and with Senator HARKIN to try to accomplish this.

AMENDMENT NO. 2830

Now I would like to call up amendment No. 2830 and ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Will the Senator yield to me before he offers his amendment?

Mr. COBURN. Yes.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Well, actually, I want to comment on how I want to work together with the Senator. Go ahead and offer the amendment, and then I would like to comment and not engage in klutzy conversation by asking questions. I think we are on the same broadband.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to setting aside the pending amendment?

Hearing no objection, the clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN] proposed an amendment numbered 2830.

Mr. COBURN. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COBURN. The desk has a modification of that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification?

Hearing no objection, the amendment is so modified.

The amendment (No. 2830), as modified, is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a $1,000,000 asset limit for eligibility for child care assistance)

On page 138, line 8, insert '', and whose family assets do not exceed $1,000,000 (as certified by a member of such family)'' after ''size''.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, what we are trying to accomplish with this amendment—and I have cleared it on our side, and I think it is being cleared on the other side as well—is to make sure the significant amount of money we spend in this area goes to people who really need it. So all this amendment does is require a self-certification when an individual acquires one of these grants that they don't have real assets greater than $1 million. If they do, maybe they should be spending their money rather than taxpayers' money on their kids' childcare.

That is all this amendment does. All we have done is to put in there, in the application process, a box they have to check that says: I don't have real assets in excess of $1 million. This will ensure that we know that at least the vast majority—and by the way, 16 percent of this money has gone to people who are very wealthy, in terms of these vouchers. I have that data. I don't have it with me. Actually, I may have it with me, and I will pull it up and speak about that in a minute.

But the fact is we want this money to help the people who need help, not to help people who don't need the help. So that is the purpose of this amendment. I have agreed, if it becomes acceptable, to have a voice vote.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Before the Senator from Oklahoma leaves the floor and we proceed to a voice vote, et cetera, I wish to thank him for his steadfast advocacy in getting more value out of the taxpayers' dollar for the taxpayers' contribution to the Federal Treasury. He has been a well-known advocate for the consolidation and streamlining of existing programs, and I salute him for that.

Going back to 1996, we actually started this with streamlining childcare bills. In 1996, because I was here during the welfare reform debate and passage, we had four different childcare bills, with four different eligibility requirements, with four different levels of bureaucracy. So the money was going into the bureaucracy's determining eligibility rather than into childcare. In the 1996 welfare reform bill, we consolidated so that we have the child care and development block grant. That is how we got to where we are.

The Senator from Oklahoma talks about how he has data that cuts across eight different Federal agencies. I pledge to him, as the chair of the Appropriations Committee, to actually sit down and look at this data, to put our heads together. And really, with money as tight as it is, the stringent budgets we are under, particularly when it comes to funding the kinds of compelling human needs that are in health and human services and education, we want to get more value for the dollar. We don't want to get more bureaucracy for the dollar.

So I say to the Senator from Oklahoma that we appreciate his withdrawing his amendment. We know the Senator from Wyoming Mr. ENZI has offered an amendment to get a report as well. But as we look at our appropriations for this year, I invite my colleague, with the greatest sincerity—and I pledge to him my word as a Senator—to sit down and review these documents and see how we can put this suggestion he has into action. I look forward to it, and, quite frankly, I am eager to see what we can get done.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I wish to join in. One, as the Senator from Maryland said, I recognize he has been out front in trying to get value for the taxpayers' dollar; and, second, he is working in a cooperative way to help us get a result. Those are two

great characteristics in a body of 100 people which operates by unanimous consent. So I am grateful for that.

On the first point, I completely agree with him on the early childhood money. We have about $18 billion from various streams of Federal dollars aimed at children below 5 or 6; then we have State dollars; then we have local dollars; then we have private dollars. We have grappled with ways to try to make sure we spend that money more effectively. One way is to emphasize centers of excellence, like Oklahoma City, Nashville, or Jersey City, where they try to put all that money together.

But I am committed to work with Senator HARKIN and Senator MIKULSKI to take the research which Senator COBURN has done and see if we can consolidate, streamline, and get more value for early childhood.

Second, he has called attention to a problem which I would appreciate his help in solving with his ''Millionaires' Amendment,'' which I think we will be voting on in a little while. Let me give an example, if I may.

The application form students fill out for Federal grants and loans to attend college is ridiculous. If I had it in my hand and held it up here, it would go from up here all the way to the floor. It is 100 questions. We had testimony in our committee that if we just answered two questions, in 95 percent of the cases it would be accurate. One: What was your family income 2 years ago? And, two: How many people are in your family? But the other 5 percent is the problem, because there could be abuse of the kind the Senator is talking about here.

What I would like to do—and I think others here would like to do—is to simplify the application form for Federal grants and loans, but do it in such a way we make sure the money goes where it is supposed to go. When there are 100 complicated questions to fill out, it discourages a lot of low-income people from going to college who we hope would, and it wastes time and money of administrators and families. Many of these families are not families with college degrees and accountants to help them fill out these long forms.

So we need the Senator from Oklahoma's help when we get to that discussion, sometime, of: How do we simplify the form of application for Federal grants and loans? And, with the 5 percent which remains, how do we narrow that down to 4, 3, 2, 1, to make sure almost all the money we are appropriating goes where it is supposed to go?

I salute him for both amendments. I look forward to supporting his amendment on the child care block grants, and hope it is a first step for dealing with the misapplication of Federal dollars aimed to help people move up the economic ladder.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, if I could have the attention of Senator ALEXANDER and Senator BURR. I am about to propose a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at 12:15 p.m. today, the Senate proceed to votes in relation to the following amendments in the order listed: Coburn No. 2830, as modified; Portman No. 2827; Tester No. 2834; Thune No. 2838; Warren No. 2842; Bennet No. 2839, as modified; further, that no second-degree amendments be in order to any of these amendments prior to the votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. For the information of all Senators, it is our understanding we will need one roll call vote in this sequence and the remaining amendments can be disposed of by voice vote.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the pending amendments be set aside and the following amendments be made pending: Portman No. 2827; Tester No. 2834; Thune No. 2838; Warren No. 2842; and Bennet No. 2839, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. LANDRIEU. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I realize the Senator is trying to move through this very important bill on the floor, which I fully support and thank him for the amendment.

Does the Senator know what the action of the Senate will be once this bill is completed? And is the intention to do final passage of this bill today?

Mr. HARKIN. I say to my friend I am hopeful we will have final passage today. We are working through it. We are down to just a couple of amendments. I haven't seen any others pop up right now. So I am hopeful we will have this series of votes, people will go to lunch, we will come back, and hopefully we will dispose of maybe a couple more amendments and then we will have final passage.

Ms. LANDRIEU. So final passage could potentially be—is it the Senator's understanding through the Chair—about 3 or so?

Mr. HARKIN. If we don't have any kind of extended debate on the floor, I would say probably at least by 3, I would hope we would be finished. If we work out agreement on a couple amendments, we might be done before that.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request?

Without objection, the clerk will report the amendments, en bloc.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] proposes amendments numbered 2827, 2834, 2838, 2842, and 2839, as modified.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 2827

(Purpose: To provide for evidence-based training that promotes early language and literacy development)

On page 78, line 9, insert ''and early language and literacy development'' after ''readiness''.

AMENDMENT NO. 2834

(Purpose: To permit the Secretary of Health and Human Services to waive the prohibition on the use of amounts by Indian tribes and tribal organizations for construction or renovation of facilities for child care programs if the use will result in an increase of the level of child care services)

On page 136, strike line 16 and all that follows through page 137, line 7, and insert the following:

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following:

''(D) LICENSING AND STANDARDS.—In lieu of any licensing and regulatory requirements applicable under State or local law, the Secretary, in consultation with Indian tribes and tribal organizations, shall develop minimum child care standards that shall be applicable to Indian tribes and tribal organizations receiving assistance under this subchapter. Such standards shall appropriately reflect Indian tribe and tribal organization needs and available resources, and shall include standards requiring a publicly available application, health and safety standards, and standards requiring a reservation of funds for activities to improve the quality of child care provided to Indian children.''; and

(B) in paragraph (6), by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

''(C) LIMITATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the Secretary may not permit an Indian tribe or tribal organization to use amounts provided under this subsection for construction or renovation if the use will result in a decrease in the level of child care services provided by the Indian tribe or tribal organization as compared to the level of child care services provided by the Indian tribe or tribal organization in the fiscal year preceding the year for which the determination under subparagraph (B) is being made.

''(ii) WAIVER.—The Secretary shall waive the limitation described in clause (i) if—

''(I) the Secretary determines that the decrease in the level of child care services provided by the Indian tribe or tribal organization is temporary; and

''(II) the Indian tribe or tribal organization submits to the Secretary a plan that demonstrates that after the date on which the construction or renovation is completed—

''(aa) the level of child care services will increase; or

''(bb) the quality of child care services will improve.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 2838

(Purpose: To specify that child care certificates may be included in State strategies to increase the supply of child care)

On page 88, line 5, insert ''offering child care certificates to parents,'' after ''tions,''.

AMENDMENT NO. 2842

(Purpose: To allow funds reserved under section 658G(a) of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 to be used to connect child care staff members with Federal and State financial aid, or other resources, in order to assist the staff members in pursuing relevant training)

On page 111, strike line 17 and insert the following:

early neurological development of children; and

''(L) connecting child care staff members of child care providers with available Federal and State financial aid, or other resources, that would assist child care staff members in pursuing relevant postsecondary training.

AMENDMENT NO. 2839, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To expand the requirement that space allotted to child care providers in Federal buildings will be used to provide child care services to children of whom at least 50 percent have 1 parent or guardian employed by the Federal Government)

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. ___. ALLOTMENT OF SPACE IN FEDERAL BUILDINGS FOR CHILD CARE.

Section 590 of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (a) through (g) as subsections (b) through (h), respectively;

(2) by inserting before subsection (b) (as so redesignated) the following:

''(a) DEFINITION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEE.—In this section, the term 'Federal employee' does not include a person that—

''(1) is not employed by the Federal Government; and

''(2) meets the requirements described in subsection (c)(2)(C)(i)(II).'';

(3) in paragraph (2)(C) of subsection (c) (as so redesignated), by striking clause (i) and inserting the following:

''(i) the space will be used to provide child care services to children of whom at least 50 percent have 1 parent or guardian who—

''(I) is employed by the Federal Government; or

''(II)(aa) has met the requirements for a master's degree or a doctorate degree from an institution of higher education (as defined in section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002)); and

''(bb) is conducting research in the Federal building under an arrangement between the parent or guardian and a Federal agency.''; and

(4) in subsection (d) (as so redesignated), by striking ''subsection (b)'' each place it appears and inserting ''subsection (c)''.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that following disposition of the Bennet amendment, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations, en bloc: Calendar Nos. 634, 625, and 550; that the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session; further, that there be 2 minutes for debate, equally divided in the usual form prior to each vote, and that the votes be 10 minutes in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. I am told we expect the amendments we are bringing up to be voice-voted this afternoon.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2830

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is now on agreeing to amendment No. 2830, as modified, offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. COBURN.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 100, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 75 Leg.]

YEAS—100

Alexander	Gillibrand	Murphy
Ayotte	Graham	Murray
Baldwin	Grassley	Nelson
Barrasso	Hagan	Paul
Begich	Harkin	Portman
Bennet	Hatch	Pryor
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reed
Blunt	Heitkamp	Reid
Booker	Heller	Risch
Boozman	Hirono	Roberts
Boxer	Hoeven	Rockefeller
Brown	Inhofe	Rubio
Burr	Isakson	Sanders
Cantwell	Johanns	Schatz
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Carper	Johnson (WI)	Scott
Casey	Kaine	Sessions
Chambliss	King	Shaheen
Coats	Kirk	Shelby
Coburn	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cochran	Landrieu	Tester
Collins	Leahy	Thune
Coons	Lee	Toomey
Corker	Levin	Udall (CO)
Cornyn	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Crapo	Markey	Vitter
Cruz	McCain	Walsh
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	McConnell	Warren
Enzi	Menendez	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Merkley	Wicker
Fischer	Mikulski	Wyden
Flake	Moran	
Franken	Murkowski	

The amendment (No. 2830), as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote and to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2827

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to the Portman amendment No. 2827.

The amendment (No. 2827) was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2834

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to the Tester amendment No. 2834.

The amendment (No. 2834) was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2838

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to the Thune amendment No. 2838.

The amendment (No. 2838) was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2842

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to the Warren amendment No. 2842.

The amendment (No. 2842) was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT 2839, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 2839, as modified, offered by the Senator from Colorado Mr. BENNET.

The amendment (No. 2839), as modified, was agreed to.

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I move to reconsider and then move to lay those motions on the table, for all the voice votes we just considered.

The motions to lay on the table were agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF PUNEET TALWAR TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

NOMINATION OF JOSEPH PIUS PIETRZYK TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

NOMINATION OF DWIGHT L. BUSH, SR., TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF MOROCCO

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Puneet Talwar, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State; Joseph Pius Pietrzyk, of Ohio, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation; and Dwight L. Bush, Sr., of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Morocco.

VOTE ON TALWAR NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form prior to a vote on the Talwar nomination.

Who yields time? The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. I yield back the remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Puneet Talwar, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON PIETRZYK NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided in the

usual form prior to a vote on the Pietrzyk nomination.

Who yields time?

Mr. BURR. I yield back the remaining time.

Mr. HARKIN. We yield back our remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Joseph Pius Pietrzyk, of Ohio, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON BUSH NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form prior to a vote on the Bush nomination.

Who yields time?

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, we yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Dwight L. Bush, Sr., of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Morocco?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table, the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate will resume legislative session.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT ACT OF 2014—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I think the end is in sight, hopefully, on this bill. Our staff has been working hard. We have all been working hard to get amendments worked out. I know both sides have conference lunches that are taking place now. So we hope to come back shortly after these luncheons conclude. We will then be able to move ahead.

As I understand it, there are three amendments pending. We don't know whether they will have votes, but we are working on that right now. So I hope we can have final passage on this bill very shortly.

Does my friend, the Senator from North Carolina, concur with that?

Mr. BURR. Madam President, I do concur. I urge those Members who might be the subject of us trying to work out some language on their amendments, if they have not spoken on them, they exercise the opportunity between 1 o'clock and 2 o'clock, while the caucuses are at lunch, to come to the floor and speak on their amendments. But we are confident we have made tremendous progress and we think we can wrap this up shortly after lunch on the remaining amendments, as well as on passage of the bill.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico pertaining to the introduction of S. 2129 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

AMENDMENT NO. 2827

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I rise today to thank my colleagues for adopting a moment ago an important amendment to this underlying bill. It is an amendment to provide for evidence-based training in efforts that promote early language development and literacy development. This is really important for kids to get them ready for kindergarten, and, again, I appreciate the fact that on a voice vote that was adopted earlier this afternoon.

Madam President, I now rise to urge the Senate to support a child safety amendment I have submitted to the child development block grant bill. I thank Senator ALEXANDER, Senator BURR, Senator MIKULSKI, and Senator HARKIN for all their help on this amendment. I appreciate their working with us.

I like the underlying legislation. It is a good bill because it goes a long way to ensuring that our Federal dollars are spent in a way that does keep our children in safe learning environments and care facilities. I believe my amendment makes a good bill even better.

Currently, this legislation prohibits individuals who have been convicted of a felony from working in a childcare facility that is funded through these Federal block grants. That is a good start, but by limiting the prohibition only to felonies, we are leaving other people out. We are leaving a pool of individuals who have been convicted of crimes against children eligible for employment in a setting where they could prey on vulnerable kids.

So the amendment simply expands to ensure that we are covering those people. It ensures the health and safety of children by clarifying that adults who are convicted of misdemeanor violent crimes against children—child abuse, child endangerment, sexual assault—or of a misdemeanor involving child pornography are also identified in criminal background checks and are not permitted to work in a childcare facility that receives support through these child care development block grants.

Let me give a couple examples of crimes that under the bill as currently drafted would not prevent an individual from working in a childcare facility funded by the legislation.

In my home State of Ohio, we just had a terrible example. An Ohio daycare worker was accused of sprinkling drugs on snacks to get children to sleep. She was fined $250 and then had her charges reduced to a misdemeanor count of child endangerment after a plea agreement. So she did not get charged with a felony in the end because she pled it down to a misdemeanor. But certainly you do not want someone like this working in one of these facilities.

There are lots of other examples.

A Utah women pled guilty to two class A misdemeanors recently for child abuse. These charges were reduced from five second-degree felonies for intentionally inflicting serious physical injury on a child. She had been arrested for physically and emotionally abusing her daughter. According to the police report, she hit her daughter with a closed fist and choked her. But she pled, again, guilty to two misdemeanors because of the plea agreement.

These are just a couple cases. There are many more, and these are just ones that have been decided in the last few months.

Under the legislation as currently written, these individuals would be eligible to work in a childcare facility that receives Federal funds.

This amendment is very simple. It only seeks to protect children and to bar individuals who would commit crimes against the most vulnerable among us from receiving these Federal tax dollars. I urge my colleagues to accept the amendment.

Again, I thank the authors of the underlying bill for working closely with us on this amendment to improve legislation that is already a good and is doing a lot to protect our kids.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, as we talk today about passing new laws, I would like to take a few minutes to talk about enforcing the laws the Congress has already passed.

I want to talk today about something that I believe has been pushed to the wayside too many times by the current administration, and that would be the Constitution of the United States.

Article II, section 3 of the U.S. Constitution declares that the President—

coming right out of the Constitution—that the President ''shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed.'' Simply put, constitutional requirements are just that—they are constitutional requirements. They are not constitutional suggestions. This is not something the Constitution does not clearly define. The branches of government in the Constitution are the judicial, the legislative, and the executive. And the job of the executive is, again, to do what? To ''take care that the laws be faithfully executed.''

Yet time and again President Obama has refused to enforce the law and shown a willingness, frankly, to misuse regulations, in my view, to sidestep the Congress, to sidestep what the law intended to do and, more importantly, to step around the Constitution. Whether it is issuing waivers to States from the work requirements contained in the bipartisan Welfare Reform Act of 1996 or announcing yet another change—and we are now at over two dozen changes and delays—in the President's own health care law, the current administration has sought ways, over and over again, to circumvent the Congress by picking and choosing which laws it wants to enforce—clearly not a power given the President in the Constitution.

In fact, there is a reason the legislative branch is article I of the Constitution. Because the Founders clearly saw the legislative branch as the branch that would determine the direction of the country, and the President's job was not to write the law, the President's job was to execute the law, to enforce the law.

People all over America are rightly concerned about government overreach. They are rightly concerned about government dysfunction. They are rightly concerned about a Senate that has not brought the appropriations bills to the floor the way they should come to the floor for over 7 years now, so we are not debating our priorities.

But it is the overreach, the dysfunction, the lack of compliance with the law and the seeming belief that somehow that is the President's job, to decide which laws we comply with as a country and which ones we do not, which laws the government enforces and which ones it does not enforce. That is not the President's job.

I introduced a bill this week to stop this overreach and to force President Obama to uphold the Constitution. The ENFORCE the Law Act, which is cosponsored by more than half of my Republican Senate colleagues, and which passed the House yesterday, permits Congress to authorize a lawsuit against the President if he fails to uphold the constitutional obligation to uphold the law.

Whenever we are asked, all of us as Members of the Senate, by people that we work for: How can the President decide he is not going to enforce the law, one of the responses we all have thoughtfully given to the other question of: What are you going to do about it, is at this point there is no standing of individual Members of Congress or even the entire body of the Senate or the body of the House to go to court and say: We have standing in court to have this law enforced.

This bill would become law, and a law that would give the Congress that standing. It effectively permits the Congress, either House of the Congress, to authorize a lawsuit against the President if he fails to uphold his constitutional obligation to faithfully execute the law.

If the President has a defense, this is a lawsuit. His side can go to court and defend that. But if he does not have a defense, he has sworn, as we have, to uphold the Constitution. This is not a partisan matter. This bill is important because it gives Congress the ability to combat executive disregard for the Congress no matter what party controls the White House or no matter what party controls the Congress.

The courts have ruled that individual Members of Congress lack standing to take the administration to court. We are not considered individually so-called ''aggrieved parties.'' That is why Members, whether it was the National Labor Relations Board case where the President thought he could decide whether the Senate was in session, instead of the Senate deciding whether the Senate was in session—I joined many of my colleagues to file an amicus brief. I am not a lawyer, but I am able to do that as a citizen, to file an amicus brief, a friend-of-the-court brief, saying why we thought the President was wrong and why we thought the people who were challenging the rules that this group created, that were put in power in an unconstitutional way—we could file that but we could not initiate that. We could not go to court and say: We believe the law is not being enforced.

The ENFORCE Act removes that procedural barrier, so that a Member of the House, a Member of the Senate, can be empowered to bring a lawsuit in Federal court challenging the administration's refusal to enforce the law, challenging the administration's belief that on their own they can suspend the law, they can postpone the law, they can delay the law.

If the law gives the President the ability to do that, it is going to be in the clear black-and-white letters of the law. It is not there now. The ENFORCE Act provides an expedited process so that if this lawsuit is initiated this way, by one or both Houses of the Congress against the administration for not faithfully executing the law, it goes immediately to a three-judge panel in the U.S. district court and then goes directly to the Supreme Court if there is an appeal.

This is an a easy way to solve this problem. It is a way that creates standing to define who is constitutionally obligated to do a job that they are not doing. It is time we reestablished the proper limits on the executive branch. The Founders believed in separation of powers. It is the responsibility of the Congress to protect the idea they came up with in a document for the first time that was a governing document, the idea of checks and balances. If you eliminate that idea of checks and balances, you eliminate the miracle of the Constitution.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me and others in supporting this effort to stop executive overreach and encourage the President to enforce the law. The Constitution still matters. The Constitution deserves to be defended. This is a way the Members of the Congress of the United States can give themselves the ability to launch that defense.

Again, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill that the House passed yesterday. All we have to do to do our part is step forward and pass this legislation.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that at 2:30 p.m. today, the Senate proceed to Executive Session to consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 686; that the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nomination; that the motion to reconsider be made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session; further, that there be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to each vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I yield back all time, and ask that the vote start immediately, and all Senators should be advised that we will start the vote.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF CAROLINE DIANE KRASS TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the Krass nomination which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Caroline Diane Krass, of the District of

Columbia, to be General Counsel of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Has the unanimous consent request been approved?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous consent request has been approved.

All time has been yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Caroline Diane Krass, of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel of the Central Intelligence Agency?

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 95, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 76 Ex.]

YEAS—95

Alexander	Franken	Murkowski
Ayotte	Gillibrand	Murphy
Baldwin	Graham	Murray
Barrasso	Grassley	Nelson
Begich	Hagan	Portman
Bennet	Harkin	Pryor
Blumenthal	Hatch	Reed
Blunt	Heinrich	Reid
Booker	Heitkamp	Risch
Boozman	Hirono	Roberts
Boxer	Hoeven	Rockefeller
Brown	Inhofe	Rubio
Burr	Isakson	Sanders
Cantwell	Johanns	Schatz
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Carper	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Casey	Kaine	Shaheen
Chambliss	King	Shelby
Coats	Kirk	Stabenow
Coburn	Klobuchar	Tester
Cochran	Landrieu	Thune
Collins	Leahy	Toomey
Coons	Lee	Udall (CO)
Corker	Levin	Udall (NM)
Cornyn	Manchin	Vitter
Crapo	Markey	Walsh
Donnelly	McCain	Warner
Durbin	McCaskill	Warren
Enzi	McConnell	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Menendez	Wicker
Fischer	Merkley	Wyden
Flake	Mikulski	

NAYS—4

Cruz	Paul
Heller	Scott

NOT VOTING—1

Moran

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT ACT OF 2014—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

The Senator from Louisiana.

AMENDMENT NO. 2845, AS MODIFIED

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I call up my amendment No. 2845 and ask that it be modified with the changes at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendment is set aside.

The clerk will report the amendment, as modified.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. VITTER] proposes an amendment numbered 2845, as modified.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require the Secretary (acting through the Assistant Secretary for Children and Families) to prepare an annual report that contains a determination about whether States have complied with a priority requirement, and to require the Secretary to withhold funds from States that fail to comply with such priority requirement)

On page 99, strike line 19 and insert the following:

''(ii) REPORT BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—Not later than September 30 of the first full fiscal year after the date of enactment of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014, and September 30 of each fiscal year thereafter, the Secretary (acting through the Assistant Secretary for Children and Families of the Department of Health and Human Services) shall prepare a report that contains a determination about whether each State uses amounts provided to such State for the fiscal year involved under this subchapter in accordance with the priority for services described in clause (i).

''(II) PENALTY FOR NONCOMPLIANCE.—For any fiscal year that the report of the Secretary described in subclause (I) indicates that a State has failed to give priority for services in accordance with clause (i), the Secretary shall—

''(aa) inform the State that the State has until the date that is 6 months after the Secretary has issued such report to fully comply with clause (i);

''(bb) provide the State an opportunity to modify the State plan of such State, to make the plan consistent with the requirements of clause (i), and resubmit such State plan to the Secretary not later than the date described in item (aa); and

''(cc) if the State does not fully comply with clause (i) and item (bb), by the date described in item (aa), withhold 5 percent of the funds that would otherwise be allocated to that State in accordance with this subchapter for the first full fiscal year after that date.

''(III) WAIVER FOR EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES.—Notwithstanding subclause (II) the Secretary may grant a waiver to a State for one year to the penalty applied in subclause (II) if the Secretary determines there are extraordinary circumstances, such as a natural disaster, that prevent the state from complying with clause (I). If the Secretary does grant a waiver to a state under this section, the Secretary shall, within 30 days of granting such waiver, submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees on the circumstances of the waiver including the stated reason from the State on the need for a waiver, the expected impact of the waiver on children served under this program, and any such other relevant information the Secretary deems necessary.

''(iii) CHILD CARE RESOURCE AND REFERRAL SYSTEM.—''

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I will briefly summarize this amendment, but I first want to thank the chairman and ranking member of the committee for working through this amendment and agreeing to what I think will be a quick consideration and adoption by voice vote.

This amendment is very simple, straightforward, but important. Present law with regard to child care and development block grants—present Federal law—says that States should and must prioritize for two categories of children: low-income kids and children with special needs. I think we all agree with that prioritization. The problem is, as recent reports have indicated, about half of all the States—23 to be exact—do not do that. They just basically ignore that Federal law.

This simple, straightforward amendment would bring accountability to the system and make sure all States follow present Federal law and give that appropriate priority treatment to children with special needs as well as low-income kids. It would do this by saying that there is going to be some accountability; that the Federal Department involved in the program already will annually make sure States follow this aspect of present law and that if a State is not doing that, it gets 6 months to cure the problem, but if it does not cure that within 6 months, then that State would feel the pinch by having 5 percent of its block grant funds withheld until it corrects the situation.

The amendment also gives the Secretary waiver authority for extraordinary circumstances, such as natural disasters and other emergencies.

Again, I appreciate the chairman and ranking member working out this provision. I do think it is important that all States follow Federal law, and we give these children—special needs children, low-income children—the priority treatment they deserve.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, the amendment has the admirable goal of prioritizing funds to low-income families who have children with disabilities. I applaud Senator VITTER's efforts and hope this provides significant reinforcement of what has been the law since 1996—that States must prioritize children from very low-income families

who have children with disabilities. This amendment reinforces that by saying the Department of Health and Human Services must meet that promise. There is a provision in there that gives them adequate time to make sure they do that.

Again, I thank the Senator from Louisiana for working with us. As I said when this amendment first came up, yes, as someone who has worked on disability issues for most of my adult life, I agreed with exactly what he wanted to do; there were just some language problems. That is the way we get legislation done around here—we work things out and we find the middle ground on which everybody can agree. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his willingness to work this out. We support the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. Madam President, I also want to thank my colleague from Louisiana and the chairman of the committee for working out this amendment.

Madam President, I know of no further debate on this amendment, and I would ask us to proceed to a vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified.

The amendment (No. 2845), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. HARKIN. I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

SECTION 8(b)

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I want to first and foremost express my thanks to the chairman, and his colleagues, for this bipartisan bill—a long overdue effort that clearly is the result of a painstaking, patient effort by the committee to reauthorize the Child Care and Development Block Grant.

I wanted to discuss very quickly one provision, section 8(b), that I feel needs additional clarification.

Given that the overall priority of all of us to increase quality while ensuring that States can effectively navigate the federal standards—while maintaining their authority to set their own standards—would the Senator agree that the intent of this law is not to rewrite other existing Federal laws or evade requirements of other Federal laws that might diminish services for children?

Mr. HARKIN. Yes, I would agree. As our committee report explains, it is intended that ''States exercise this provision in an attempt to maximize the effective administration and delivery of Federally subsidized childcare, and not for purposes that have a minor effect on childcare.''

I firmly believe, and I know my colleagues will agree, that this provision is not intended, nor should it be interpreted, as one that can be used to rewrite any other current laws, evade central provisions of other current laws, or undermine the goals and purposes of other laws. Certainly, it is not our intent to allow States to change, undermine or threaten in any way current laws.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I thank the chairman.

HHS RULEMAKING

Mr. BURR. Madam President, I have a question for my friend from Iowa, the chairman of the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions. The Department of Health and Human Services, HHS, in May 2013 issued a notice of proposed rulemaking to the Child Care and Development Fund, CCDF, that would make several health and safety, quality, background checks, and other related changes. That NPRM is currently in the comment period and has yet to be finalized.

Am I correct in my understanding that HHS has shared with you, as well as with me, their interpretation that, should S. 1086, the Child Care Development Block Grant Reauthorization which we are considering in the Senate today along with any subsequent changes through the legislative process, become law, the proposed rulemaking for the CCDF would be overridden by S. 1086?

Mr. HARKIN. The Senator from North Carolina is correct that HHS has shared with me that S. 1086, and any further congressional changes made to S. 1086, would override the May 2013 notice of proposed rulemaking to the CCDF.

Mr. BURR. I thank the distinguished chairman for this important clarification and for his hard work in developing this important legislation.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, with 20 kids and grandkids, I understand the importance and value of quality, affordable childcare. I applaud those individuals seeking to attain further education and training in order to improve their situations, and the Child Care and Development Block Grant Program assists them in that pursuit.

The Child Care and Development Block Grant Program has been in place since 1990, and as a part of welfare reform in 1996, three other childcare initiatives were consolidated into this program, which provides formula-based block grant funding to States to subsidize childcare and emphasizes work, personal responsibility and parental choice. In my State of Oklahoma, 17,000 families and 28,000 children benefit directly from these funds.

This legislation not only reauthorizes the program for another 5 years, but it also does not add to the deficit and makes some important reforms, while preserving State flexibility in how the funds are used. S. 1086 adds new safety and health standards, calls for annual, unannounced onsite monitoring of licensed providers, requires background checks of childcare staff and providers and expands compliance with child abuse reporting requirements. Additionally, the Senate adopted 18 amendments, which I also supported, including Amendment 2822, which sets aside at least 2 percent of a State's CCDBG funds for Indian tribes and tribal organizations—of significance for Oklahoma. I also co-sponsored two adopted amendments: Amendment 2813, which extends a grace period to foster youth so that they can begin receiving CCDBG services while families compile medical documentation; and Amendment 2814, which requires States to have a plan in place to coordinate existing services and programs for children in foster care. I support S. 1086 and am encouraged by the example of regular order restored to Senate business.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, Americans believe in the power of hard work as the key to getting ahead, the key to prosperity, the key to a better future. We also believe in the importance of family, and in the responsibility we all share for making sure that America's children are cared for and protected.

The legislation before us today furthers both these values the value of hard work and the value of family. It would update and modernize a program that for two decades has helped families pursue rewarding employment or important education and training while obtaining essential care for their children. It is bipartisan legislation, unanimously approved in committee, with support from a broad range of education and child advocacy groups.

For all working parents, but particularly for low-income families, the demands of work and parenting are enormous challenges. Quality childcare can be hard to find and expensive so expensive that, for many families, the cost all but wipes out their paycheck. The Child Care and Development Block Grant Program is designed to help families meet this challenge. The program provides block grants to States so they can provide financial assistance to families coping with childcare expenses. Nationwide, more than 1.5 million children receive care through these grants. In Michigan, these grants helped more than 50,000 children receive the care they needed in Fiscal Year 2013.

The legislation Senators HARKIN and ALEXANDER have brought to the floor reauthorizes the block grant program so this important assistance can continue. The bill also makes important improvements. It requires States to establish education and training requirements for childcare workers, and ensures that States will inspect childcare facilities before they are granted licenses, and at least once a year thereafter. These requirements will improve our ability to ensure that children are cared for in a safe and secure environment. The bill makes important changes to improve care for children with special needs. It makes changes to eligibility requirements to make assistance more stable and dependable for families.

More than 30 national education, child-advocacy, parenting and violence prevention advocacy groups have endorsed this legislation, strongly supporting the reauthorization of the grant program and the changes to make the program more modern and effective. These groups also point out that in addition to authorization, programs require appropriations to be successful. Childcare is one of many important domestic priorities that Congress could more effectively address if we are willing to reach a balanced deficit reduction agreement that eliminates sequestration and provides needed funding. I remain hopeful we can reach such an agreement.

I wish to thank Senator HARKIN, chairman of the HELP Committee, and Senator ALEXANDER, Ranking Member of the HELP Committee, as well as Senators MIKULSKI, BURR, GILLIBRAND, and AYOTTE for sponsoring this important legislation. I support its passage and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mrs. HAGAN. Madam President, I wish to speak today in support of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014.

First, I applaud the hard work of my colleagues on the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee—Chairman TOM HARKIN and Ranking Member LAMAR ALEXANDER.

I also commend Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI, my predecessor as chairman of the Subcommittee on Children and Families, and Senator RICHARD BURR for their commitment to improving the lives of children and their families as the sponsors of this important legislation.

We can all agree that supporting our children should be a priority of the utmost importance, and I am proud of the bipartisan work done by my colleagues toward that end.

The childcare and development block grant is an invaluable program that provides assistance to low-income working families. In North Carolina 78,000 children are served every month by CCDBG funding. These children and families deserve high quality childcare so that parents, like the ones I hear from in my State every day, can go to work with the knowledge that their children are safe and receiving high quality care.

Last year, I visited Elm Street Day Care Center in Greensboro, NC, where I saw the importance of childcare, and development block grant funding firsthand. I saw how this program is helping working families in North Carolina and noted ways we could update this law to make it to work better and more efficiently.

I am pleased this bill takes a significant step toward providing more information to parents about their children's care and encourages States to follow North Carolina's lead and increase the quality of childcare centers.

Currently, States must spend at least 4 percent of their Federal childcare funds on improving the quality of childcare—including providing professional development for childcare providers, licensing and monitoring childcare facilities, and providing consumer education, so that parents have the information they need to make informed choices.

This reauthorization raises the minimum amount to be spent on quality improvements to 10 percent by 2020. As a result, we can help to ensure that children in all 50 States are receiving quality care by passing this legislation.

I am also particularly pleased to support this bill because it includes key provisions of the Child Care Infant Mortality Prevention Act, which I introduced with Senators DIANNE FEINSTEIN and SUSAN COLLINS in September.

These provisions will allow for the use of Federal funds to train childcare providers in sleep practices, first aid, and CPR for infants.

According to the Centers for Disease Control and the American Academy of Pediatrics, safe sleep practices can reduce by one-half the annual number of cases of Sudden Unexpected Infant Death Syndrome—a tragedy that touches approximately 100 families in North Carolina each year.

Roughly 20 percent of all cases of Sudden Unexpected Infant Death Syndrome occur in child care settings, and—with this provision—we can provide child care providers with the resources they need to prevent these unnecessary tragedies.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I am pleased to support the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014, and would like to commend the bipartisan work of Senators MIKULSKI and BURR and Chairman HARKIN and Ranking Member ALEXANDER of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee in bringing this important legislation to the floor. There have been several previous attempts to reauthorize this critical program in the past, including when I was a member of this committee. It is my hope we can come together and finally carry this important legislation across the finish line to the benefit of children and families across the country.

Access to affordable, high quality, safe and secure childcare is essential for working families. Yet, such care is very hard to find. According to a 2013 Child Care Aware survey, the cost of full-time, center-based care for two children is the highest single household expense in the Northeast, Midwest and South. This high cost often puts fully licensed programs out of reach for low-incomes families.

The child care and development block grant has not been reauthorized since 1996. At that time, the primary focus of the program was to enable people to move from welfare to work. Today, knowing the critical importance of early brain development and the role early education plays in school readiness and successful outcomes for young people, we must work to achieve the dual goals of CCDBG to ensure affordable and quality childcare options for children and families. And we cannot achieve these goals without addressing the issue of payment rates, the level at which states reimburse childcare providers who care for low-income children who receive a child care subsidy.

That is why during previous attempts to reauthorize the child care and development block grant during the 107th, 108th and 109th Congresses, I introduced the Child Care Quality Incentive Act to provide incentives to States to set equitable payment rates so that low-income families would have access to affordable and high quality care for their children. I am pleased that the bill before us today includes some of the key provisions of my legislation, such as requiring States to conduct a statistically valid and reliable survey of market rates for childcare, report the results of the survey publicly, and set the rates based on the survey results, taking into consideration the cost of providing higher quality care. Raising the payment rates for childcare is an integral component to improving quality.

The other essential element to improving quality and affordability is our investment in childcare and early education programs. According the Congressional Research Service, seven percent fewer children were served in fiscal year 2012 than had been served in fiscal year 2011. According to Kids Count Rhode Island, since peaking in 2003, the number of childcare subsidies in the State has decreased by 45 percent. The $154 million increase for childcare that we included in the fiscal year 2014 Consolidated Appropriations Act was a step in the right direction. Clearly, we need to do more.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to advance this legislation to expand our support for working families, and ensure that all children have the quality of education and care to reach their full potential.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, for the information of Senators, we are now down to two voice votes on two pending amendments that have been cleared. We will then have a rollcall vote on final passage. I am hopeful that is going to happen within a very short period of time. In maybe 5 minutes or 10 minutes, I hope we will be ready for a final vote on this bill.

With that, 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. HARKIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 2847 AND 2846

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, we have no further debate on the two pending amendments—Portman No. 2847 and Sanders No. 2846—and the substitute. I know of—Madam President, I was misinformed. I thought those amendments had already been called up.

Madam President, I would like to call up in order Portman amendment No. 2847 and Sanders amendment No. 2846 and ask for their immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] proposes, en bloc, for Mr. PORTMAN, an amendment numbered 2847, and for Mr. SANDERS an amendment numbered 2846.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 2847

(Purpose: To provide that a child care staff member who has been convicted of a violent misdemeanor against a child or a misdemeanor involving child pornography is ineligible for employment by certain child care providers)

On page 120, strike line 12 and insert the following:

preceding 5 years; or

''(E) has been convicted of a violent misdemeanor committed as an adult against a child, including the following crimes: child abuse, child endangerment, sexual assault, or of a misdemeanor involving child pornography.

AMENDMENT NO. 2846

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate on significantly reducing child poverty by calendar year 2019)

On page 141, insert at the end the following:

SEC. 13. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCING CHILD POVERTY BY CALENDAR YEAR 2019.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the United States has the highest rate of childhood poverty among 34 major countries in the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, including Denmark, Finland, Norway, Iceland, Cyprus, Austria, Sweden, the Czech Republic, Germany, Slovenia, Hungary, South Korea, the United Kingdom, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Ireland, France, Malta, Luxembourg, Slovakia, Estonia, Belgium, New Zealand, Poland, Canada, Australia, Japan, Portugal, Greece, Italy, Lithuania, Latvia, Spain, and Bulgaria;

(2) a record-breaking 46,496,000 individuals lived in poverty in the United States in 2012, which is an increase of 14,915,000 individuals since 2000;

(3) 16,073,000 children in the United States lived in poverty in 2012, which is an increase of 4,486,000 children since 2000;

(4) more than 7,100,000 children in the United States, 40 percent of children living in poverty in the United States, live in extreme poverty (defined as living in families with an income that is less than half of the poverty level);

(5) nearly 1,200,000 public school students in the United States were homeless in the 2011–2012 school year, an increase of 73 percent since the 2006–2007 school year;

(6) in an average month in fiscal year 2011, 1,200,000 households with children in the United States did not have any cash income and, for food, depended only on benefits under the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.);

(7) in 2012, government assistance programs removed from poverty 9,000,000 children, including 5,300,000 children through the earned income tax credit under section 32 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the child tax credit under section 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and 2,200,000 children through the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.);

(8) in 2012, child poverty would have been 57 percent higher, and extreme poverty would have been 240 percent higher, without government tax credits and food, housing, and energy benefits;

(9) in 2013, an individual working full-time at the Federal minimum wage could not afford the fair market rent for a 2-bedroom rental unit and have enough money for food, utilities, and other necessities;

(10) in school years 2009–2010 and 2010–2011, less than half of children ages 3 and 4 were enrolled in preschool;

(11) Early Head Start programs carried out under the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 et seq.) served only 4 percent of the 2,900,000 eligible poor infants and toddlers each day in fiscal year 2012, and Head Start programs carried out under such Act served only 41 percent of the 2,000,000 eligible poor children ages 3 and 4;

(12) more than 220,000 children are on waiting lists for child care assistance; and

(13) child poverty costs the United States not less than $500,000,000 each year in additional education, health, and criminal justice costs and in lost productivity.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the President should immediately present to Congress a comprehensive plan to significantly reduce child poverty in the United States by calendar year 2019.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, as I said, I know of no further debate on those amendments. We are ready to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, if the Senator will yield, as we close into the final minutes of this bill, I just want to say that today will be a great victory for America's children because we will pass the child care and development block grant. I think it is a great victory for the Senate to show that we could govern ourselves with an open amendment process. We could do it diligently, we could do it deliberatively, and we could do it with courtesy and civility. This is the way the Senate should be. Within 2 days we have arrived at a great bill, with cooperation and civility on both sides of the aisle. I hope this becomes a model for the way the Senate will conduct itself for the rest of the session.

I have been very proud to be part of this bill. I thank Senator RICHARD BURR of North Carolina, my Republican counterpart on the children's committee, with all of the due diligence we did for a year and a half. I also thank Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER for his steadfast leadership and input, and of course I thank TOM HARKIN, our leader, who, as he wraps up his Senate career, will never wrap up his advocacy for America's children.

I thank all of our staff for the great work they did in the 100 meetings with stakeholders and the 200 meetings with us.

Madam President, I am ready for the vote and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. Madam President, I would like to take this quick opportunity to thank my colleague Senator MIKULSKI for those kind words and, more importantly, for her passion on this issue. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their help. But more importantly, I would like to thank the committee staff and personal staffs who have been over here for the last several days and late last night trying to work out amendments. I thank the Members who have been very accommodating to changes so we could get this bill up.

I might take a personal privilege to say that part of this bill was done by a former staff member of mine, Celia Sims, and she is one proud woman today because of that being included in this bill and its passage. I look forward to it.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I will not extend this more than 2 minutes, but I think it is instructive to colleagues to note what the Senator from Maryland, the Senator from North Carolina, and the Senator from Iowa have done. We started this bill about 24 hours ago, right after lunch. More than 40 amendments were filed. More than half of them have been considered and disposed of. There was no objection to a motion to proceed. There was no cloture vote filed. There was no filibuster. And on both sides of the aisle, anyone who showed up with an amendment relevant to the childcare discussion had a chance to have it considered without anybody picking their amendment. Finally, on this side and that side of the aisle, many Members showed a lot of restraint and courtesy in adjusting their amendments so that we could get here. We will not be able to do this every time, but it is a modest step in a very good direction toward the way the Senate should work.

I want to especially thank the Senator from Iowa, the Senator from Maryland, and the Senator from North Carolina for their leadership.

I would also like to extend my deep thanks and sincere appreciation to the dedicated staff that worked on this bill for the past year. Without their hard work and tireless effort we wouldn't have been able to reach the successful conclusion on the passage of this important bill.

I would like to thank Senator BURR's staff, Christopher Toppings and Natasha Hickman for working so closely with my staff and working so well together and with our Republican offices.

I would also like to thank Senator MIKULSKI's staff, Brent Palmer and

Jessica McNiece for their hard work and steady support of getting this bill through the Senate.

The Chairman of the committee has an outstanding staff who are all very capable and dedicated, especially Mario Cardona, Mildred Otero, and his new Staff Director, Derek Miller. I thank them for their close working relationship with my staff.

We know that these bills don't just suddenly appear. Legislative Counsel staff work long hours on the bill and then on the amendments, so I would like to especially thank Liz King, Kristin Romero, Katie Grendon, Bill Baird, and Rob Silver.

And we always rely on our experts at the Congressional Research Service to give us good information in a timely manner, so I extend our thanks to Karen Lynch.

Finally I would like to thank my staff. They have put in a lot of time and effort to make this a process the Senate can be proud of, and I appreciate their efforts and late nights on this bill. So my thanks go out to Diane Tran, Bill Knudsen, Marty West, Patrick Murray, Peter Oppenheim, Michael Merrell, David Cleary, Liz Wolgemuth, and Jim Jeffries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments en bloc.

The amendments (Nos. 2847 and 2846) were agreed to en bloc.

The Senator from Iowa.

AMENDMENT NO. 2811 WITHDRAWN

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I withdraw my pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, again, I know of no further amendments or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the committee substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I would like to join my colleagues and thank everyone for getting this bill done. This is a good bill. First, I would again say thanks to both Senator BURR and Senator MIKULSKI. This is really their bill. They spent the better part of 2 years working this out.

I would like to say that we have had a good day here to work this out, as Senator ALEXANDER said. But a lot of that is the preliminary work that goes into developing a bill such as this over a long period of time. So my respect—my great respect—and my thanks to both Senator BURR and Senator MIKULSKI for getting this bill to where we are now.

My thanks to my good friend Senator ALEXANDER and for the great partnership we have working together on the committee. As he said the other day, no other committee has a wider divergence of ideological views than our committee, but I believe, if I am not mistaken, this is the 19th or 20th bill we have gotten through our committee this Congress.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Will my friend yield for a brief comment?

Mr. HARKIN. Yes, of course I will yield.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it would be improper if we did not acknowledge the work MIKE LEE was involved with in this legislation. He should be complimented for working to help get this passed.

Mr. HARKIN. The leader is right. Senator LEE was very accommodating in letting us move forward on this bill. I appreciate that.

We accomplished a lot in the floor process, as Senator ALEXANDER said. I think we can adopt the legislation, making it an even stronger bill. I would not like to thank a lot of the staff. I hope I do not miss anyone. David Cleary, Peter Oppenheim, Patrick Murray, Marty West, and Bill Knudsen of Senator ALEXANDER's staff.

I would like to thank Chris Toppings and Natasha Hickman of Senator BURR's staff.

I would like to commend the work of Jessica McNiece and Brent Palmer of Senator MIKULSKI's staff.

Finally, I would like to thank Pam Smith, who is not here but who worked on this for a long time, Derek Miller, Mildred Otero, Mario Cardona, Soncia Coleman, Michael Gamel McCormick, Leanne Hotek, Brit Moller, and Aissa Canchola of my staff.

I also wish to thank, from the staffs of Senator MURRAY, Sarah Bolton; Senator SANDERS, David Cohen; Senator CASEY, Sara Mabry and Christina Baumgardner; Senator HAGAN, Ashley Eden; Senator FRANKEN, Gohar Sedighi and Maggie Henderson; Senator BENNET, Juliana Herman and Molly Fishman; Senator WHITEHOUSE, Rick Van Buren; Senator BALDWIN, Michael Dinapolo; Senator MURPHY, Yoon Hayne; Senator WARREN, Julie Morgan; Senator ENZI, Kristin Chapman; Senator ISAKSON, Brett Layson; Senator PAUL, Natalie Burkholter; Senator HATCH, Katie Neal; Senator ROBERTS, Joshua Yurek; Senator MURKOWSKI, Karen McCarthy; Senator KIRK, Cabe Clurman; and Senator SCOTT, Elizabeth Simmons.

As I said at the beginning of this bill's consideration, this bill represents a strong, positive shift for working families in America who benefit from the childcare subsidy program. I hope my colleagues will join all of us in voting to give this an overwhelming vote of yes on final passage.

I know of no further debate on the bill.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. HARKIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 77 Leg.]

YEAS—96

Alexander	Franken	Murphy
Ayotte	Gillibrand	Murray
Baldwin	Graham	Nelson
Barrasso	Grassley	Paul
Begich	Hagan	Portman
Bennet	Harkin	Pryor
Blumenthal	Hatch	Reed
Blunt	Heinrich	Reid
Booker	Heitkamp	Risch
Boozman	Heller	Roberts
Boxer	Hirono	Rockefeller
Brown	Hoeven	Rubio
Burr	Isakson	Sanders
Cantwell	Johanns	Schatz
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Carper	Johnson (WI)	Scott
Casey	Kaine	Sessions
Chambliss	King	Shaheen
Coats	Kirk	Shelby
Cochran	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Collins	Landrieu	Tester
Coons	Leahy	Thune
Corker	Levin	Toomey
Cornyn	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Crapo	Markey	Udall (NM)
Cruz	McCain	Vitter
Donnelly	McCaskill	Walsh
Durbin	McConnell	Warner
Enzi	Menendez	Warren
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Fischer	Mikulski	Wicker
Flake	Murkowski	Wyden

NAYS—2

Coburn	Lee

NOT VOTING—2

Inhofe	Moran

The bill (S. 1086), as amended, was passed as follows:

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 ''Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. SHORT TITLE AND PURPOSES.

Section 658A of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9801 note) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 658A. SHORT TITLE AND PURPOSES.

''(a) SHORT TITLE.—This subchapter may be cited as the 'Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990'.

''(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this subchapter are—

''(1) to allow each State maximum flexibility in developing child care programs and policies that best suit the needs of children and parents within that State;

''(2) to promote parental choice to empower working parents to make their own decisions regarding the child care that best suits their family's needs;

''(3) to assist States in providing high-quality child care services to parents trying to achieve independence from public assistance;

''(4) to assist States in improving the overall quality of child care services and programs by implementing the health, safety, licensing, training, and oversight standards

established in this subchapter and in State law (including regulations);

''(5) to improve school readiness by having children, families, and child care providers engage in activities, in child care settings, that are developmentally appropriate and age-appropriate for the children and that promote children's language and literacy and mathematics skills, social and emotional development, physical health and development, and approaches to learning;

''(6) to encourage States to provide consumer education information to help parents make informed choices about child care services and to promote involvement by parents and family members in the education of their children in child care settings;

''(7) to increase the number and percentage of low-income children in high-quality child care settings; and

''(8) to improve the coordination and delivery of early childhood education and care (including child care).''.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 658B of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858) is amended by striking ''subchapter'' and all that follows, and inserting ''subchapter, such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2020.''.

SEC. 4. LEAD AGENCY.

(a) DESIGNATION.—Section 658D(a) of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858b(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''chief executive officer'' and inserting ''Governor''; and

(2) by striking ''designate'' and all that follows and inserting ''designate an agency (which may be an appropriate collaborative agency), or establish a joint interagency office, that complies with the requirements of subsection (b) to serve as the lead agency for the State under this subchapter.''.

(b) COLLABORATION WITH TRIBES.—Section 658D(b)(1) of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858b(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(E) at the option of an Indian tribe or tribal organization in the State, collaborate and coordinate with such Indian tribe or tribal organization in the development of the State plan.''.

SEC. 5. APPLICATION AND PLAN.

(a) PERIOD.—Section 658E(b) of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858c(b)) is amended, by striking ''2-year'' and inserting ''3-year''.

(b) POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—Section 658E(c) of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858c(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''or established'' after ''designated'';

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by inserting a comma after ''care of such providers'';

(B) by striking subparagraphs (D) through (H); and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) MONITORING AND INSPECTION REPORTS.—The plan shall include a certification that the State, not later than 1 year after the State has in effect the policies and practices described in subparagraph (K)(i), will make public by electronic means, in a consumer-friendly and easily accessible format, organized by provider, the results of monitoring and inspection reports, including those due to major substantiated complaints about failure to comply with this subchapter and State child care policies, as well as the number of deaths, serious injuries, and instances of substantiated child abuse that occurred in child care settings each year, for eligible child care providers within the State. The results shall also include information on the date of such an inspection and, where applicable, information on corrective action taken.

''(E) CONSUMER EDUCATION INFORMATION.—The plan shall include a certification that the State will collect and disseminate (which dissemination may be done, except as otherwise specified in this subparagraph, through resource and referral organizations or other means as determined by the State) to parents of eligible children and the general public—

''(i) information that will promote informed child care choices and that concerns—

''(I) the availability of child care services provided through programs authorized under this subchapter and, if feasible, other child care services and other programs provided in the State for which the family may be eligible;

''(II) if available, information about the quality of providers, including information from a Quality Rating and Improvement System;

''(III) information, made available through a State website, describing the State process for licensing child care providers, the State processes for conducting background checks, and monitoring and inspections, of child care providers, and the offenses that prevent individuals and entities from serving as child care providers in the State;

''(IV) the availability of assistance to obtain child care services;

''(V) other programs for which families that receive child care services for which financial assistance is provided in accordance with this subchapter may be eligible, including the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families established under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.), Head Start and Early Head Start programs carried out under the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 et seq.), the program carried out under the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8621 et seq.), the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.), the special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children established under section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786), the child and adult care food program established under section 17 of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1766), and the Medicaid and State children's health insurance programs under titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq., 1397aa et seq.);

''(VI) programs carried out under section 619 and part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1419, 1431 et seq.); and

''(VII) research and best practices concerning children's development, including language and cognitive development, development of early language and literacy and mathematics skills, social and emotional development, meaningful parent and family engagement, and physical health and development (particularly healthy eating and physical activity);

''(ii) information on developmental screenings, including—

''(I) information on existing (as of the date of submission of the application containing the plan) resources and services the State can deploy, including the coordinated use of the Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment program under the Medicaid program carried out under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.) and developmental screening services available under section 619 and part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1419, 1431 et seq.), in conducting developmental screenings and providing referrals to services, when appropriate, for children who receive assistance under this subchapter; and

''(II) a description of how a family or eligible child care provider may utilize the resources and services described in subclause (I) to obtain developmental screenings for children who receive assistance under this subchapter who may be at risk for cognitive or other developmental delays, which may include social, emotional, physical, or linguistic delays; and

''(iii) information, for parents receiving assistance under the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) and low-income parents, about eligibility for assistance provided in accordance with this subchapter.

''(F) COMPLIANCE WITH STATE LICENSING REQUIREMENTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The plan shall include a certification that the State involved has in effect licensing requirements applicable to child care services provided within the State, and provide a detailed description of such requirements and of how such requirements are effectively enforced.

''(ii) LICENSE EXEMPTION.—If the State uses funding received under this subchapter to support a child care provider that is exempt from the corresponding licensing requirements described in clause (i), the plan shall include a description stating why such licensing exemption does not endanger the health, safety, or development of children who receive services from child care providers who are exempt from such requirements.

''(iii) REQUESTS FOR RELIEF.—As described in section 658I(d), a State may request relief from a provision of Federal law other than this subchapter that might conflict with a requirement of this subchapter, including a licensing requirement.

''(G) TRAINING REQUIREMENTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The plan shall describe the training requirements that are in effect within the State that are designed to enable child care providers to promote the social, emotional, physical, and cognitive development of children and that are applicable to child care providers that provide services for which assistance is provided in accordance with this subchapter in the State.

''(ii) REQUIREMENTS.—The plan shall provide an assurance that such training requirements—

''(I) provide a set of workforce and competency standards for child care providers that provide services described in clause (i);

''(II) are developed in consultation with the State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care (designated or established pursuant to section 642B(b)(1)(A)(i) of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9837b(b)(1)(A)(i)));

''(III) include an evidence-based training framework that is designed to promote children's learning and development and school readiness and to improve child outcomes, including school readiness and early language and literacy development;

''(IV) incorporate knowledge and application of the State's early learning and developmental guidelines (where applicable), and the State's child development and health standards; and

''(V) to the extent practicable, are appropriate for a population of children that includes—

''(aa) different age groups (such as infants, toddlers, and preschoolers);

''(bb) English learners;

''(cc) children with disabilities; and

''(dd) Native Americans, including Indians, as the term is defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b) (including Alaska Natives within the meaning of that term), and Native Hawaiians (as defined in section 7207 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7517)).

''(iii) PROGRESSION OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT.—In developing the requirements, the State shall develop a statewide progression of professional development designed to improve the skills and knowledge of the workforce—

''(I) which may include the acquisition of course credit in postsecondary education or of a credential, aligned with the framework; and

''(II) which shall be accessible to providers supported through Indian tribes or tribal organizations that receive assistance under this subchapter.

''(iv) ALIGNMENT.—The State shall engage the State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care, and may engage institutions of higher education (as defined in section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002)), and other training providers in aligning training opportunities with the State's training framework.

''(v) CREDENTIALS.—The Secretary shall not require an individual or entity that provides child care services for which assistance is provided in accordance with this subchapter to acquire a credential to provide such services. Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit a State from requiring a credential.

''(H) CHILD-TO-PROVIDER RATIO STANDARDS.—

''(i) STANDARDS.—The plan shall describe child care standards, for child care for which assistance is made available in accordance with this subchapter, appropriate to the type of child care setting involved, that address—

''(I) group size limits for specific age populations;

''(II) the appropriate ratio between the number of children and the number of providers, in terms of the age of the children in child care, as determined by the State; and

''(III) required qualifications for such providers.

''(ii) CONSTRUCTION.—The Secretary may offer guidance to States on child-to-provider ratios described in clause (i) according to setting and age group but shall not require that States maintain specific child-to-provider ratios for providers who receive assistance under this subchapter.

''(I) HEALTH AND SAFETY REQUIREMENTS.—The plan shall include a certification that there are in effect within the State, under State or local law, requirements designed to protect the health and safety of children that are applicable to child care providers that provide services for which assistance is made available in accordance with this subchapter. Such requirements—

''(i) shall relate to matters including health and safety topics (including prevention of shaken baby syndrome and abusive head trauma) consisting of—

''(I) the prevention and control of infectious diseases (including immunization) and the establishment of a grace period that allows homeless children and children in foster care to receive services under this subchapter while their families (including foster families) are taking any necessary action to comply with immunization and other health and safety requirements;

''(II) handwashing and universal health precautions;

''(III) the administration of medication, consistent with standards for parental consent;

''(IV) the prevention of and response to emergencies due to food and other allergic reactions;

''(V) prevention of sudden infant death syndrome and use of safe sleeping practices;

''(VI) sanitary methods of food handling;

''(VII) building and physical premises safety;

''(VIII) emergency preparedness and response planning for emergencies resulting from a natural disaster, or a man-caused event (such as violence at a child care facility), within the meaning of those terms under section 602(a)(1) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5195a(a)(1));

''(IX) the handling and storage of hazardous materials and the appropriate disposal of biocontaminants;

''(X) identification of and protection from hazards that can cause bodily injury such as electrical hazards, bodies of water, and vehicular traffic;

''(XI) for providers that offer transportation, if applicable, appropriate precautions in transporting children;

''(XII) first aid and cardiopulmonary resuscitation; and

''(XIII) minimum health and safety training, to be completed pre-service or during an orientation period, appropriate to the provider setting involved that addresses each of the requirements relating to matters described in subclauses (I) through (XII); and

''(ii) may include requirements relating to nutrition, access to physical activity, or any other subject area determined by the State to be necessary to promote child development or to protect children's health and safety.

''(J) COMPLIANCE WITH STATE AND LOCAL HEALTH AND SAFETY REQUIREMENTS.—The plan shall include a certification that procedures are in effect to ensure that child care providers within the State, that provide services for which assistance is made available in accordance with this subchapter, comply with all applicable State and local health and safety requirements as described in subparagraph (I).

''(K) ENFORCEMENT OF LICENSING AND OTHER REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS.—

''(i) CERTIFICATION.—The plan shall include a certification that the State, not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014, shall have in effect policies and practices, applicable to licensing or regulating child care providers that provide services for which assistance is made available in accordance with this subchapter and the facilities of those providers, that—

''(I) ensure that individuals who are hired as licensing inspectors in the State are qualified to inspect those child care providers and facilities and have received training in related health and safety requirements, child development, child abuse prevention and detection, program management, and relevant law enforcement;

''(II) require licensing inspectors (or qualified inspectors designated by the lead agency) of those child care providers and facilities to perform inspections, with—

''(aa) not less than 1 prelicensure inspection for compliance with health, safety, and fire standards, of each such child care provider and facility in the State; and

''(bb) not less than annually, an inspection (which shall be unannounced) of each such child care provider and facility in the State for compliance with all child care licensing standards, which shall include an inspection for compliance with health, safety, and fire standards (although inspectors may or may not inspect for compliance with all 3 standards at the same time); and

''(III) require the ratio of licensing inspectors to such child care providers and facilities in the State to—

''(aa) be maintained at a level sufficient to enable the State to conduct inspections of such child care providers and facilities on a timely basis in accordance with Federal and State law; and

''(bb) be consistent with research findings and best practices.

''(ii) CONSTRUCTION.—The Secretary may offer guidance to a State, if requested by the State, on a research-based minimum standard regarding ratios described in clause (i)(III) and provide technical assistance to the State on meeting the minimum standard within a reasonable time period, but shall not prescribe a particular ratio.

''(L) COMPLIANCE WITH CHILD ABUSE REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—The plan shall include a certification that child care providers within the State will comply with the child abuse reporting requirements of section 106(b)(2)(B)(i) of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106a(b)(2)(B)(i)).

''(M) MEETING THE NEEDS OF CERTAIN POPULATIONS.—The plan shall describe how the State will develop and implement strategies (which may include the provision of compensation at higher payment rates and bonuses to child care providers, the provision of direct contracts or grants to community-based organizations, offering child care certificates to parents, or other means determined by the State) to increase the supply and improve the quality of child care for—

''(i) children in underserved areas;

''(ii) infants and toddlers;

''(iii) children with disabilities, as defined by the State; and

''(iv) children who receive care during non-traditional hours.

''(N) PROTECTION FOR WORKING PARENTS.—

''(i) MINIMUM PERIOD.—

''(I) 12-MONTH PERIOD.—The plan shall demonstrate that each child who receives assistance under this subchapter in the State will be considered to meet all eligibility requirements for such assistance and will receive such assistance, for not less than 12 months before the State redetermines the eligibility of the child under this subchapter, regardless of a temporary change in the ongoing status of the child's parent as working or attending a job training or educational program or a change in family income for the child's family, if that family income does not exceed 85 percent of the State median income for a family of the same size.

''(II) FLUCTUATIONS IN EARNINGS.—The plan shall demonstrate how the State's processes for initial determination and redetermination of such eligibility take into account irregular fluctuations in earnings.

''(ii) REDETERMINATION PROCESS.—The plan shall describe the procedures and policies that are in place to ensure that working parents (especially parents in families receiving assistance under the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.)) are not required to unduly disrupt their employment in order to comply with the State's requirements for redetermination of eligibility for assistance provided in accordance with this subchapter.

''(iii) PERIOD BEFORE TERMINATION.—At the option of the State, the plan shall demonstrate that the State will not terminate assistance provided to carry out this subchapter based on a factor consisting of a parent's loss of work or cessation of attendance at a job training or educational program for

which the family was receiving the assistance, without continuing the assistance for a reasonable period of time, of not less than 3 months, after such loss or cessation in order for the parent to engage in a job search and resume work, or resume attendance at a job training or educational program, as soon as possible.

''(iv) GRADUATED PHASEOUT OF CARE.—The plan shall describe the policies and procedures that are in place to allow for provision of continued assistance to carry out this subchapter, at the beginning of a new eligibility period under clause (i)(I), for children of parents who are working or attending a job training or educational program and whose family income exceeds the State's income limit to initially qualify for such assistance, if the family income for the family involved does not exceed 85 percent of the State median income for a family of the same size.

''(O) COORDINATION WITH OTHER PROGRAMS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The plan shall describe how the State, in order to expand accessibility and continuity of quality early childhood education and care, and assist children enrolled in prekindergarten, Early Head Start, or Head Start programs to receive full-day services, will efficiently coordinate the services supported to carry out this subchapter with—

''(I) programs carried out under the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 et seq.), including the Early Head Start programs carried out under section 645A of that Act (42 U.S.C. 9840a);

''(II) programs carried out under part A of title I, and part B of title IV, of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311 et seq., 7171 et seq.);

''(III) programs carried out under section 619 and part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1419, 1431 et seq.);

''(IV) the maternal, infant, and early childhood home visiting programs authorized under section 511 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 711), as added by section 2951 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148);

''(V) State, Indian tribe or tribal organization, and locally funded early childhood education and care programs;

''(VI) programs serving homeless children and services of local educational agency liaisons for homeless children and youths designated under subsection (g)(1)(J)(ii) of section 722 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11432(g)(1)(J)(ii));

''(VII) State agencies and programs serving children in foster care and the foster families of such children; and

''(VIII) other Federal programs supporting early childhood education and care activities, and, where applicable, child care programs funded through State veterans affairs offices.

''(ii) OPTIONAL USE OF COMBINED FUNDS.—If the State elects to combine funding for the services supported to carry out this subchapter with funding for any program described in subclauses (I) through (VII) of clause (i), the plan shall describe how the State will combine the multiple sets of funding and use the combined funding.

''(iii) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in clause (i) shall be construed to affect the priority of children described in clause (i) to receive full-day prekindergarten or Head Start program services.

''(P) PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS.—The plan shall demonstrate how the State encourages partnerships among State agencies, other public agencies, Indian tribes and tribal organizations, and private entities to leverage existing service delivery systems (as of the date of the submission of the application containing the plan) for early childhood education and care and to increase the supply and quality of child care services for children who are less than 13 years of age, such as by implementing voluntary shared services alliance models.

''(Q) PRIORITY FOR LOW-INCOME POPULATIONS.—The plan shall describe the process the State proposes to use, with respect to investments made to increase access to programs providing high-quality early childhood education and care, to give priority for those investments to children of families in areas that have significant concentrations of poverty and unemployment and that do not have such programs.

''(R) CONSULTATION.—The plan shall include a certification that the State has developed the plan in consultation with the State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care designated or established pursuant to section 642B(b)(1)(A)(i) of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9837b(b)(1)(A)(i)).

''(S) PAYMENT PRACTICES.—The plan shall include a certification that the payment practices of child care providers in the State that serve children who receive assistance under this subchapter reflect generally accepted payment practices of child care providers in the State that serve children who do not receive assistance under this subchapter, so as to provide stability of funding and encourage more child care providers to serve children who receive assistance under this subchapter.

''(T) EARLY LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENTAL GUIDELINES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The plan shall include an assurance that the State will develop or implement early learning and developmental guidelines that are appropriate for children from birth through entry into kindergarten, describing what such children should know and be able to do, and covering the essential domains of early childhood education and care and early childhood development for use statewide by child care providers. Such child care providers shall—

''(I) be licensed or regulated under State law; and

''(II) not be a relative of all children for whom the provider provides child care services.

''(ii) ALIGNMENT.—The guidelines shall be research-based, developmentally appropriate, and aligned with State standards for education in kindergarten through grade 3.

''(iii) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS.—The plan shall include an assurance that funds received by the State to carry out this subchapter will not be used to develop or implement an assessment for children that—

''(I) will be the sole basis for a child care provider being determined to be ineligible to participate in the program carried out under this subchapter;

''(II) will be used as the primary or sole basis to provide a reward or sanction for an individual provider;

''(III) will be used as the primary or sole method for assessing program effectiveness; or

''(IV) will be used to deny eligibility to participate in the program carried out under this subchapter.

''(iv) EXCEPTIONS.—Nothing in this subchapter shall preclude the State from using a single assessment (if appropriate) for children for—

''(I) supporting learning or improving a classroom environment;

''(II) targeting professional development to a provider;

''(III) determining the need for health, mental health, disability, developmental delay, or family support services;

''(IV) obtaining information for the quality improvement process at the State level; or

''(V) conducting a program evaluation for the purposes of providing program improvement and parent information.

''(v) NO FEDERAL CONTROL.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize an officer or employee of the Federal Government to—

''(I) mandate, direct, or control a State's early learning and developmental guidelines, developed in accordance with this section;

''(II) establish any criterion that specifies, defines, or prescribes the standards or measures that a State uses to establish, implement, or improve—

''(aa) early learning and developmental guidelines, or early learning standards, assessments, or accountability systems; or

''(bb) alignment of early learning and developmental guidelines with State standards for education in kindergarten through grade 3; or

''(III) require a State to submit such standards or measures for review.

''(U) DISASTER PREPAREDNESS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The plan shall demonstrate the manner in which the State will address the needs of children in child care services provided through programs authorized under this subchapter, including the need for safe child care, during the period before, during, and after a state of emergency declared by the Governor or a major disaster or emergency (as such terms are defined in section 102 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122)).

''(ii) STATEWIDE CHILD CARE DISASTER PLAN.—Such plan shall include a statewide child care disaster plan for coordination of activities and collaboration, in the event of an emergency or disaster described in clause (i), among the State agency with jurisdiction over human services, the agency with jurisdiction over State emergency planning, the State lead agency, the State agency with jurisdiction over licensing of child care providers, the local resource and referral organizations, the State resource and referral system, and the State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care as provided for under section 642B(b) of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9837b(b)).

''(iii) DISASTER PLAN COMPONENTS.—The components of the disaster plan, for such an emergency or disaster, shall include—

''(I) guidelines for the continuation of child care services in the period following the emergency or disaster, including the provision of emergency and temporary child care services, and temporary operating standards for child care providers during that period;

''(II) evacuation, relocation, shelter-in-place, and lock-down procedures, and procedures for communication and reunification with families, continuity of operations, and accommodation of infants and toddlers, children with disabilities, and children with chronic medical conditions; and

''(III) procedures for staff and volunteer training and practice drills.''.

(3) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''as required under'' and inserting ''in accordance with'';

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking ''The State'' and inserting the following:

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The State'';

(ii) by striking ''and any other activity that the State deems appropriate to realize any of the goals specified in paragraphs (2) through (5) of section 658A(b)'' and inserting ''activities that improve access to child care services, including use of procedures to permit immediate enrollment (after the initial eligibility determination and after a child is

determined to be eligible) of homeless children while required documentation is obtained, training and technical assistance on identifying and serving homeless children and their families, and specific outreach to homeless families, and any other activity that the State determines to be appropriate to meet the purposes of this subchapter (which may include an activity described in clause (ii))''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(ii) REPORT BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—Not later than September 30 of the first full fiscal year after the date of enactment of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014, and September 30 of each fiscal year thereafter, the Secretary (acting through the Assistant Secretary for Children and Families of the Department of Health and Human Services) shall prepare a report that contains a determination about whether each State uses amounts provided to such State for the fiscal year involved under this subchapter in accordance with the priority for services described in clause (i).

''(II) PENALTY FOR NONCOMPLIANCE.—For any fiscal year that the report of the Secretary described in subclause (I) indicates that a State has failed to give priority for services in accordance with clause (i), the Secretary shall—

''(aa) inform the State that the State has until the date that is 6 months after the Secretary has issued such report to fully comply with clause (i);

''(bb) provide the State an opportunity to modify the State plan of such State, to make the plan consistent with the requirements of clause (i), and resubmit such State plan to the Secretary not later than the date described in item (aa); and

''(cc) if the State does not fully comply with clause (i) and item (bb), by the date described in item (aa), withhold 5 percent of the funds that would otherwise be allocated to that State in accordance with this subchapter for the first full fiscal year after that date.

''(III) WAIVER FOR EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES.—Notwithstanding subclause (II) the Secretary may grant a waiver to a State for one year to the penalty applied in subclause (II) if the Secretary determines there are extraordinary circumstances, such as a natural disaster, that prevent the State from complying with clause (i). If the Secretary does grant a waiver to a State under this section, the Secretary shall, within 30 days of granting such waiver, submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees on the circumstances of the waiver including the stated reason from the State on the need for a waiver, the expected impact of the waiver on children served under this program, and any such other relevant information the Secretary deems necessary.

''(iii) CHILD CARE RESOURCE AND REFERRAL SYSTEM.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—A State may use amounts described in clause (i) to establish or support a system of local or regional child care resource and referral organizations that is coordinated, to the extent determined appropriate by the State, by a statewide public or private nonprofit, community-based or regionally based, lead child care resource and referral organization.

''(II) LOCAL OR REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.—The local or regional child care resource and referral organizations supported as described in subclause (I) shall—

''(aa) provide parents in the State with consumer education information referred to in paragraph (2)(E) (except as otherwise provided in that paragraph), concerning the full range of child care options, analyzed by provider, including child care provided during nontraditional hours and through emergency child care centers, in their political subdivisions or regions;

''(bb) to the extent practicable, work directly with families who receive assistance under this subchapter to offer the families support and assistance, using information described in item (aa), to make an informed decision about which child care providers they will use, in an effort to ensure that the families are enrolling their children in high-quality care;

''(cc) collect and analyze data on the coordination of services and supports, including services under section 619 and part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1419, 1431 et seq.), for children with disabilities (as defined in section 602 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 1401));

''(dd) collect and analyze data on the supply of and demand for child care in political subdivisions or regions within the State and submit such data and analysis to the State;

''(ee) work to establish partnerships with public agencies and private entities to increase the supply and quality of child care services in the State; and

''(ff) as appropriate, coordinate their activities with the activities of the State lead agency and local agencies that administer funds made available in accordance with this subchapter.'';

(C) in subparagraph (D)—

(i) by striking ''1997 through 2002'' and inserting ''2015 through 2020''; and

(ii) by striking ''families described in paragraph (2)(H)'' and inserting ''families with children described in clause (i), (ii), (iii), or (iv) of paragraph (2)(M)''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(E) DIRECT SERVICES.—From amounts provided to a State for a fiscal year to carry out this subchapter, the State shall—

''(i) reserve the minimum amount required to be reserved under section 658G, and the funds for costs described in subparagraph (C); and

''(ii) from the remainder, use not less than 70 percent to fund direct services (provided by the State) in accordance with paragraph (2)(A).'';

(4) by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

''(4) PAYMENT RATES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The State plan shall certify that payment rates for the provision of child care services for which assistance is provided in accordance with this subchapter are sufficient to ensure equal access for eligible children to child care services that are comparable to child care services in the State or substate area involved that are provided to children whose parents are not eligible to receive assistance under this subchapter or to receive child care assistance under any other Federal or State program and shall provide a summary of the facts relied on by the State to determine that such rates are sufficient to ensure such access.

''(B) SURVEY.—The State plan shall—

''(i) demonstrate that the State has, after consulting with the State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care designated or established in section 642B(b)(1)(A)(i) of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9837b(b)(1)(A)(i)), local child care program administrators, local child care resource and referral agencies, and other appropriate entities, developed and conducted (not earlier than 2 years before the date of the submission of the application containing the State plan) a statistically valid and reliable survey of the market rates for child care services in the State (that reflects variations in the cost of child care services by geographic area, type of provider, and age of child);

''(ii) demonstrate that the State prepared a detailed report containing the results of the State market rates survey conducted pursuant to clause (i), and made the results of the survey widely available (not later than 30 days after the completion of such survey) through periodic means, including posting the results on the Internet;

''(iii) describe how the State will set payment rates for child care services, for which assistance is provided in accordance with this subchapter—

''(I) in accordance with the results of the market rates survey conducted pursuant to clause (i);

''(II) taking into consideration the cost of providing higher quality child care services than were provided under this subchapter before the date of enactment of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014; and

''(III) without, to the extent practicable, reducing the number of families in the State receiving such assistance to carry out this subchapter, relative to the number of such families on the date of enactment of that Act; and

''(iv) describe how the State will provide for timely payment for child care services provided in accordance with this subchapter.

''(C) CONSTRUCTION.—

''(i) NO PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to create a private right of action.

''(ii) NO PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN DIFFERENT RATES.—Nothing in this subchapter shall be construed to prevent a State from differentiating the payment rates described in subparagraph (B)(iii) on the basis of such factors as—

''(I) geographic location of child care providers (such as location in an urban or rural area);

''(II) the age or particular needs of children (such as the needs of children with disabilities and children served by child protective services);

''(III) whether the providers provide child care during weekend and other nontraditional hours; or

''(IV) the State's determination that such differentiated payment rates are needed to enable a parent to choose child care that is of high quality.''; and

(5) in paragraph (5), by inserting ''(that is not a barrier to families receiving assistance under this subchapter)'' after ''cost sharing''.

(c) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 658F(b)(2) of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858d(b)(2)) is amended by striking ''section 658E(c)(2)(F)'' and inserting ''section 658E(c)(2)(I)''.

SEC. 6. ACTIVITIES TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF CHILD CARE.

Section 658G of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858e) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 658G. ACTIVITIES TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF CHILD CARE.

''(a) RESERVATION.—

''(1) RESERVATION FOR ACTIVITIES RELATING TO THE QUALITY OF CHILD CARE SERVICES.—A State that receives funds to carry out this subchapter for a fiscal year referred to in paragraph (2) shall reserve and use a portion of such funds, in accordance with paragraph (2), for activities provided directly, or through grants or contracts with local child care resource and referral organizations or other appropriate entities, that are designed to improve the quality of child care services and increase parental options for, and access to, high-quality child care, provided in accordance with this subchapter.

''(2) AMOUNT OF RESERVATIONS.—Such State shall reserve and use—

''(A) to carry out the activities described in paragraph (1), not less than—

''(i) 6 percent of the funds described in paragraph (1), for the first and second full fiscal years after the date of enactment of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014;

''(ii) 8 percent of such funds, for the third and fourth full fiscal years after the date of enactment; and

''(iii) 10 percent of such funds, for the fifth full fiscal year after the date of enactment and each succeeding fiscal year; and

''(B) in addition to the funds reserved under subparagraph (A), 3 percent of the funds described in paragraph (1), for the first full fiscal year after the date of enactment and each succeeding fiscal year, to carry out the activities described in paragraph (1) and subsection (b)(4), as such activities relate to the quality of care for infants and toddlers.

''(b) ACTIVITIES.—Funds reserved under subsection (a) shall be used to carry out not fewer than 2 of the following activities:

''(1) Supporting the training, professional development, and professional advancement of the child care workforce through activities such as—

''(A) offering child care providers training and professional development that is intentional and sequential and leads to a higher level of skill or certification;

''(B) establishing or supporting programs designed to increase the retention and improve the competencies of child care providers, including wage incentive programs and initiatives that establish tiered payment rates for providers that meet or exceed child care services guidelines, as defined by the State;

''(C) offering training, professional development, and educational opportunities for child care providers that relate to the use of developmentally appropriate and age-appropriate curricula, and early childhood teaching strategies, that are scientifically based and aligned with the social, emotional, physical, and cognitive development of children, including offering specialized training for child care providers who care for infants and toddlers, children who are English learners, and children with disabilities (as defined in section 602 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1401));

''(D) providing training concerning the State early learning and developmental guidelines, where applicable, including training concerning early mathematics and early language and literacy development and effective instructional practices to support mathematics and language and literacy development in young children;

''(E) incorporating effective use of data to guide instruction and program improvement;

''(F) including effective behavior management strategies and training, including positive behavioral interventions and supports, that promote positive social and emotional development and reduce challenge behaviors;

''(G) at the option of the State, incorporating feedback from experts at the State's institutions of higher education, as defined in section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002), and other early childhood development experts and early childhood education and care experts;

''(H) providing training corresponding to the nutritional and physical activity needs of children to promote healthy development;

''(I) providing training or professional development for child care providers to serve and support children with disabilities;

''(J) providing training and outreach on engaging parents and families in culturally and linguistically appropriate ways to expand their knowledge, skills, and capacity to become meaningful partners in supporting their children's learning and development;

''(K) providing training or professional development for child care providers regarding the early neurological development of children; and

''(L) connecting child care staff members of child care providers with available Federal and State financial aid, or other resources, that would assist child care staff members in pursuing relevant postsecondary training.

''(2) Supporting the use of the early learning and developmental guidelines described in section 658E(c)(2)(T) by—

''(A) developing and implementing the State's early learning and developmental guidelines; and

''(B) providing technical assistance to enhance early learning for preschool and school-aged children in order to promote language and literacy skills, foster school readiness, and support later school success.

''(3) Developing and implementing a tiered quality rating system for child care providers, which shall—

''(A) support and assess the quality of child care providers in the State;

''(B) build on licensing standards and other State regulatory standards for such providers;

''(C) be designed to improve the quality of different types of child care providers;

''(D) describe the quality of early learning facilities;

''(E) build the capacity of State early childhood education and care programs and communities to promote parents' and families' understanding of the State's early childhood education and care system and the ratings of the programs in which the child is enrolled; and

''(F) provide, to the maximum extent practicable, financial incentives and other supports designed to help child care providers achieve and sustain higher levels of quality.

''(4) Improving the supply and quality of child care programs and services for infants and toddlers through activities, which may include—

''(A) establishing or expanding neighborhood-based high-quality comprehensive family and child development centers, which may serve as resources to child care providers in order to improve the quality of early childhood education and care and early childhood development services provided to infants and toddlers from low-income families and to help eligible child care providers improve their capacity to offer high-quality care to infants and toddlers from low-income families;

''(B) establishing or expanding the operation of community or neighborhood-based family child care networks;

''(C) supporting statewide networks of infant and toddler child care specialists, including specialists who have knowledge regarding infant and toddler development and curriculum and program implementation as well as the ability to coordinate services with early intervention specialists who provide services for infants and toddlers with disabilities under part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1431 et seq.);

''(D) carrying out initiatives to improve the quality of the infant and toddler child care workforce, such as providing relevant training, professional development, or mentoring opportunities and linking such opportunities to career pathways, developing career pathways for providers in such workforce, and improving the State credentialing of eligible providers caring for infants and toddlers;

''(E) if applicable, developing infant and toddler components within the State's quality rating system described in paragraph (3) for child care providers for infants and toddlers, or the development of infant and toddler components in a State's child care licensing regulations or early learning and developmental guidelines;

''(F) improving the ability of parents to access information about high-quality infant and toddler care; and

''(G) carrying out other activities determined by the State to improve the quality of infant and toddler care provided in the State, and for which there is evidence that the activities will lead to improved infant and toddler health and safety, infant and toddler development, or infant and toddler well-being, including providing training (including training in safe sleep practices, first aid, and cardiopulmonary resuscitation).

''(5) Promoting broad child care provider participation in the quality rating system described in paragraph (3).

''(6) Establishing or expanding a statewide system of child care resource and referral services.

''(7) Facilitating compliance with State requirements for inspection, monitoring, training, and health and safety, and with State licensing standards.

''(8) Evaluating and assessing the quality and effectiveness of child care programs and services offered in the State, including evaluating how such programs and services may improve the overall school readiness of young children.

''(9) Supporting child care providers in the pursuit of accreditation by an established national accrediting body with demonstrated, valid, and reliable program standards of high quality.

''(10) Supporting State or local efforts to develop or adopt high-quality program standards relating to health, mental health, nutrition, physical activity, and physical development and providing resources to enable eligible child care providers to meet, exceed, or sustain success in meeting or exceeding, such standards.

''(11) Carrying out other activities determined by the State to improve the quality of child care services provided in the State, and for which measurement of outcomes relating to improved provider preparedness, child safety, child well-being, or school readiness is possible.

''(c) CERTIFICATION.—Beginning with fiscal year 2015, at the beginning of each fiscal year, the State shall annually submit to the Secretary a certification containing an assurance that the State was in compliance with subsection (a) during the preceding fiscal year and a description of how the State used funds received under this subchapter to comply with subsection (a) during that preceding fiscal year.

''(d) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Each State receiving funds under this subchapter shall prepare and submit an annual report to the Secretary, which shall include information about—

''(1) the amount of funds that are reserved under subsection (a);

''(2) the activities carried out under this section; and

''(3) the measures that the State will use to evaluate the State's progress in improving the quality of child care programs and services in the State.

''(e) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall offer technical assistance, in accordance with section 658I(a)(3), which may include technical assistance through the use of grants or cooperative agreements, to States for the activities described in subsection (b).

''(f) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as providing the Secretary the authority to regulate, direct, or dictate State child care quality activities or progress in implementing those activities.''.

SEC. 7. CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECKS.

The Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 658G the following:

"SEC. 658H. CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECKS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—A State that receives funds to carry out this subchapter shall have in effect—

''(1) requirements, policies, and procedures to require and conduct criminal background checks for child care staff members (including prospective child care staff members) of child care providers described in subsection (c)(1); and

''(2) licensing, regulation, and registration requirements, as applicable, that prohibit the employment of child care staff members as described in subsection (c).

''(b) REQUIREMENTS.—A criminal background check for a child care staff member under subsection (a) shall include—

''(1) a search of each State criminal and sex offender registry or repository in the State where the child care staff member resides and each State where such staff member resided during the preceding 10 years;

''(2) a search of State-based child abuse and neglect registries and databases in the State where the child care staff member resides and each State where such staff member resided during the preceding 10 years;

''(3) a search of the National Crime Information Center;

''(4) a Federal Bureau of Investigation fingerprint check using the Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System; and

''(5) a search of the National Sex Offender Registry established under the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16901 et seq.).

''(c) PROHIBITIONS.—

''(1) CHILD CARE STAFF MEMBERS.—A child care staff member shall be ineligible for employment by a child care provider that is licensed, regulated, or registered by the State or for which assistance is provided in accordance with this subchapter, if such individual—

''(A) refuses to consent to the criminal background check described in subsection (b);

''(B) knowingly makes a materially false statement in connection with such criminal background check;

''(C) is registered, or is required to be registered, on a State sex offender registry or repository or the National Sex Offender Registry established under the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16901 et seq.); or

''(D) has been convicted of a felony consisting of—

''(i) murder, as described in section 1111 of title 18, United States Code;

''(ii) child abuse or neglect;

''(iii) a crime against children, including child pornography;

''(iv) spousal abuse;

''(v) a crime involving rape or sexual assault;

''(vi) kidnaping;

''(vii) arson;

''(viii) physical assault or battery; or

''(ix) subject to subsection (e)(4), a drug-related offense committed during the preceding 5 years; or

''(E) has been convicted of a violent misdemeanor committed as an adult against a child, including the following crimes: child abuse, child endangerment, sexual assault, or of a misdemeanor involving child pornography.

''(2) CHILD CARE PROVIDERS.—A child care provider described in paragraph (1) shall be ineligible for assistance provided in accordance with this subchapter if the provider employs a staff member who is ineligible for employment under paragraph (1).

''(d) SUBMISSION OF REQUESTS FOR BACKGROUND CHECKS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A child care provider covered by subsection (c) shall submit a request, to the appropriate State agency designated by a State, for a criminal background check described in subsection (b), for each child care staff member (including prospective child care staff members) of the provider.

''(2) STAFF MEMBERS.—Subject to paragraph (4), in the case of an individual who became a child care staff member before the date of enactment of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014, the provider shall submit such a request—

''(A) prior to the last day described in subsection (i)(1); and

''(B) not less often than once during each 5-year period following the first submission date under this paragraph for that staff member.

''(3) PROSPECTIVE STAFF MEMBERS.—Subject to paragraph (4), in the case of an individual who is a prospective child care staff member on or after that date of enactment, the provider shall submit such a request—

''(A) prior to the date the individual becomes a child care staff member of the provider; and

''(B) not less often than once during each 5-year period following the first submission date under this paragraph for that staff member.

''(4) BACKGROUND CHECK FOR ANOTHER CHILD CARE PROVIDER.—A child care provider shall not be required to submit a request under paragraph (2) or (3) for a child care staff member if—

''(A) the staff member received a background check described in subsection (b)—

''(i) within 5 years before the latest date on which such a submission may be made; and

''(ii) while employed by or seeking employment by another child care provider within the State;

''(B) the State provided to the first provider a qualifying background check result, consistent with this subchapter, for the staff member; and

''(C) the staff member is employed by a child care provider within the State, or has been separated from employment from a child care provider within the State for a period of not more than 180 consecutive days.

''(e) BACKGROUND CHECK RESULTS AND APPEALS.—

''(1) BACKGROUND CHECK RESULTS.—The State shall carry out the request of a child care provider for a criminal background check as expeditiously as possible, but in not to exceed 45 days after the date on which such request was submitted, and shall provide the results of the criminal background check to such provider and to the current or prospective staff member.

''(2) PRIVACY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The State shall provide the results of the criminal background check to the provider in a statement that indicates whether a child care staff member (including a prospective child care staff member) is eligible or ineligible for employment described in subsection (c), without revealing any disqualifying crime or other related information regarding the individual.

''(B) INELIGIBLE STAFF MEMBER.—If the child care staff member is ineligible for such employment due to the background check, the State will, when providing the results of the background check, include information related to each disqualifying crime, in a report to the staff member or prospective staff member.

''(C) PUBLIC RELEASE OF RESULTS.—No State shall publicly release or share the results of individual background checks, however, such results of background checks may be included in the development or dissemination of local or statewide data related to background checks, if such results are not individually identifiable.

''(3) APPEALS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The State shall provide for a process by which a child care staff member (including a prospective child care staff member) may appeal the results of a criminal background check conducted under this section to challenge the accuracy or completeness of the information contained in such member's criminal background report.

''(B) APPEALS PROCESS.—The State shall ensure that—

''(i) each child care staff member shall be given notice of the opportunity to appeal;

''(ii) a child care staff member will receive instructions about how to complete the appeals process if the child care staff member wishes to challenge the accuracy or completeness of the information contained in such member's criminal background report; and

''(iii) the appeals process is completed in a timely manner for each child care staff member.

''(4) REVIEW.—The State may allow for a review process through which the State may determine that a child care staff member (including a prospective child care staff member) disqualified for a crime specified in subsection (c)(1)(D)(ix) is eligible for employment described in subsection (c)(1), notwithstanding subsection (c). The review process shall be consistent with title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.).

''(5) NO PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to create a private right of action if the provider is in compliance with State regulations and requirements.

''(f) FEES FOR BACKGROUND CHECKS.—Fees that a State may charge for the costs of processing applications and administering a criminal background check as required by this section shall not exceed the actual costs to the State for the processing and administration.

''(g) CONSTRUCTION.—

''(1) DISQUALIFICATION FOR OTHER CRIMES.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent a State from disqualifying individuals as child care staff members based on their conviction for crimes not specifically listed in this section that bear upon the fitness of an individual to provide care for and have responsibility for the safety and well-being of children.

''(2) RIGHTS AND REMEDIES.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to alter or otherwise affect the rights and remedies provided for child care staff members residing in a State that disqualifies individuals as child care staff members for crimes not specifically provided for under this section.

''(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

''(1) the term 'child care provider' means a center-based child care provider, a family child care provider, or another provider of child care services for compensation and on a regular basis that—

''(A) is not an individual who is related to all children for whom child care services are provided; and

''(B) is licensed, regulated, or registered under State law or receives assistance provided in accordance with this subchapter; and

''(2) the term 'child care staff member' means an individual (other than an individual who is related to all children for whom child care services are provided)—

''(A) who is employed by a child care provider for compensation;

''(B) whose activities involve the care or supervision of children for a child care provider or unsupervised access to children who are cared for or supervised by a child care provider; or

''(C) who is a family child care provider.

''(i) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A State that receives funds under this subchapter shall meet the requirements of this section for the provision of criminal background checks for child care staff members described in subsection (d)(1) not later than the last day of the second full fiscal year after the date of enactment of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014.

''(2) EXTENSION.—The Secretary may grant a State an extension of time, of not more than 1 fiscal year, to meet the requirements of this section if the State demonstrates a good faith effort to comply with the requirements of this section.

''(3) PENALTY FOR NONCOMPLIANCE.—Except as provided in paragraphs (1) and (2), for any fiscal year that a State fails to comply substantially with the requirements of this section, the Secretary shall withhold 5 percent of the funds that would otherwise be allocated to that State in accordance with this subchapter for the following fiscal year.''.

SEC. 8. REPORTS AND INFORMATION.

(a) ADMINISTRATION.—Section 658I of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858g) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by inserting a comma after ''publish''; and

(ii) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

''(3) provide technical assistance to States (which may include providing assistance on a reimbursable basis), consistent with (as appropriate) scientifically valid research, to carry out this subchapter;''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) disseminate, for voluntary informational purposes, information on practices that scientifically valid research indicates are most successful in improving the quality of programs that receive assistance with this subchapter;

''(5) after consultation with the Secretary of Education and the heads of any other Federal agencies involved, issue guidance, and disseminate information on best practices, regarding use of funding combined by States as described in section 658E(c)(2)(O)(ii), consistent with law other than this subchapter.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(c) PROHIBITION.—Nothing in this subchapter shall be construed as providing the Secretary the authority to permit States to alter the eligibility requirements for eligible children, including work requirements that apply to the parents of eligible children.''.

(b) REQUESTS FOR RELIEF.—Section 658I of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, as amended by subsection (a), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) REQUEST FOR RELIEF.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The State may submit to the Secretary a request for relief from any provision of Federal law (including a regulation, policy, or procedure) affecting the delivery of child care services with Federal funds, other than this subchapter, that conflicts with a requirement of this subchapter.

''(2) CONTENTS.—Such request shall—

''(A) detail the provision of Federal law that conflicts with that requirement;

''(B) describe how modifying compliance with that provision of Federal law to meet the requirements of this subchapter will, by itself, improve delivery of child care services for children in the State; and

''(C) certify that the health, safety, and well-being of children served through assistance received under this subchapter will not be compromised as a result.

''(3) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall consult with the State submitting the request and the head of each Federal agency (other than the Secretary) with responsibility for administering the Federal law detailed in the State's request. The consulting parties shall jointly identify—

''(A) any provision of Federal law (including a regulation, policy, or procedure) for which a waiver is necessary to enable the State to provide services in accordance with the request; and

''(B) any corresponding waiver.

''(4) WAIVERS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and after the joint identification described in paragraph (3), the head of the Federal agency involved shall have the authority to waive any statutory provision administered by that agency, or any regulation, policy, or procedure issued by that agency, that has been so identified, unless the head of the Federal agency determines that such a waiver is inconsistent with the objectives of this subchapter or the Federal law from which relief is sought.

''(5) APPROVAL.—Within 90 days after the receipt of a State's request under this subsection, the Secretary shall inform the State of the Secretary's approval or disapproval of the request. If the plan is disapproved, the Secretary shall inform the State, in writing, of the reasons for the disapproval and give the State the opportunity to amend the request.

''(6) DURATION.—The Secretary may approve a request under this subsection for a period of not more than 3 years, and may renew the approval for additional periods of not more than 3 years.

''(7) TERMINATION.—The Secretary shall terminate approval of a request for relief authorized under this subsection if the Secretary determines, after notice and opportunity for a hearing, that the performance of a State granted relief under this subsection has been inadequate, or if such relief is no longer necessary to achieve its original purposes.''.

(c) REPORTS.—Section 658K(a) of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858i(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B)—

(A) in clause (ix), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in clause (x), by inserting ''and'' at the end; and

(C) by inserting after clause (x), the following:

''(xi) whether the children receiving assistance under this subchapter are homeless children;''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''1997'' and inserting ''2014''; and

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''section 658P(5)'' and inserting ''section 658P(6)''.

(d) REPORT BY SECRETARY.—Section 658L of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858j) is amended—

(1) by striking the section heading and inserting the following:

''SEC. 658L. REPORTS, HOTLINE, AND WEB SITE.'';

(2) by striking ''Not later'' and inserting the following:

''(a) REPORT BY SECRETARY.—Not later'';

(3) by striking ''1998'' and inserting ''2016''; and

(4) by striking ''to the Committee'' and all that follows through ''of the Senate'' and inserting ''to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate''; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) NATIONAL TOLL-FREE HOTLINE AND WEB SITE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall operate a national toll-free hotline and Web site, to—

''(A) develop and disseminate publicly available child care consumer education information for parents and help parents access safe, affordable, and quality child care in their community; and

''(B) to allow persons to report (anonymously if desired) suspected child abuse or neglect, or violations of health and safety requirements, by an eligible child care provider that receives assistance under this subchapter.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall ensure that the hotline and Web site meet the following requirements:

''(A) REFERRAL TO LOCAL CHILD CARE PROVIDERS.—The Web site shall be hosted by 'childcare.gov'. The Web site shall enable a child care consumer to enter a zip code and obtain a referral to local child care providers described in subparagraph (B) within a specified search radius.

''(B) INFORMATION.—The Web site shall provide to consumers, directly or through linkages to State databases, at a minimum—

''(i) a localized list of all State licensed child care providers;

''(ii) any provider-specific information from a Quality Rating and Improvement System or information about other quality indicators, to the extent the information is publicly available and to the extent practicable;

''(iii) any other provider-specific information about compliance with licensing, and health and safety, requirements to the extent the information is publicly available and to the extent practicable;

''(iv) referrals to local resource and referral organizations from which consumers can find more information about child care providers, and a recommendation that consumers consult with the organizations when selecting a child care provider; and

''(v) State information about child care subsidy programs and other financial supports available to families.

''(C) NATIONWIDE CAPACITY.—The Web site and hotline shall have the capacity to help families in every State and community in the Nation.

''(D) INFORMATION AT ALL HOURS.—The Web site shall provide, to parents and families, access to information about child care 24 hours a day.

''(E) SERVICES IN DIFFERENT LANGUAGES.—The Web site and hotline shall ensure the widest possible access to services for families who speak languages other than English.

''(F) HIGH-QUALITY CONSUMER EDUCATION AND REFERRAL.—The Web site and hotline shall ensure that families have access to child care consumer education and referral services that are consistent and of high quality.

''(3) PROHIBITION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to allow the Secretary to compel States to provide additional data and information that is currently (as of the date of enactment of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014) not publicly available, or is not required by this subchapter.''.

(e) PROTECTION OF INFORMATION.—Section 658K(a)(1) of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858i(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(E) PROHIBITION.—Reports submitted to the Secretary under subparagraph (C) shall not contain individually identifiable information.''.

SEC. 9. RESERVATION FOR TOLL-FREE HOTLINE AND WEB SITE; PAYMENTS TO BENEFIT INDIAN CHILDREN.

Section 658O of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858m) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''The Secretary'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary'';

(ii) by striking ''1 percent, and not more than 2 percent,'' and inserting ''2 percent''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) LIMITATIONS.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall only reserve an amount that is greater than 2 percent of the amount appropriated under section 658B, for payments described in subparagraph (A), for a fiscal year (referred to in this subparagraph as the 'reservation year') if —

''(i) the amount appropriated under section 658B for the reservation year is greater than the amount appropriated under section 658B for fiscal year 2014; and

''(ii) the Secretary ensures that the amount allotted to States under subsection (b) for the reservation year is not less than the amount allotted to States under subsection (b) for fiscal year 2014.''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) NATIONAL TOLL-FREE HOTLINE AND WEB SITE.—The Secretary shall reserve not less than $1,000,000 of the amount appropriated under this subchapter for each fiscal year for the operation of a national toll-free hotline and Web site, under section 658L(b).''; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following:

''(D) LICENSING AND STANDARDS.—In lieu of any licensing and regulatory requirements applicable under State or local law, the Secretary, in consultation with Indian tribes and tribal organizations, shall develop minimum child care standards that shall be applicable to Indian tribes and tribal organizations receiving assistance under this subchapter. Such standards shall appropriately reflect Indian tribe and tribal organization needs and available resources, and shall include standards requiring a publicly available application, health and safety standards, and standards requiring a reservation of funds for activities to improve the quality of child care provided to Indian children.''; and

(B) in paragraph (6), by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

''(C) LIMITATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the Secretary may not permit an Indian tribe or tribal organization to use amounts provided under this subsection for construction or renovation if the use will result in a decrease in the level of child care services provided by the Indian tribe or tribal organization as compared to the level of child care services provided by the Indian tribe or tribal organization in the fiscal year preceding the year for which the determination under subparagraph (B) is being made.

''(ii) WAIVER.—The Secretary shall waive the limitation described in clause (i) if—

''(I) the Secretary determines that the decrease in the level of child care services provided by the Indian tribe or tribal organization is temporary; and

''(II) the Indian tribe or tribal organization submits to the Secretary a plan that demonstrates that after the date on which the construction or renovation is completed—

''(aa) the level of child care services will increase; or

''(bb) the quality of child care services will improve.''.

SEC. 10. DEFINITIONS.

Section 658P of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858n) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

''(3) CHILD WITH A DISABILITY.—The term 'child with a disability' means—

''(A) a child with a disability, as defined in section 602 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1401);

''(B) a child who is eligible for early intervention services under part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1431 et seq.);

''(C) a child who is less than 13 years of age and who is eligible for services under section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794); and

''(D) a child with a disability, as defined by the State involved.

''(4) ELIGIBLE CHILD.—The term 'eligible child' means an individual—

''(A) who is less than 13 years of age;

''(B) whose family income does not exceed 85 percent of the State median income for a family of the same size, and whose family assets do not exceed $1,000,000 (as certified by a member of such family); and

''(C) who—

''(i) resides with a parent or parents who are working or attending a job training or educational program; or

''(ii) is receiving, or needs to receive, protective services and resides with a parent or parents not described in clause (i).'';

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (5) through (9) as paragraphs (6) through (10), respectively;

(3) by inserting after paragraph (4), the following:

''(5) ENGLISH LEARNER.—The term 'English learner' means an individual who is limited English proficient, as defined in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801) or section 637 of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9832).'';

(4) in paragraph (6)(A), as redesignated by paragraph (2)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking ''section 658E(c)(2)(E)'' and inserting ''section 658E(c)(2)(F)''; and

(B) in clause (ii), by striking ''section 658E(c)(2)(F)'' and inserting ''section 658E(c)(2)(I)'';

(5) in paragraph (9), as redesignated by paragraph (2), by striking ''designated'' and all that follows and inserting ''designated or established under section 658D(a).'';

(6) in paragraph (10), as redesignated by paragraph (2), by inserting '', foster parent,'' after ''guardian'';

(7) by redesignating paragraphs (11) through (14) as paragraphs (12) through (15), respectively; and

(8) by inserting after paragraph (10), as redesignated by paragraph (2), the following:

''(11) SCIENTIFICALLY VALID RESEARCH.—The term 'scientifically valid research' includes applied research, basic research, and field-initiated research, for which the rationale, design, and interpretation are soundly developed in accordance with principles of scientific research.''.

SEC. 10A. PARENTAL RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES.

Section 658Q of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858o) is amended—

(1) by inserting before ''Nothing'' the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) PARENTAL RIGHTS TO USE CHILD CARE CERTIFICATES.—Nothing in this subchapter shall be construed in a manner—

''(1) to favor or promote the use of grants and contracts for the receipt of child care services under this subchapter over the use of child care certificates; or

''(2) to disfavor or discourage the use of such certificates for the purchase of child care services, including those services provided by private or nonprofit entities, such as faith-based providers.''.

SEC. 11. STUDIES ON WAITING LISTS.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct studies to determine, for each State, the number of families that—

(1) are eligible to receive assistance under the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858 et seq.);

(2) have applied for the assistance; and

(3) have been placed on a waiting list for the assistance.

(b) REPORT.—The Comptroller General shall prepare a report containing the results of each study and shall submit the report to the appropriate committees of Congress—

(1) not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) every 2 years thereafter.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''State'' has the meaning given the term in section 658P of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858n).

SEC. 12. CONFORMING AMENDMENT.

Section 319C–1(b)(2)(A)(vii) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d–3a(b)(2)(A)(vii)) is amended by inserting ''or established'' after ''designated''.

SEC. 13. REVIEW OF FEDERAL EARLY LEARNING AND CARE PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services, in conjunction with the Secretary of Education, shall conduct an interdepartmental review of all early learning and care programs in order to—

(1) develop a plan for the elimination of duplicative and overlapping programs, as identified by the Government Accountability Office's 2012 annual report (GAO–12–342SP); and

(2) make recommendations to Congress for streamlining all such programs.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Secretary of Education and the heads of all Federal agencies that administer Federal early learning and care programs, shall submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives, a detailed report that outlines the efficiencies that can be achieved by, as well as specific recommendations for, eliminating duplication, overlap, and fragmentation among all Federal early learning and care programs.

SEC. 14. SAFE CHILD CARE ACT.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Safe Child Care Act of 2014''.

(b) BACKGROUND CHECKS.—Section 231 of the Crime Control Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13041) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''subsection (b)(3)'' and inserting ''paragraph (3)''; and

(B) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (4);

(2) by moving paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (b) to subsection (a), and inserting them after paragraph (1) of that subsection;

(3) in subsection (a)(3), as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection, by striking ''subsection (a)(1)'' and inserting ''paragraph (1)'';

(4) in subsection (b), by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(1) A background check required by subsection (a) shall be initiated through the personnel programs of the applicable Federal agencies.

''(2) A background check for a child care staff member under subsection (a) shall include—

''(A) a search, including a fingerprint check, of the State criminal registry or repository in—

''(i) the State where the child care staff member resides; and

''(ii) each State where the child care staff member previously resided during the longer of—

''(I) the 10-year period ending on the date on which the background check is initiated; or

''(II) the period beginning on the date on which the child care staff member attained 18 years of age and ending on the date on which the background check is initiated;

''(B) a search of State-based child abuse and neglect registries and databases in—

''(i) the State where the child care staff member resides; and

''(ii) each State where the child care staff member previously resided during the longer of—

''(I) the 10-year period ending on the date on which the background check is initiated; or

''(II) the period beginning on the date on which the child care staff member attained 18 years of age and ending on the date on which the background check is initiated;

''(C) a search of the National Crime Information Center database;

''(D) a Federal Bureau of Investigation fingerprint check using the Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System;

''(E) a search of the National Sex Offender Registry established under the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16901 et seq.); and

''(F) a search of the State sex offender registry established under that Act in—

''(i) the State where the child care staff member resides; and

''(ii) each State where the child care staff member previously resided during the longer of—

''(I) the 10-year period ending on the date on which the background check is initiated; or

''(II) the period beginning on the date on which the child care staff member attained 18 years of age and ending on the date on which the background check is initiated.

''(3) A child care staff member shall be ineligible for employment by a child care provider if such individual—

''(A) refuses to consent to the background check described in subsection (a);

''(B) makes a false statement in connection with such background check;

''(C) is registered, or is required to be registered, on a State sex offender registry or the National Sex Offender Registry established under the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006; or

''(D) has been convicted of a felony consisting of—

''(i) murder, as described in section 1111 of title 18, United States Code;

''(ii) child abuse or neglect;

''(iii) a crime against children, including child pornography;

''(iv) spousal abuse;

''(v) a crime involving rape or sexual assault;

''(vi) kidnapping;

''(vii) arson;

''(viii) physical assault or battery; or

''(ix) subject to paragraph (5)(D), a drug-related offense committed during the preceding 5 years.

''(4)(A) A child care provider covered by paragraph (3) shall submit a request, to the appropriate State agency designated by a State, for a background check described in subsection (a), for each child care staff member (including prospective child care staff members) of the provider.

''(B) In the case of an individual who is hired as a child care staff member before the date of enactment of the Safe Child Care Act of 2014, the provider shall submit such a request—

''(i) prior to the last day of the second full fiscal year after that date of enactment; and

''(ii) not less often than once during each 5-year period following the first submission date under this subparagraph for that staff member.

''(C) In the case of an individual who is a prospective child care staff member on or after that date of enactment, the provider shall submit such a request—

''(i) prior to the date the individual becomes a child care staff member of the provider; and

''(ii) not less often than once during each 5-year period following the first submission date under this subparagraph for that staff member.

''(5)(A) The State shall—

''(i) carry out the request of a child care provider for a background check described in subsection (a) as expeditiously as possible; and

''(ii) in accordance with subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, provide the results of the background check to—

''(I) the child care provider; and

''(II) the current or prospective child care staff member for whom the background check is conducted.

''(B)(i) The State shall provide the results of a background check to a child care provider as required under subparagraph (A)(ii)(I) in a statement that—

''(I) indicates whether the current or prospective child care staff member for whom the background check is conducted is eligible or ineligible for employment by a child care provider; and

''(II) does not reveal any disqualifying crime or other related information regarding the current or prospective child care staff member.

''(ii) If a current or prospective child care staff member is ineligible for employment by a child care provider due to a background check described in subsection (a), the State shall provide the results of the background check to the current or prospective child care staff member as required under subparagraph (A)(ii)(II) in a criminal background report that includes information relating to each disqualifying crime.

''(iii) A State—

''(I) may not publicly release or share the results of an individual background check described in subsection (a); and

''(II) may include the results of background checks described in subsection (a) in the development or dissemination of local or statewide data relating to background checks if the results are not individually identifiable.

''(C)(i) The State shall provide for a process by which a child care staff member (including a prospective child care staff member) may appeal the results of a background check required under subsection (a) to challenge the accuracy or completeness of the information contained in the criminal background report of the staff member.

''(ii) The State shall ensure that—

''(I) the appeals process is completed in a timely manner for each child care staff member;

''(II) each child care staff member is given notice of the opportunity to appeal; and

''(III) each child care staff member who wishes to challenge the accuracy or completeness of the information in the criminal background report of the child care staff member is given instructions about how to complete the appeals process.

''(D)(i) The State may allow for a review process through which the State may determine that a child care staff member (including a prospective child care staff member) disqualified for a crime specified in paragraph (3)(D)(ix) is eligible for employment by a child care provider, notwithstanding paragraph (3).

''(ii) The review process under this subparagraph shall be consistent with title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.).

''(E) Nothing in this section shall be construed to create a private right of action against a child care provider if the child care provider is in compliance with this section.

''(F) This section shall apply to each State that receives funding under the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858 et seq.).

''(6) Fees that the State may charge for the costs of conducting a background check as required by subsection (a) shall not exceed the actual costs to the State for the administration of such background checks.

''(7) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent a Federal agency from disqualifying an individual as a child care staff member based on a conviction of the individual for a crime not specifically listed in this subsection that bears upon the fitness of an individual to provide care for and have responsibility for the safety and well-being of children.

''(8) In this subsection—

''(A) the term 'child care provider' means an agency of the Federal Government, or a unit of or contractor with the Federal Government that is operating a facility, described in subsection (a); and

''(B) the term 'child care staff member' means an individual who is hired, or seeks to be hired, by a child care provider to be involved with the provision of child care services, as described in subsection (a).''; and

(5) by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

''(c) SUSPENSION PENDING DISPOSITION OF CRIMINAL CASE.—In the case of an incident in which an individual has been charged with an offense described in subsection (b)(3)(D) and the charge has not yet been disposed of, an employer may suspend an employee from having any contact with children while on the job until the case is resolved.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1 of the second full fiscal year after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 15. ALLOTMENT OF SPACE IN FEDERAL BUILDINGS FOR CHILD CARE.

Section 590 of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (a) through (g) as subsections (b) through (h), respectively;

(2) by inserting before subsection (b) (as so redesignated) the following:

''(a) DEFINITION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEE.—In this section, the term 'Federal employee' does not include a person that—

''(1) is not employed by the Federal Government; and

''(2) meets the requirements described in subsection (c)(2)(C)(i)(II).'';

(3) in paragraph (2)(C) of subsection (c) (as so redesignated), by striking clause (i) and inserting the following:

''(i) the space will be used to provide child care services to children of whom at least 50 percent have 1 parent or guardian who—

''(I) is employed by the Federal Government; or

''(II)(aa) has met the requirements for a master's degree or a doctorate degree from an institution of higher education (as defined in section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002)); and

''(bb) is conducting research in the Federal building under an arrangement between the parent or guardian and a Federal agency.''; and

(4) in subsection (d) (as so redesignated), by striking ''subsection (b)'' each place it appears and inserting ''subsection (c)''.

SEC. 16. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCING CHILD POVERTY BY CALENDAR YEAR 2019.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the United States has the highest rate of childhood poverty among 34 major countries in the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, including Denmark, Finland, Norway, Iceland, Cyprus, Austria, Sweden, the Czech Republic, Germany, Slovenia, Hungary, South Korea, the United Kingdom, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Ireland, France, Malta, Luxembourg, Slovakia, Estonia, Belgium, New Zealand, Poland, Canada, Australia, Japan, Portugal, Greece, Italy, Lithuania, Latvia, Spain, and Bulgaria;

(2) a record-breaking 46,496,000 individuals lived in poverty in the United States in 2012, which is an increase of 14,915,000 individuals since 2000;

(3) 16,073,000 children in the United States lived in poverty in 2012, which is an increase of 4,486,000 children since 2000;

(4) more than 7,100,000 children in the United States, 40 percent of children living in poverty in the United States, live in extreme poverty (defined as living in families with an income that is less than half of the poverty level);

(5) nearly 1,200,000 public school students in the United States were homeless in the 2011–2012 school year, an increase of 73 percent since the 2006–2007 school year;

(6) in an average month in fiscal year 2011, 1,200,000 households with children in the United States did not have any cash income and, for food, depended only on benefits under the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.);

(7) in 2012, government assistance programs removed from poverty 9,000,000 children, including 5,300,000 children through the earned income tax credit under section 32 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the child tax credit under section 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and 2,200,000 children through the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.);

(8) in 2012, child poverty would have been 57 percent higher, and extreme poverty would have been 240 percent higher, without government tax credits and food, housing, and energy benefits;

(9) in 2013, an individual working full-time at the Federal minimum wage could not afford the fair market rent for a 2-bedroom rental unit and have enough money for food, utilities, and other necessities;

(10) in school years 2009–2010 and 2010–2011, less than half of children ages 3 and 4 were enrolled in preschool;

(11) Early Head Start programs carried out under the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 et seq.) served only 4 percent of the 2,900,000 eligible poor infants and toddlers each day in fiscal year 2012, and Head Start programs carried out under such Act served only 41 percent of the 2,000,000 eligible poor children ages 3 and 4;

(12) more than 220,000 children are on waiting lists for child care assistance; and

(13) child poverty costs the United States not less than $500,000,000 each year in additional education, health, and criminal justice costs and in lost productivity.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the President should immediately present to Congress a comprehensive plan to significantly reduce child poverty in the United States by calendar year 2019.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CHANGE OF VOTE

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, on rollcall vote 77 I voted ''aye.'' It was my intention to vote ''nay.'' I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to change my vote since it will not affect the outcome.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The foregoing tally has been changed to reflect the above order).

SUPPORTING SOVEREIGNTY AND DEMOCRACY IN UKRAINE—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 329, S. 2124, which is the bill to support sovereignty and democracy in Ukraine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 329, S. 2124, to support sovereignty and democracy in Ukraine, and for other purposes.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 3370 AND S. 2137

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 317, H.R. 3370, the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act; that there be up to 45 minutes of debate prior to a vote on passage of the bill, with the majority controlling 30 minutes and the Republicans controlling 15 minutes; further, that upon disposition of H.R. 3370, the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 2137, introduced earlier today by Senator LEE; that the bill be read a third time and the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the bill; that each bill be subject to a 60 affirmative vote threshold, with all of the above occurring with no intervening action or debate; finally, that there be 2 minutes equally divided in between the votes; and that Senator COBURN be recognized for up to 30 minutes following the votes for his remarks relative to the flood insurance bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following disposition of S. 2137, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following two nominations en bloc: Calendar Nos. 647 and 551; that the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session; further, that there be 2 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form prior to each vote, and that the votes be 10 minutes in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOMEOWNER FLOOD INSURANCE AFFORDABILITY ACT OF 2013

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H.R. 3370.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3370) to delay the implementation of certain provisions of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there are now 45 minutes for debate.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, this particular bill has not been examined in committee—not in the Senate, not even in the House. It was rushed to the floor of the House without amendment, and it is rushed to the floor here without amendment. This is not how the legislative process is supposed to work—especially not here in the Senate.

My opponents may say we already had our chance to impact this policy, but what we have before us now is a different bill—a bill which we have never seen before. This bill is not a conference report. It takes zero cues from the Senate bill. Not a single representative of the American people has been given the opportunity to offer even a single amendment to this legislation.

All I have been asking for is a vote on an amendment which eliminates certain insurance rebates for second homes. My amendment would not change homeowners' flood insurance policies or even reduce the new taxpayer subsidy we are going to give them. It simply removes a retroactive reimbursement for second homes. Essentially we ask that working families around the country, including taxpayers in my State, not have to cut an additional check to the owners of coastal vacation houses. I know of no one who objects to my provision on policy grounds. Let me repeat that. I don't know of anyone, not one person who has raised a policy objection to

the amendment I have offered. It is an objective improvement to the underlying policy and this is what the Senate is supposed to do. Yet the supporters of the bill have been blocking any amendments that may garner bipartisan support to hold together a deal that has been negotiated in a backroom, written in secret by only a few Members, perhaps with the influence of a few people who may be interested in that. These ''masters of the universe'' as my friend Senator SESSIONS has sometimes referred to them, are shutting the American people out of the process.

I asked for 10 minutes and a vote on a single unobjectionable germane amendment to a bill the public has never before seen, but it seems this may be a bridge too far for the ''masters of the universe,'' as my friend from Alabama likes to call them.

So in an effort hopefully to change one of the more offensive policies in the bill, one that provides a refund of premiums paid under the law to homeowners of second vacation homes from a program that is already $24 billion in the hole, I agree to a vote on my amendment as a stand-alone bill. I have assurances from the House majority leader that he will work to get the policy considered in the House and I take him at his word.

I urge my colleagues to support my bill to protect the American people from being asked to fund—to refund premiums paid under current law to owners of second homes and vacation homes.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I am opposed to H.R. 3370 because it abandons the much-needed reforms to the National Flood Insurance Program, NFIP, that were instituted in the Biggert-Waters Reform Act of 2012. That bill set the NFIP on a course to quickly remove Federal subsidies from the program and make it actuarially sound. If these policies had been fully implemented, it would have allowed the development of a private insurance marketplace for flood insurance, which does not currently exist. H.R. 3370 prevents flood insurance policies from being written at an actuarially sound rate when homes are sold to a new buyer or when a flood insurance policy lapses. New purchasers of homes in areas that require flood insurance should not be subsidized for making that decision. H.R. 3370 puts in doubt the hope that NFIP's subsidies are eliminated.

Thank you, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise to urge a ''yes'' vote for final passage of the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act, the legislation we are here to consider. I will say the Senate went through a considerate, deliberate process where amendments were openly considered. I believe at the end of the process there was a 67-to-32 vote. We don't normally get two-thirds of the Senate agreeing on major issues, but we did at that time in a bipartisan effort.

My understanding is the legislation that ultimately we are considering today, which is basically foundationally what we agreed to here with some changes in the House, for which there was vigorous back-and-forth negotiation, passed by over 300 votes of the House of Representatives. So it seems to me it has a broad bipartisan support and was vigorously debated in that Chamber.

We have an opportunity to once again, after the bill we just passed, show this body can work. We had a respectable debate on good-faith amendments that were germane to the bill, lived up to the ideals of the Senate when it was before us. We were able to have bipartisan negotiations to improve the House-passed version of our bill so it would provide the levels of relief that are necessary. As a result, we are now poised to pass some critical legislation with overwhelmingly bipartisan support which provides real relief to millions of American families.

Just very briefly, because I hope to basically not use all the time so we can come to a vote and get our Members on their way, this new legislation is first of all budget neutral. It does not add a dime to the deficit, nor does it hurt the solvency of the National Flood Insurance Program. It prevents skyrocketing rate increases by implementing the following measures: One, it creates a firewall on annual rate increases. It repeals the property sales trigger that was depressing the values of homes. It repeals the new policy sales trigger. It reinstates grandfathering. It refunds homeowners who overpaid. It has something that I thought was critically important, that I thought was so important when we passed Biggert-Waters that I included it by amendment in the banking committee—an affordability goal.

Let us have the ability to ensure the solvency of the National Flood Insurance Program, but let us have an affordability mechanism which FEMA was, under the law that exists today, required to report to the Congress so we could ultimately come up with an affordability mechanism that would ensure that we have a solvent program and that we have an affordable program.

At the end of the day, insurance is about spreading risk over a wide pool and in doing so keeping rates affordable. With rates that I heard from homeowners in New Jersey that went from $1,000 to $10,000 or $15,000, not only is that not affordable but you are going to ultimately reduce the size of the risk pool in the National Flood Insurance Program. That means that is going to continue to drive up the cost, and we have a self-fulfilling cycle that ultimately does not provide for solvency.

So we have kept some of the most important reforms under Biggert-Waters, but we created a window of opportunity to make sure we get to affordability, that we help the real estate market, at a time when it desperately needs help, to be able to continue to prosper. The people's most significant asset in their life was built over a lifetime to buy a home, and that is where they ultimately have their greatest asset. It is where they leverage for their kid's education or emergency in health care and a whole host of plans for retirement.

So for millions of people in my State and across the country who ultimately did the right thing, followed rules, paid their premiums, met the higher standards, now to be told that in addition to—in New Jersey's case the consequences of Hurricane Sandy, and throughout the Northeast, flooding in Colorado or the Mississippi or a whole host of other places—but despite the fact they did everything right, through no fault of their own and having paid their fees, they are now in rate shock, an inability to keep flood insurance, which sometimes triggers a default on the mortgage, if they have a mortgage, or makes it impossible to sell their home.

That is what we are rectifying. It is our collective purpose. I urge a strong ''yes'' vote.

Finally, I wish to thank my colleagues who have worked with me on a bipartisan basis: My lead cosponsor Senator ISAKSON. I don't believe there is anybody in the Senate who has a greater depth of knowledge in the real estate industry and how this legislation affects that but also understands the consequences of individual families and is working in an incredibly strong way so we can get to this bipartisan moment. I appreciate all of his work.

Also, I have to say the tenaciousness and the ability to bring us to this point is that of Senator LANDRIEU, who has become an expert out of necessity from what happens in her State with Hurricane Katrina. The people of Louisiana are extraordinarily fortunate to have her as one of their Senators. She has been a guiding light throughout this process, tremendously helpful in getting us to today.

Lastly, I appreciate the leadership on both sides to get us to this moment so we could have this vote.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. I am going to be very brief in the interest of time. I wish to thank Senator MENENDEZ for his leadership, Senator LANDRIEU for her leadership. Without their work this would not happen.

Let me tell you what this does. This bill corrects the unintended consequence of denying liquidity to coastal Americans in their housing and causing the unintended consequence of people not buying insurance and putting themselves and this country at greater risk in those areas that are

prone to floods. It aggressively addresses the need we have to make this system more solvent and make it work better.

The Senate today will be solving a greater problem for coastal American residents and those in flood areas. They will be doing the right thing at the right time to correct an unintended consequence of an action of the Congress. I am honored to be a part of it.

I commend Senator MENENDEZ and Senator LANDRIEU and thank them for their effort.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. First, I thank my colleague from Louisiana for letting me butt in a little bit.

I also praise the three people who are on the floor, one can say without each of whom this would not have happened. I don't think we can say that about anyone else here, myself included, but you can say that about these three. Senator MENENDEZ, our lead sponsor on the bill, who is indomitable and smart about crafting legislation; JOHNNY ISAKSON, who was able to make this a bipartisan bill and in his gentle, friendly, and persuasive way brought many people on board, prevented people from blocking it; and the dynamo—we would all agree—the dynamo of this operation, Senator MARY LANDRIEU, who did not quit. I would say MARY LANDRIEU and I have had probably 200 phone calls in the last month about flood insurance—three or four a day. Whenever there was a blockage, she was like a jackhammer getting through it. So I thank her.

I am going to be very brief as well—not quite as brief as my colleague from Georgia, but brief for me and brief for the Senate.

This is a very important day for the people of New York. We have thousands of homeowners who either have had their flood insurance rise or are fearful of their flood insurance rising. Most of them are middle-class people in places such as Staten Island, Brooklyn, Queens, the Rockaways, out to the southern shore of Long Island and up the Hudson River. To be a homeowner is to have your little piece of the rock if you are a middle-class person. Basically, it is all you own. To have that taken away from you by an irrational Washington force called Biggert-Waters made no sense. Yet, when people's flood insurance bills would go up from $500 to $4,000, when they were told if they sold their house it might go up to $10,000, their piece of the rock—their home—was in true jeopardy.

We all know there is an increase in flooding. We all know the huge damage Katrina and Sandy caused. But to put it on the backs of homeowners, as FEMA was doing by both increasing rates and expanding flood maps beyond what flood zones should be made no sense.

We had so many people in New York who were damaged—I know this is true of my colleague from New Jersey as well—who were damaged by Sandy, who painstakingly rebuilt their home, getting some money from insurance and some money from FEMA and some money from Sandy and going to relatives and friends. After their home was finally rebuilt to be told, now here is your $5,000 flood insurance bill, when these people are in debt, it was awful, a double whammy.

This bill isn't perfect, but it will stop all of that. It grandfathers homes in so people who sell their homes will not see the price go way up, and because of the efforts we made in the Senate, the bill the House is sending us has an individual limit on how much flood insurance can go up. Eighteen percent is still not as low an amount as we would like—and we may be able to revisit that down the road—but it certainly is not a 700-, 2,000- or 5,000-percent increase, which is what people were getting.

So this is a good day. It is a good day for the shorefront areas of New York which contain close to 1 million people. It is a good day for the coastal areas throughout America, the areas by rivers throughout America. Do you know what it means? It means that the American dream of working hard, buying a home, and having your little piece of the rock will not be destroyed by some unknown, misunderstood, and irrational force from Washington on flood insurance. Flood insurance will now be a friend once again rather than a foe.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I wish to speak on this for 2 minutes now, because I know people are anxious to vote on final passage of this important bill, and I will speak at length after the vote.

I just wish to say thank you to the two leaders who are on the floor, Senator MENENDEZ from New Jersey, Senator JOHNNY ISAKSON from Georgia. They were the team who brought the coalition together when it was very hard—and still is difficult—to build a coalition on any subject. This subject is complicated. It is difficult. There are very strong feelings on all sides. There are different parts of the country that look at this in different ways, and there are debts that need to be paid attached to this program. So this was not an easy negotiation, and the leaders both did an extraordinary job keeping us on track.

No. 2, this compromise—and that is what it represents—the best of the compromise was, in fact, debated at length on this Senate floor; it was debated at length in the House of Representatives; and it was voted on 67 to 32 in the Senate favorably and 306 to 91 in the House favorably. The minority view—represented by the Senator from Utah, which would throw this bill into a conference committee right now—is not what the American people want, and it is not what the majority of Republicans or the majority of Democrats want, as demonstrated by the vote I just put into the RECORD.

We could all take this bill and rewrite sections of it that would work better for our home State, but that is not what this place is about. This place is not about perfection. It is about the art of the possible, and it is about listening to our constituents and responding to them when they have a great need.

In the State of Louisiana, I have 400,000 people who are afraid they will lose their homes. For many of these families, that is the greatest asset they have, and they are close to losing it. They don't want us to go to the conference committee and perfect this bill. They want us to pass it today, right now, and that is what I think we are going to do.

I know the Senator from Utah is disappointed. He may know the masters of the universe, but I am still looking for them. I could use a lot more wisdom and strength. If they are around here, I would like them to present themselves. All we have right now is each other—human beings trying to do the very best we can with a difficult circumstance. It may not be a perfect bill, but the concept of this bill got 67 votes in the Senate and 306 votes in the House. We have passed it in record time, given the pace around here. I am very proud.

I see the Senator from Florida. I know he would like to say a word.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator yield?

Ms. LANDRIEU. Yes.

Mr. NELSON. I thank the Senator from Louisiana, who has been the sparkplug behind this bill. As a result of her hard work, there are a lot of people in Florida who will be saved unconscionable increases.

Again, my thanks to the Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I yield and turn the floor over to the leader, Senator MENENDEZ. I believe the time will be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I understand we are going to be able to act on the Lee bill with a voice vote. As a result, I ask consent that the order with respect to a 60-affirmative-vote threshold with respect to S. 2137 be vitiated with all of the provisions of the previous order remaining in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, in the interest of getting this bill to the President's desk and giving relief to flood victims across the country, and many other homeowners, we yield back the remainder of our time and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 72, nays 22, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 78 Leg.]

YEAS—72

Ayotte	Grassley	Portman
Baldwin	Hagan	Pryor
Begich	Harkin	Reed
Bennet	Heinrich	Reid
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Rockefeller
Blunt	Hirono	Rubio
Booker	Hoeven	Sanders
Brown	Isakson	Schatz
Burr	Kaine	Schumer
Cantwell	King	Scott
Cardin	Kirk	Sessions
Casey	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Chambliss	Landrieu	Stabenow
Coats	Leahy	Tester
Cochran	Levin	Toomey
Collins	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Coons	Markey	Udall (NM)
Cruz	Menendez	Vitter
Donnelly	Merkley	Walsh
Durbin	Mikulski	Warner
Feinstein	Murkowski	Warren
Franken	Murphy	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murray	Wicker
Graham	Nelson	Wyden

NAYS—22

Alexander	Enzi	McCain
Barrasso	Fischer	McConnell
Boozman	Flake	Risch
Carper	Hatch	Roberts
Coburn	Johanns	Shelby
Corker	Johnson (SD)	Thune
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	
Crapo	Lee	

NOT VOTING—6

Boxer	Inhofe	Moran
Heller	McCaskill	Paul

The bill (H.R. 3370) was passed.

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I was unable to attend the roll call vote on passage of H.R. 3370, the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act of 2014. Had I been present for this vote, I would have voted yea.•

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, when Hurricane Betsy roared ashore in Grand Isle on September 9, 1965, it wrought havoc in Louisiana and Mississippi and became the first natural disaster to cost American taxpayers more than $1 billion. It fundamentally changed the way our nation prepared for and responded to disasters. Private insurers fled the market, making it necessary for the federal government to step in and help communities rebuild and recover. The National Flood Insurance Program established building standards for flood prone areas to limit communities' exposure to flooding and rewarded responsible homeowners with affordable flood insurance that was no longer available in the private market.

In response, Congress, led by Hale Boggs, passed the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 with the explicit goal of making ''. . . flood insurance available on reasonable terms and conditions . . .''

Affordability was one of the primary goals of the National Flood Insurance Program when it was created, and it remains an essential priority today. Unfortunately, affordability was virtually eliminated by the 2012 NFIP reform legislation known as Biggert-Waters, and we had to fight to get it reinstated in the compromise bill that cleared the House last Wednesday, March 5 with a strong, bipartisan vote of 306–91.

On January 16, Speaker BOEHNER flatly refused to consider comprehensive flood insurance reform legislation in the House, telling an AP reporter bluntly: ''We're not going to do that.'' The decisive 67–32 Senate vote to pass the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act on January 30 demonstrated the breadth and depth of our coalition and provided the necessary momentum for House leadership to get engaged and support this strategy.

Senior leaders of both parties worked closely with Rep. MAXINE WATERS, Rep. CEDRIC RICHMOND, Majority Leader ERIC CANTOR and Rep. MICHAEL GRIMM to reach a fair, bipartisan, bicamercal compromise that can get to the President's desk, and we owe it to our constituents to act as soon as possible with an up or down vote.

The National Flood Insurance Program is one of the earliest examples of large scale community planning in America. It made community based mitigation a requirement for rebuilding. In order to be eligible for federally subsidized, low-cost flood insurance, communities had to pass ordinances restricting future development in floodplains. Taxpayers for Common Sense, the National Wildlife Federation and others would have you believe that NFIP encourages development in flood plains, but the reality is that it does the exact opposite.

By removing affordability from the core of the National Flood Insurance Program, Biggert-Waters put every policyholder on the path to Full Risk Rates whatever they may be. Speaking in support of the compromise bill, STEVE SCALISE, my colleague from Louisiana and Chair of the conservative Republican Study Committee, explained the problem clearly and directly saying:

''Sending somebody a $10,000 or a $20,000-a-year bill on a $200,000 house that never flooded is not an actuarially sound rate. It's a death sentence.''

Whether it takes 2 years or 20 years to get there, full risk rates of $20,000 or more will continue to freeze the housing market, depress property values, and prevent responsible homeowners from purchasing flood insurance. Program participation is already anemic with just over half—60 percent—of those required by law to have flood insurance in compliance and even less market penetration in low-risk areas where we want people to purchase voluntary flood insurance policies to grow and diversify the risk pool. The Senate bill delayed the worst rate increases until FEMA completed the affordability study and proposed an affordability framework to protect people from impossibly high premiums.

This indiscriminate march to Full Risk Rates is further complicated by a fundamentally flawed mapping process that wipes local levees off the maps and excludes impacted communities from the mapping process. At my request last summer, David Miller, Association Administrator for the Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration—the man in charge of the National Flood Insurance Program, stood on top of a $450 million levee in Lafourche Parish that was completely wiped off the map when FEMA released their new flood map in 2008. Their map remains under appeal to this day.

The parish was one of 25 sites nationally included in the pilot program for FEMA's new Levee Analysis and Mapping Procedures, LAMP, that were designed to fix this problem, but that process only began last summer and has a long way to go before it is ready for prime time. The Senate bill delayed rate increases based on new flood maps until FEMA certified that their maps were accurate and reliable.

Whereas the Senate sought to delay the worst parts of Biggert-Waters until maps were accurate and the affordability study was complete, the House took a different approach by repealing these provisions and replacing them with other annual fees and rate increases. We had a healthy discussion and debate about our two approaches and eventually arrived at a compromise we could all live with that will protect people from the most aggressive rate hikes included in Biggert-Waters.

I commend Rep. WATERS and Rep. RICHMOND for the leadership in reinstating affordability as an essential element of this program. Since Representative CANTOR unveiled his bill on February 21, we successfully amended it to include an 18 percent annual cap on individual premium increases and an overall affordability target of 1 percent of the value of the policy.

While I would have preferred lower annual premium increases and stricter standards on overall affordability, this bill is a decent compromise that will address the most pernicious pieces of Biggert-Waters and attract the bipartisan support necessary to get it to the President's desk. This is another important step in our ongoing efforts to provide affordable, accessible and sustainable flood insurance to middle class Americans, but this bill is not the

end of the battle. Nothing is perfect. Nothing is permanent.

After nearly 2 years of arduous work and steadfast determination by a broad coalition of individuals, business groups and community leaders, the most pernicious provisions and draconian rate increases of Biggert-Waters have successfully been stopped and affordability has been returned as the centerpiece of the National Flood Insurance Program. The passionate debate we had during the last 2 years—one that will continue—has shown that affordable flood insurance is about more than just actuarial numbers on a page. It is about protecting our unique culture, our treasured way of life, and preserving the historic coastal communities that built this nation and continue to drive its economy today.

As Chair of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Committee, I will hold FEMA accountable for implementing this bill in a timely and transparent manner that provides homeowners and housing markets with the immediate relief they need to recover from these draconian rate hikes. Over the course of the past week, we were able to improve the original Cantor bill by removing onerous and unnecessary bureaucratic provisions, but I am not confident that FEMA will execute this either efficiently or effectively.

The great coalition of home builders, realtors, bankers, insurance agents, mayors, local governments and individual homeowners that fought to make flood insurance reform a national priority must remain vigilant and engaged. The National Flood Insurance Program expires in 2017, and we will need to include strict affordability language to protect responsible homeowners from impossible premiums.

The compromise bill that passed the House last week with a vote of 306–91 has the support of the coalition that helped secure the strong 67–32 vote in the Senate earlier this year. Some of the key industry groups behind the bill are:

Greater New Orleans Inc—GNO Inc,
National Association of Realtors,
National Home Builders Association,
National Association of Counties—NACo,
National League of Cities,
American Bankers Association,
Independent Community Bankers of America, and the
Independent Insurance Agents and Brokers of America—Big ''I''.

Biggert-Waters was built backwards and upside down. It authorized immediate rate increases on responsible homeowners without any understanding of how they would impact individual policyholders or the program at large and before FEMA was able to certify that their maps are accurate and reliable.

Lafourche Parish has been appealing their new map since 2008 because FEMA cannot figure out how to give them credit for local levees, including an 8–16 foot, 40 mile ring levee that was authorized by Congress in 1965—the Larose to Golden Meadow Hurricane Protection Project. To date, $450 million has been invested in this project, including $200 million from the Federal government. This past summer, FEMA began a pilot program that is supposed to solve the problem, but it will be another 2–3 years before that process is complete. FEMA needs to get their flood maps right the first time.

Currently, only 60 percent of the homeowners and businesses that are REQUIRED to have flood insurance actually do, and the aggressive rate increases authorized under Biggert-Waters threaten to make that problem a whole lot worse. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that every 10 percent increase in premiums leads to a 3 percent drop in overall program participation.

Katherine in Houma, LA cannot sell her home because a pernicious provision in Biggert-Waters that immediately increases premiums hundreds or thousands of dollars when you sell your house. When the young couple that was trying to buy her house went to closing, they learned that the flood insurance would go from $1,400 to $8,000 and could no longer afford the house. Katherine is stuck with a house she cannot sell and insurance she cannot afford.

Biggert-Waters threatens the very foundation of home ownership, the cornerstone of the American Dream. Fixing this flawed legislation is about protecting people's homes and equity and preserving the American dream that if you work hard and play by the rules you can have a secure future.

Our bill structures NFIP in an affordable, comprehensive and sustainable way. For decades, the program was sustainable until the 2005 storm season resulted in an unprecedented $17 billion in claims. Prior to that, it had an annual average deficit of just $19 million per year.

This is not just a Louisiana or coastal issue. Fifty-five percent of our nation's population lives within 50 miles of the coast—and that doesn't include those living along inland waterways. Ten percent of the homes in the United States have a one-in-four chance of flooding in the lifetime of their mortgage.

In 2010, the 15 percent of U.S. counties that are located directly on open ocean, the Great Lakes, major estuaries or coastal flood plains contributed $8.3 trillion—55 percent—to the Nation's Gross Domestic Product, and these communities proved more resilient during the 2007 recession, actually growing employment by 1.4 percent while the national employment rate fell by 2.3 percent.

This is not about millionaires in mansions on the beach. This is about middle class Americans who need affordable flood insurance so they can live where they need to work to harvest fresh seafood, produce domestic energy, and manufacture and transport the goods we need to maintain America's competitive advantage in the 21st century.

In response to all the concern I have heard from my constituents, I launched ''My Home, My Story'' to show you, literally, show some of the people and properties facing these rate increases that we are aiming to help. These aren't mansions, these aren't millionaires. These are middle class, working people living in normal, middle class houses doing their best to raise their kids, contribute to their communities and make a living.

I received over a hundred pictures and stories from my constituents.

Cody put his home on the market for less than its value and still couldn't sell it because of the high premium on his flood insurance.

Rachel lives in a 1,000 square foot elevated home with no central air or heat, one small bathroom, a quaint front porch and a beautiful sycamore tree. Three months after moving in, her flood insurance increased by $750 per year, and she's is struggling to make payments.

Maggie is a 66-year-old woman who has lived in the same house since 1974 and plans to stay there for the remainder of her life. She lives on a very strict budget and just received her first Social Security payment. If the law is not changed, it will be impossible for her to stay in her home or sell her home.

It provides basic consumer protections to responsible homeowners who built to code and played by the rules are struggling to stay in the NFIP.

It protects home equity. In St. Charles Parish, LA, the Assessor is reducing home values up to 30 percent because of the dramatic rate hikes that take effect overnight when a person goes to sell their home.

Based on the average mortgage, every $1,000 increase in annual flood insurance premiums reduces an individual's purchasing power by $20,000.

This provision affects 20 percent of all NFIP policyholders—1.1 million properties nationwide.

It ensures FEMA Flood Maps are Accurate. In 2011, FEMA acknowledged the failings of its ''without levees'' policy that resulted in local levees being literally wiped off the map, but it took them over two years to develop a new policy—the Levee Analysis and Mapping Procedures, LAMP. A pilot program for 25 sites nationwide—including 5 in Louisiana—Lafourche, Terrebonne, St. Charles, Plaquemines and St. Tammany—began in July, but it will be another 2–3 years before that process will be complete.

It allows FEMA to Complete the Affordability Study. FEMA must complete the affordability study mandated by Biggert-Waters and propose solutions for Congressional review. Our bill creates an expedited process for Congress to take action on these recommendations while maintaining critical checks and balances on FEMA's authority.

Provides Fair Credit for Local Levees—Removes the penalty on locally-financed flood protection projects and ensures that local and state investments in mitigation are accurately factored into the flood mapping process.

I thank the following Senate cosponsors for all their hard work throughout this process:

ROBERT MENENDEZ, JOHNNY ISAKSON, MARY L. LANDRIEU, THAD COCHRAN, JEFF MERKLEY, DAVID VITTER, JOHN HOEVEN, TIM SCOTT, ROGER WICKER, HEIDI HEITKAMP, CHUCK SCHUMER, KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND, ED MARKEY, BILL NELSON, MARK BEGICH, ELIZABETH WARREN, AL FRANKEN, JOE MANCHIN, ROBERT CASEY, AMY KLOBUCHAR, CORY BOOKER, KAY HAGAN, LINDSEY GRAHAM, BRIAN SCHATZ, RICHARD BLUMENTHAL, JACK REED, SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, LISA MURKOWSKI, RON WYDEN, SUSAN COLLINS and DEBBIE STABENOW.

This bill does not incentivize unsustainable development—In order to participate in the National Flood Insurance Program, communities have to adopt national building codes governing new development in flood prone areas. Our bill provides basic consumer protections to homeowners that build to code and played by the rules. It does not alter or amend any rules governing new construction. The National Flood Insurance Program is one of the earliest examples of federal land use planning.

It does not put American Taxpayers on the hook for a small sub-set of NFIP policyholders. Prior to Hurricanes Katrina and Sandy, NFIP was basically self-sustaining with an average annual deficit under $20 million over that 26-year span. The $24 billion debt incurred as a result of 2005 and 2008 storm seasons was the driving force behind the rate reforms in Biggert-Waters which required NFIP policyholders, not American taxpayers, to pay down that debt and establish a reserve fund for future catastrophic events. Our bill does not change that, it merely gives responsible policyholders a little more time to adjust to the higher premiums they have to pay as a result of Biggert-Waters.

FEMA Administrator Craig Fugate estimates that the NFIP saves taxpayers $1.6 billion every year in avoided flood losses and disaster response costs due to the national building codes each participating community and policyholder were required to adopt and adhere to.

I would also like to thank the following staff members for their hard work throughout this process: Jason Tuber, Kirby Mayo, Karissa Willhite and Tim Del Monico in Senator MENENDEZ' office; Zack Rosenblum and Meghan Tiara in Senator SCHUMER's office; Joan Kirchner in Senator ISAKSON's office; Adam Telle in Senator COCHRAN's office; Travis Johnson in Senator VITTER's office; Claire O'Rourke, Liz Craddock, Matt Lehner and Wes Kungel in my office; Lisa Lederberger in MAXINE WATERS' office; Zach Butterworth in CEDRIC RICHMOND's office; Dill Dauster and Alex McDunah in Senator REID's office and all of the exceptional floor staff. On behalf of myself, the Senate cosponsors, and the entire flood insurance reform coalition, thank you.

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM PREMIUM REFUNDS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of S. 2137, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2137) to ensure that holders of flood insurance policies under the National Flood Insurance Program do not receive premium refunds for coverage of second homes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on S. 2137.

Who yields time?

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, we yield back the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, all time is yielded back.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 2137) was passed, as follows:

S. 2137

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

SECTION 1. NO REFUNDS UNDER NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM FOR COVERAGE OF SECOND HOMES.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''National Flood Insurance Program'' means the program established under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.).

(b) NO REFUNDS FOR COVERAGE OF SECOND HOMES.—Notwithstanding section 3(a)(4) of the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act of 2014 or any other provision of law, in the case of flood insurance coverage under the National Flood Insurance Program for a residential property that is not the primary residence of an individual (as that term is used in section 1307(a)(2)(A) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4014(a)(2)(A))), the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency may not refund any premium for such coverage collected in excess of the rates required under the provisions of, and amendments made by, section 3 of the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act of 2014.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF ARUN MADHAVAN KUMAR TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE AND DIRECTOR GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES AND FOREIGN COMMERCIAL SERVICE

NOMINATION OF TIMOTHY M. BROAS TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF THE NETHERLANDS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nominations of Arun Madhavan Kumar, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Director General of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service; and Timothy M. Broas, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

VOTE ON KUMAR NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on the Kumar nomination.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask that all time be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Arun Madhavan Kumar, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Director General of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON BROAS NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on the Broas nomination.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I yield back that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Timothy M. Broas, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of the Netherlands?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid

upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

SUPPORTING SOVEREIGNTY AND DEMOCRACY IN UKRAINE—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The Senator from Oklahoma.

FLOOD INSURANCE

Mr. COBURN. I will try to make my remarks short. I know several of my colleagues have places they need to be and have a time schedule they are on. I was involved in a committee hearing this afternoon and could not contribute to the debate on the floor on the Flood Insurance Program.

I have about 8 months left in the Senate. I just want to remind us of what we have just done. We have solved a very short-term problem and made a long-term problem significantly worse. We did not really do our work because we were in such a hurry to take the political pressure off of the increases in the flood insurance rate.

Addressing that issue was important, and I agree that we needed to make some adjustments. But what we did is we chose politicians to win and the future to lose when it comes to flood risk mitigation and flood risk cost for the American public. Are there some positive things in the bill? Yes. But what we did once again is we put our political positions ahead of the best interests of this country.

The Biggert-Waters bill was a great reform bill. What happened is when we passed it, we did not recognize the tremendous rate increases many people would have. In the last 5 years in this country, we spent $1.6 billion at FEMA reevaluating all of the flood plains in this country. The whole purpose behind that was to really put a risk of what is out there based on what we have and slowly get to a point where we are actually measuring the risk.

What have we actually done when we just passed this bill and sent it to the President? What you did is you asked everybody in the future to continue to pay an exorbitant amount of money for their insurance so people who are at risk will not have to pay ultimately what is due them. The only time we are going to see that actually happens now is when a property sells. That is when we are going to see it. Vacation homes are excepted. I understand that. We are not going to give rebates to people. I understand that. But the big problem is we undermined the incentive to mitigate for risk. We undermined it.

So we now have a new flood insurance program. We have $18 billion worth of problems. We are getting ready to go to $26, $28 billion worth of problems, and that is on the heads of our kids. So we once again chose a position that put our kids at risk so we politically can be better off because we are going to alleviate the parochial scream. Rather than actually fix the scream, we are going to alleviate it, and we have eliminated all of that.

So my disappointment is not that we responded to parochial requests; it is that we did not do the hard work of actually fixing the problem and addressing some of the parochial problems and anecdotal notes of massive increases in flood insurance. We could have done both, but we chose not to.

It is so heartbreaking to me and to this country that we continually choose the politically expedient path that will bury our kids when we do not have to. That is a function of a lack of real leadership, of solving the real problems rather than treating the symptoms of the problems, which is what we did. We have wasted $1.6 billion now, essentially. We might recover it 30 years from now. But the Flood Insurance Program is now not in any better shape and will not be in any better shape 20 years from now than it is today.

So I hope we are happy that we have solved the parochial problems, but when you go to sleep tonight think about who is going to pay that bill. It is not the people who are getting the benefit from the very large subsidized flood insurance. It is the kids of this country and what is not going to be provided for them. It is those on the really low rung of the ladder economically. We are not going to have the finances to actually care for those who need the care from us the most. Really, it is the well-healed or the more well-healed and the more well-connected. They won again. The builders and the developers won. The real estate firms won. Less than two-tenths of 1 percent of this whole thing, without even modifying Biggert-Waters, applied to people in the lower 40 percent of income in this country. Less than two-tenths of 1 percent. Seventy percent applied to the top 20 percent of the people. So we gave a break to the most well off people. Those are the numbers. You cannot dispute those numbers. So because they screamed and do not want to pay their fair share, we have now damaged the future potential for our children.

I would say congratulations. We continue to do the same thing. No wonder the American people say: What is up with Congress? They do not have the courage to make a difficult, tough decision. What they do is they always make the politically expedient one.

That is exactly what we did today. That is what the House did today. To me, it is sickening.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, what now is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to proceed to S. 2124 is the pending business.

Mr. REID. What is the subject matter of that bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Ukraine bill.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by me, after consultation with Senator MCCONNELL, the motion to proceed be agreed to; that there be 1 hour of debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that upon the use or yielding back of that time, the bill be read a third time and passed, with all of the above occurring with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Reserving the right to object—I will not object—Madam President, the majority leader has asked that we move and pass this legislation which was considered in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It was open for amendment. Several amendments were adopted. Several were rejected. By a vote of 14 to 3, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reported out this bill.

Why should we care about this legislation? I will try to be as brief as possible, but I urge my colleagues' attention to the latest New York Times report today: ''Russia Massing Military Forces Near Border With Ukraine.'' Russian forces are massing near the border with Ukraine. Airborne; ground capabilities; the parachute drop was on a scale not seen since the collapse of the Soviet Union; the units involved artillery batteries, assault helicopters, and at least 10,000 soldiers.

In other words, right now as we speak, Vladimir Putin is either planning on or contemplating an invasion of eastern Ukraine. We have seen the movie before: provocateurs, people having to come and restore order, and there is no order, so then we see military intervention, and then there is going to be another referendum such as is supposed to take place on Sunday in the Crimea, which I predict 80 percent of the vote will do so when that is clearly not what the will of the people of Crimea is.

So, incredibly, incredibly, there will be an objection from this side to this legislation when the people of the Ukraine are crying out for our help and our assistance.

My friend Senator BARRASSO will now be proposing the House bill that has not one single sanction in it—not one sanction. I am surprised that the Senator would want to propose a bill that does not have any punishment for the Russians for what they are doing right now.

Then another one of my colleagues will probably come out and object to us taking up and passing the bill that was put through the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—open to amendments—in a process that could not be criticized by anyone.

So what is the message we are sending to the Ukrainian people? What is the message we are sending them? That we have a problem with a fix for the IMF.

Then also there are some who are demanding changes in the regulation by

the Treasury Department concerning campaign contributions. What has happened? Where are our priorities? Is the IMF—no matter whether it is fixed or not fixed with this legislation—more important than the lives of thousands of people? Is that what we are talking about?

You know, I will say to my friends who are objecting to this—and there are a number of them on my side—you can call yourself Republicans—that is fine—because that is on your voter registration. Do not call yourself Reagan Republicans. Ronald Reagan would never—would never—let this kind of aggression go unresponded to by the American people.

We are not talking about troops on the ground. We are talking about responses that impose sanctions and punishment for Vladimir Putin, who clearly has said that his goal—the greatest disaster of the 20th century was the dissolution, the collapse of the then-Soviet Union. We know what Vladimir Putin is all about. We know what he understands.

So now because of an IMF fix or a campaign finance fix, we are now going to reject a piece of legislation that was done on a bipartisan basis with the leadership of the chairman, whom I see on the floor, of which I am proud, and with the ranking member, Senator CORKER of Tennessee. We are going to say no.

Do you know what the most ridiculous thing about all of this is? That the majority leader has filed cloture. We have well over 60 votes. So we are going to be back in about 11 or 12 days, whatever it is, and cloture will have expired. We have well over 60 votes. We will pass this.

Instead, our signal to the people of Ukraine today, as Russian military forces are massing on their border: Wait a minute. It is more important that we get our campaign finance regulations fixed. It is more important that we have the IMF fix as a higher priority than the lives of the men and women in the Ukraine.

I have been embarrassed before on the floor of the Senate, I will tell the Presiding Officer, but I have not been embarrassed this way about Members of my own party. One of the proudest aspects I have always felt of our Republican Party and the leadership of Ronald Reagan is we stood up for people. We stood up for people when the Iron Curtain was there. We stood up for Natan Sharansky. We said, ''Tear down this wall.'' Now we have a guy who is trying to reinstate the old Russian Empire, which he has said himself, and what are we saying? No. A shameful day. I will not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, reserving the right to object—and it is not my ultimate intention to object but hopefully to persuade my colleagues not to object.

I have been watching my colleagues on television, in committee, and on the Senate floor rail about what is happening in Ukraine and about the lack of action from their perspective. We are at a moment—that after a very considered process in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which I am privileged to chair, working alongside the ranking member Senator CORKER and with Senator MCCAIN, another distinguished member of the committee—with a very strong bipartisan vote on a major piece of legislation, that, in fact, when it comes time to act, we have those who say no, even though they go on TV and bemoan the lack of action.

I find it incredibly difficult to suggest that what the House passed can be the only response to what is happening in Ukraine. Yes, it is a loan guarantee which we include in our legislation, but everything we do we pay for. So for those who are fiscally conservative and are concerned about it, we have paid for what we seek to do. That cannot be said about the House.

Secondly, we go beyond a loan guarantee. As important as that loan guarantee is to making an expression to the Ukrainian Government, to the Ukrainian people, to our partners in Europe and in NATO, we say there has to be responsibility taken for those who corrupted the Ukrainian Government, for those who undermined its sovereignty, for those who undermined its security.

We have provisions, both permissive and mandatory, to sanction individuals who have been found to have, in fact, corrupted the circumstances and/or affected the territorial integrity or sovereignty of Ukraine. One of them was sponsored by Senator MCCAIN, which was adopted unanimously, a mandatory provision.

If we want to be doing something about Russia, we can't do it with the House bill, we can only do it with the Senate bill. Then, yes, the IMF. I respect people who for some reason have an ideological difference about international monetary institutions, but if we want to talk about security, we will not have security in Ukraine if we cannot stabilize it economically, and a $1 billion loan guarantee isn't enough to make that happen.

It is the IMF that is going to be the singular force to create the opportunity for economic stability inside of Ukraine, which is fundamental to meeting our security challenge as well.

To hold IMF reform hostage to the question of whether unlimited campaign money can go into our elections without deciding whether that is being done appropriately under the law as it exists is outrageous.

There is a reason we care about Ukraine. It is not simply because we want to do the right thing by a country that has been invaded in the Crimea and for which thousands of Russian troops and equipment are amassing along its border in Eastern Ukraine, it is because this has a global consequence.

If the West doesn't act what will China say when it is looking at its territorial desires in the South China Sea? What will Iran say as we are negotiating with them about nuclear weapons?

What will others in the world, in North Korea—whose march to nuclear weapons on a greater scale is in play—all of them will be looking at what we and the West do as it relates to Ukraine and making a decision: How far can I go? What can I get away with?

To be able to stabilize Ukraine, we need to ultimately have the International Monetary Fund. To hold that hostage because of investigations going on—wherever they may lead and however they may lead to the question of campaign finance moneys may be inappropriately, ultimately, being used in violation of law—is outrageous.

What is at play is our national interests, our national security, the sovereignty of the people of the Ukraine, the message that we will send across the world about what we stand ready to do. That should not be hostage to political interests that have nothing to do with those issues.

For all those who have been standing and making speeches, for all those who have been going on TV with plenty of criticism, this is your opportunity to act and act now. There is no reason we cannot do that at this moment.

I withdraw my reservation and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. I will be brief. I wish to say first to the leader, we certainly have had some discussions regarding operations on the Senate floor and the speed with which we deal with things and the amount of debate, but I thank him for trying to bring this issue to a vote today.

I thank him for what he is going to do in a moment; that is, to file cloture on this piece of legislation that passed out of our committee with strong bipartisan support, so that immediately when we get back we will take up the bill.

I wish we could do it tonight. We have a group of seven or eight Senators on their way to Ukraine. Nothing would be better than for them to know we passed this strong piece of legislation this week, while there is going to be a referendum that is going to take place early next week in Crimea, while we have Russian troops on the border, while we have a Prime Minister who was here last night showing extreme courage, as a 39-year-old young man, in dealing with the issues he is facing today.

I lament the fact that we are not going to have the opportunity as a body—the most deliberative body in the world, some say—to take action on this issue.

I do wish to say that whenever we bring up the bill—it appears it will not be tonight; hopefully it will be as soon as we get back—this is a strong piece of legislation. It deals both with giving Ukraine a bridge to the future while

they are dealing with economic issues internally; it deals with sanctions to isolate Russia, which is what we all know needs to happen to keep them from continuing this activity; and it puts in place reforms our country has already agreed to that Congress has not taken action on—and that makes the IMF more fully able to deal with this issue, which is a poster child for why we would want the IMF to operate in a responsible and strong manner.

I strongly support this legislation. I thank the chairman for working with us the way he did. I thank Senator MCCAIN for his leadership on these issues.

Again, I thank the majority leader for placing this in an urgent manner before the Senate today. I lament the fact that we will not vote on it today, but hopefully we will pass it broadly when we return.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Reserving the right to object, I am going to be brief, but I wish to make this point, that it is rare we take an action in the Senate that is watched around the world, and that is happening tonight. That is happening tonight because the crisis in Ukraine and in the Crimea has focused the attention of the world on Russian aggression, aggression by a country which hosted the Sochi Olympics—a charm offensive so we could see the new Russia—and then the final day of the ceremonies they sent their troops into Crimea.

That isn't the new Russia. That is the old Russia. It is a Russia many of us are familiar with, a Russia for those of us who have Lithuanian blood. My mother was born there and remembered full well what the Soviets did in the Baltics and what it meant to those poor people for such a long time.

We remember and we know that the ambitions of Vladimir will only be stopped with the resolve of the West. The resolve of the West starts in this Chamber tonight. It is an opportunity for Members on both sides of the aisle to stand and approve the measure which passed the Senate Foreign Relations Committee yesterday 14 to 4, with the great leadership of Senator MENENDEZ of New Jersey and Senator CORKER of Tennessee.

It was a bipartisan effort to say that what the Russians have done is wrong; that if they continue this course we will initiate political and economic sanctions; and that we will join the international community in strengthening the Ukrainian economy so it can prosper, embrace democracy, and the Western values which we treasure. That is what is at stake with this request this evening.

To hear people say let's not do it because we should debate the future of the IMF—for goodness' sake. Can't we save that for another day.

For the people in Ukraine, for those in America of Ukrainian descent who have family in Ukraine, can't we say we will save the debate on the IMF for another day.

Others have suggested there is another course of action. They say if we want to help Ukraine, we have to say the U.S. Department of Treasury cannot investigate violations of 501(c)(4) organizations.

What does that have to do with Ukraine? Nothing.

This is what it boils down to. Those who are making that demand are saying we cannot protect Ukraine unless we are prepared to protect the Koch brothers from the possibility of investigation and prosecution for wrongdoing. That is what it comes down to. That is an outrage. If we submitted that as a plot line to ''House of Cards,'' they would reject it and say nothing could be so outlandish. We have heard it not once but many times.

Let's stand tonight in the Senate and send a message to Russia and to Ukraine that we stand behind those people whose lives are at stake as they try to move forward toward democracy and as they move forward toward a free election. Let's stand behind them tonight and not hide behind some procedural effort.

I object to this measure and I hope the unanimous consent request is agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, reserving the right to object, today Russia's Defense Ministry announced new military operations in regions along the Ukrainian border, a disturbing development that comes 1 day after Ukraine's interim Prime Minister visited President Obama and met with Members of this body.

We are now faced with the inescapable reality that the Senate is about to enter a recess week, having taken no meaningful action to aid the interim government in Kiev. We are left with one option, taking up and passing the House-passed bill, which authorizes $1 billion in loan guarantees. We can pass that measure now by unanimous consent and assure our friends in Ukraine that they are not forgotten.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee bill contains provisions related to the International Monetary Fund that are unrelated to the crisis in Ukraine and not needed immediately and must be debated by this body.

The bill also contains sanctions, cuts to the Department of Defense, and other appropriations provisions.

The Foreign Relations Committee bill touches the jurisdiction of several committees and is certain to be met with opposition and perhaps a protracted conference with the House where, were we to take it up today, in the face of Russian armored vehicles, we are offering rhetoric, despite the fact that the committee bill addresses jurisdiction within the Armed Services Committee, the Appropriations Committee, and cuts Defense Department spending.

The chairman of the committee refused yesterday to allow me to offer amendments concerning the export of natural gas to markets in Europe. The Senate should debate whether helping Ukrainians through the export of natural gas is in our interest, as dozens of newspapers around the country talk about Moscow tightening the squeeze on Ukraine over energy.

The Washington Post says: ''Europe needs an alternative to Russian natural gas.''

The Wall Street Journal: ''West Tries to Loosen Russia's Gas Grip.''

The New York Times: ''U.S. Hopes Boom in Natural Gas Can Curb Putin.''

The Senate should debate whether helping the Ukrainians through the export of natural gas is in our interest. It should have that debate and pass sanctions, but none of those matters can be addressed today—none of them.

The only bill that can get to the President quickly is the House-passed bill, and we should pass it now.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 4152

Mr. BARRASSO. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 328, H.R. 4152.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. I was talking to my friend, the senior Senator from Arizona, a little while ago. He and I came to the Senate together many years ago from the House of Representatives.

We came to the Senate together. We were separated because Arizona has more people and Nevada seniority. During those many years that we have been together, we have had some experiences in the Senate that are memorable. I don't know as much—and that is an understatement—about military preparedness and the military as JOHN MCCAIN does. That is a gross understatement. He is somebody we should listen to when it comes to things dealing with aggression and military operations.

Ukraine is kind of personal to me. A baby was born. His parents named him Israel Goldfarb. He, with his parents, came to the United States. His name was changed. That man is my wife's dad, my father-in-law. He was born in Ukraine. My wife Landra and I have been to Ukraine. But this is dealing with more than someone's father-in-law, may he rest in peace; it deals with 45 million freedom-loving people who are being threatened by the big bear wanting to return to the days of the Soviet Union.

So for my friend, the Senator from Wyoming, to come here and say there is nothing we can do about this today, that is absolutely wrong. There is plenty we can do about it today. But we are not going to do that. Why? Well, my friend says there are committees who are concerned about jurisdiction.

How do the people in Ukraine feel about that one? How do they feel about that—that the bipartisan heavy vote we got out of the markup in the Foreign Relations Committee may have stepped on someone's toes dealing with the jurisdiction of a committee? This is much more important than that.

The International Monetary Fund is very much related to Ukraine, and my friend from Wyoming knows that. He is on the committee. He knows about the importance of the IMF.

But 45 million people are desperate for help. They are afraid. They are afraid. Russia has deployed paratroopers to the border with Ukraine. They didn't drive in; they were dropped from the air. These are Russian Cold War tactics.

I want to make a suggestion to President Putin, and that is this. He is going to have this plebiscite on Sunday in Crimea. Why doesn't he have one in Chechnya? What would happen there? Would they support Russia? No. They are an oppressed people because of Vladimir Putin. If he wants to have a vote on what the people of the Russian Federation want to do, let him have a vote in Chechnya and see how that vote would turn out. This is so transparent what he is doing—illegally.

These are Cold War tactics to try to intimidate the 45 million people in Ukraine. That is just what it is—intimidation. The entire world condemns what he has done with rare exception, and they are going to condemn it even more if he goes further because action will have to be taken to isolate Russia and its economy. This robust bill which was passed by the Foreign Relations Committee and sent to the floor is important.

I don't throw around a lot of accolades, especially for my Republican colleagues. I should do more, but I don't, and I have to get better at that. But I have told him personally, and I tell the people of Tennessee and the people of this country and the people around the world that the speech that was given yesterday by the ranking member of that committee, the junior Senator from Tennessee, was historic. It was a wonderful speech that set aside all partisanship and directed its attention to what is going on in a part of the world that must concern us.

This measure that comes from the House of Representatives, I can't do better than what the senior Senator from Arizona said. How could we send eight of our Senators to Ukraine and say: Yes, we decided to do something, but we are not going to do anything to suggest in any way that what Russia has done is wrong. There is not a sanction that would cause anything to happen with what the House has done. I can't imagine—I can't imagine—how anyone in good conscience, after what has gone on in the last few days—how anyone could agree that our great country should go to Ukraine and tell them that we have passed something that helps you, although we don't condemn Russia in any fashion in the resolution. We are being asked to agree to that? I don't think so.

The role of the IMF in stabilizing Ukraine's economy and keeping Ukraine free is important. But it is important not only for the Ukrainians; it is important for this country. It is a part of our national security interests.

So we know people are upset about committee jurisdiction, and we know because it is out in public. I have kept this to myself for quite some time because it was done when we were doing other things, such as the omnibus. Efforts were made at that time to give up on the investigations of the Koch brothers and all the others. Remember, Treasury is not investigating only Republican super PACs. They are investigating super PACs, as they should—Republican super PACs, tea party super PACs, libertarian super PACs—all of them. If that isn't something that should be investigated, I don't know what is.

I have talked about Senator MCCAIN's efforts in recognizing and identifying for us, and we listen because of his experience in the military. But we should also listen to what he says about campaign spending. I am sorry to take so long. I know people are wanting to leave, but I want to say this. I have been a part of raising money here in Washington for a long time—more than three decades. When I first came here, for the only money you could get you listed where they worked, their address, and everything about them. Then we all will remember both parties found a way to sneak stuff through. We did it through corporations. We funneled the money through State parties, and I remember that. I felt so unclean, for lack of a better description. People would give you these big checks to give to the State party. Then McCain-Feingold passed. For the next election it was as if I had taken a bath—a bath after having run a marathon.

JOHN MCCAIN understands why we need to investigate all this soft money—the super PAC money. When he says it, we should listen. Maybe our colleagues don't want to listen to me, but they should listen to JOHN MCCAIN because he has a record of substantiating his efforts in that regard.

So this thing is being objected to—what we are trying to do here to protect the 45 million in Ukraine—because of this investigation of the Koch brothers and others. I am not going to get into the details about social welfare organizations and all that, but we all know they are political front groups that spend millions of dollars in misleading ads, and it is unfortunate.

So it is too bad we have this. It is hard to believe that some are so wedded to the Koch brothers and others that they would torpedo a bill that is vital to the national security of this country and the freedom of tens of millions of Ukrainians and the birthplace of my wife's dad. This is wrong, and I am very disappointed in my friend from Wyoming that he would come forward and do this. I have to tell you it takes a lot of courage because there isn't a lot of academic integrity in that. Strike the word integrity. There isn't a lot of foundation for what he has done. It is unreasonable. It is unfair and it is without substantiation, and I object.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. I know the Senator from Alabama wants to speak, and I assure him I will not remain on the floor to hear it because I know what the Senator from Alabama is going to say that has something to do with paying for it out of defense spending. I will match my record with the Senator from Alabama on defense spending anytime, day or night.

The fact is, this money is taken out of programs that were already canceled and were going to be returned to the Treasury. If they had been used for defense, then it would have busted the budget agreement the Senator from Alabama has so stoutly defended time after time. So in a bit of preemption of the Senator from Alabama, his argument is wrong that this is taking money out of defense. He is dead wrong.

So all I would say to my colleagues is that the Senator from Wyoming came down and wants us to take up and pass a bill passed by the House of Representatives which has not a single binding sanction in it—not one. Not one binding sanction in it. Not one strong message to the people of Ukraine that we are supporting them.

Russia's defense ministry announced: New military operations in several regions near the Ukrainian border on Thursday. Even as Chancellor Angela Merkel warned the operations came as Ukraine's Acting President Oleksandr V. Turchynov—the Acting President of the Ukraine was quoted by Ukrainian news media as saying Russian forces amassed near the border were ready to invade.

So we now have Russian forces ready to invade a sovereign nation, and what are we talking about? An IMF fix. Suppose the Senator from Alabama was right and this sum of money is being taken out of national defense. How much money are we going to have to spend on national defense if Vladimir Putin goes unchecked throughout Europe?

The next target, by the way, will be the Baltic countries because they have Russian speaking populations as well, and we may have to have provocations

there; Moldova, where Russia occupies Transnistria; Georgia, where Russia occupies Abkhazia and South Ossetia. But what are we arguing about? Whether the IMF fix is appropriate or not. What are we arguing about? Whether it is in dispute as to whether this is actually some reduction in defense spending. Where in the world are our priorities? Where in the world is our sympathy and our concern and our need to support the people of Ukraine in this hour of need?

I don't want to go on too long, but the issue of natural gas, we all know that is the way out of it long term. Does anybody think including a provision on natural gas is going to have any effect whatsoever on events that are now happening and will happen in the next few days? Of course not. I am a strong supporter of getting natural gas to these countries, but it is not going to happen in the next days, weeks, months or maybe even years. So to use that is an excuse, of course, again.

I have watched in the last few months two fool's errands. One was when we shut down the government. We were all so proud we shut down the government, turned away 600,000 people from our national parks, took $27 million out of the economy of my State on a fool's errand that was not going to succeed. Now we see another fool's errand because the majority leader will file cloture and there will be well over 60 votes, and 10 or 11 or however many days from now we will pass it and these sanctions will be enacted.

In the meantime—in the meantime—the first message to the people of Ukraine, who have Russians—in the view of the Ukrainian President—ready to invade, is that we are telling them no, because we don't agree with an IMF fix or we think the money may be or may not be coming out of defense.

Mr. MURPHY. Will the Senator yield for a brief question?

Mr. MCCAIN. I will be glad to.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the Senator.

Senator MCCAIN and I were in Ukraine at the end of last year. We had the privilege to speak on the Maidan in front of about half a million people, maybe even a million people who were there protesting the current government, the corruption that had reined free, their decision to move away from an orientation towards Europe. After Senator MCCAIN's remarks, the crowd rose up with the chant of ''Thank you, USA. Thank you, USA.''

Wherever we went during that trip, as we heard also from the new prime minister yesterday, they were desperate for the help of the United States. They are grateful for the fact that both the House and the Senate are moving forward on the issue of providing loan guarantees—loan guarantees that aren't nearly enough. That is why we need to have the IMF reforms, so they can deliver the bulk of the assistance. But they feel as though they are standing virtually alone as Russia marches across their borders, and desperately want the United States to lead an international consensus to make it clear to the Russians there is a price to be paid.

The Russians marched into Crimea in large part because they didn't believe the United States and Europe would enact the crippling sanctions which would have otherwise caused them to make a different decision. What this moment could be about, right now on the floor of the Senate, as we head back over to Ukraine to again express our support, is there is bipartisan consensus in the Senate and the House that we are not only going to stand with them on the question of economic support, but we are going to enact a set of sanctions which will make Russia consider a different decision.

My question to Senator MCCAIN is: As important as economic support is, that is not what they are asking for here. They are not asking for passage of the House bill. They are asking for the United States, as we have time and time again, to lead an international consensus to send a strong message to Russia. We are going to go over there and I believe have a good series of meetings this weekend, but we could have had a much stronger message brought to them if we had answered their call ultimately to provide them economic support and stand with our partners in Europe, sending a strong message to the Russians.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank my friend from Connecticut. I say if we take up and pass the House bill, it does one thing: It gives them loan guarantees for $1 billion. There is not one other single binding provision in the House bill which my colleague from Wyoming wanted to take up and pass, instead of this bill, which went through the committee—with the input, by the way, of the administration. There is bipartisan and administration cooperation on it.

I urge my colleagues to read the provisions of this bill. They are tough. They are tough, enforceable provisions which will make Vladimir Putin and his kleptocratic oligarchy uncomfortable.

And, by the way, one of the reasons why Vladimir Putin is doing what he is doing is he is afraid a free, independent, and noncorrupt Ukraine on his border might send a message to the Russian people who are sick and tired of him anyway.

Sanctions on persons in the Russian Federation, complicit in or responsible for significant corruption, are a major provision of this bill; Sanctions on persons responsible for violence or undermining the peace, security, stability, sovereignty, or territorial integrity of Ukraine. There are many other provisions in this bill which are binding which will make life very uncomfortable.

Instead, my dear friend—and he is my dear friend—from Wyoming wants to take up and pass a bill which has one thing, and one thing only, and that is a $1 billion loan guarantee. By the way, the EU has just given them $15 billion.

So all I can say is we will pass this legislation, and we will go and we will assure our Ukrainian friends that this bill will be passed and we will act.

I hope people at home who know Ukraine and know the people of Ukraine and know the friends and relatives and others will make it known to their elected representatives that for us to sit by and not help these people would be writing a disgraceful chapter in American history.

I thank my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Madam President, if I could add to the comments of Senator MCCAIN.

Last night we all met with the Prime Minister. They don't even need this economic aid today. They have to sign an IMF agreement first. It is weeks before they even need what the Senator from Wyoming wished to pass.

On the other hand, what we are trying to do is push Russia back. As the leader mentioned, this bill has tough sanctions. And, by the way, Europe is meeting on Monday to begin looking at the sanctions they want to put in place. So if we were to pass the sanctions which we have in this bill—which are tough sanctions, sanctions which we have never imposed before, sanctions on economic extortion, sanctions on corruption—what that would do is help boost the European community along to do the same thing, and our goal here is to isolate Russia to keep them from continuing to put pressure on Ukraine.

So I couldn't agree more. Why would we pass a bill which does no good as it relates to trying to push Russia back and isolate them, when we have an opportunity right now to pass a bill which shows we are willing to isolate Russia and actually give strength to what the European community is getting ready to do hopefully this next week.

So I agree. I wish we were taking up the bill which we all worked on together and passed by a huge bipartisan majority, and I wish we could send you all with the sanctions in hand, passed out of the Senate, to show the people of Ukraine that while militarily there may not be involvement, we stand together with them to do everything we can to isolate Russia, to isolate Putin, and to make sure economically they pay a huge price if they try to take any other actions in this area. So I agree with the Senator.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. GILLIBRAND). The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, there has been an objection. I think unfairly, there has been an objection. Everyone should understand, the first legislative matter we will take up when we get back here is going to be this. There is nothing I know of at this time that is more important.

So Senators should be aware, this is nothing we are going to run from. We are going to act on it as soon as we get back. It is really too bad we haven't been able to move forward. We should have. We could have. We are not going to. But we are going to move to it as soon as we get back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, what has happened in Ukraine is a real disaster. It should never have happened. It is so bad, and it reflects a weakness in American foreign policy which goes deep. The American people understand that. I think the whole world is baffled at the lack of clarity in American foreign policy. I would say, if JOHN MCCAIN had been elected President and were President today, we would have never had this invasion by the Soviet Russians into Ukraine and Crimea.

This is a big problem. It is not going away. It is a very deep and serious problem.

The fundamental thing we can do today—and we should do today—is move forward with what the United States can contribute to this situation, which is to pass the $1 billion loan fund. The European Union is doing their $15 billion through the IMF. Why don't we do that? Why don't we do that?

The reason is, this leadership is determined to push forward a policy change in the International Monetary Fund which has been up here before the Congress since 2010 and has not been passed and does not have to be passed today. They have insisted on that.

They have placed Ukraine in second place through their reforms which they have been pushing for with the IMF, and there are serious problems with that. It gives Russia more clout, among other things; not a lot, but it gives them more clout in the International Monetary Fund. And it costs money and violates the budget.

I am the ranking member on the Budget Committee. It is subject to a budget point of order. There is no doubt about that. Anybody can suggest otherwise if they want to, but it violates the budget, and we ought not to be doing this in violation of the budget. We don't have to.

But this administration negotiated with Senator MCCAIN and Senator CORKER and the Democratic leadership in the Senate and they agreed this would be the policy. Not what the House passed. But they would add more to it, they would reform the IMF, and then we are all just supposed to accept it.

I told the Senator from Tennessee—a very fine Senator—I am ranking member on the Budget Committee. He knows that. We have worked together to try to adhere to the spending limits Congress has imposed on ourselves. We just voted on this. Ten weeks ago the President signed this reform which raised the spending but limited it, and they want to spend more in a way which is not legitimate. So I am baffled.

Why in the world would we not take advantage of the—yes, what the House has sent to us, pass this legislation, and allow us to make our individual contribution of $1 billion? And, by the way, we are scoring it at about $350 million because it is unlikely we will be fully paid back.

So why don't we do that? Is it pride? Is it pique? Is it politics? I can't imagine. So you don't get everything you want, colleagues. Take what you can get. It is really the only thing which amounts to anything now. The IMF has put up $15 billion. They don't need this reform to do their loan, their aid to Ukraine. They don't need this legislation for that. Why is it so important?

Senator DURBIN said: Well, why can't we debate this another day. Right. Why can't we debate the IMF another day? But if his bill were to pass, the debate is over; the law the President wants to pass would pass, without congressional involvement in it.

Members of Congress have been dealing with these issues for a long time. It is a serious question. It does not need to be here today on this legislation. It just does not.

I have warned our colleagues that we do not need to be passing legislation which is not paid for in this fashion, and I would object to it. They had time here to fix it, but no attempt was made to fix it.

It is a little disturbing to me to see our colleagues, who have themselves decided what the best solution is, come to the floor and attack those of us who have a good-faith objection to it, when we are perfectly prepared to support the fundamental thing which needs to be done—and that is the $1 billion loan package the United States has agreed to fund, the House has agreed to support, I support, virtually every Member of Congress supports. But not this big reform package of IMF which is not justified.

I feel deeply this is a big mistake. Why in the world we wouldn't act today and take yes for an answer, I can't imagine. It goes beyond what I think is realistic.

I would conclude by saying again, something is very wrong with the foreign policy of the United States of America. Whether we reform the IMF is not going to send a message to Russia. The idea that somehow we are going to affect them by exactly what has passed here today I believe is incorrect. I believe fundamentally this package is what we can do, what we should do, and we should do it today. Then we should come back and be prepared to impose serious sanctions or whatever the President asks for.

Finally, I am disappointed the President of the United States is not more consultative with Congress in order to determine what legislation we need to pass and would continue to insist on passing reform legislation of the International Monetary Fund, which, in all likelihood, will be rejected by the House.

I feel as though we are through the looking glass here. I hate that tensions are so high. But if we would take yes for an answer, pass this House bill, come back and have a full evaluation of reform of IMF, and pass sanctions as we go forward, that would be the right thing for us to do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I commend the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Wyoming for their leadership on this important issue.

The crisis in Ukraine has riveted our attention for the last 4 months as we have seen brave men and women standing in freezing cold, standing for freedom, standing for their desire to stand with the West, to stand with Europe, to stand with America, and to be free from the domination of Putin's Russia.

We all strongly support the efforts of the Ukrainian people to choose a different path from subjugation to Russia, to choose a path toward economic and political liberty and toward a close friendship with the West.

Madam President, all of us on both sides of the Chamber are united in decrying the military aggression of Russian strongman Vladmir Putin, as he has invaded a sovereign nation with military force, committing an act of war. No one should be confused as to what Mr. Putin is attempting to do. Indeed, acting Ukraine Prime Minister Yatsenyuk said very clearly that Putin is trying to reestablish the borders of the old Soviet Union. He is expanding, sadly, into a vacuum of leadership the United States has not been filling. Russia is filling that vacuum, and the seizure of Crimea is only the beginning of Putin's aggressiveness. He will continue, I would predict, to be aggressive unless and until he meets significant resistance.

We are also united in believing there is an important role for the United States to play in responding to this crisis. I believe we should take concrete actions to respond to Russia's invasion of Crimea.

No. 1, we should press to expel Russia from the G8.

No. 2, the administration should immediately begin enforcing the Magnitsky Act—which he has failed to do up to this point—designed to punish human rights atrocities by Russian Government officials. Indeed, we should expand it to include Ukranian human rights abusers.

No. 3, we should immediately install the ballistic missile batteries in Eastern Ukraine that were scheduled to go in that President Obama mistakenly canceled in an effort to appease Mr. Putin. That effort did not succeed, and we should go forward with allowing eastern Europe to defend itself.

Additionally, there is a great deal we can do to aid the people of Ukraine.

The President should immediately offer the Government of Ukraine a free-trade agreement indicating that their goods are welcome in the United States and our goods in their country.

We should explore other options to assist them in economic recovery consistent with free market principles, including moving as expeditiously as possible to allow them access to U.S. energy exports and in particular liquidified natural gas. Russia uses natural gas and energy as a tool of economic blackmail. It is critical to the source of Russia's power not just over Ukraine but over much of Europe. The United States is blessed with abundant supplies of natural gas. It is only foolhardy government policy that stands in the way of our exporting that natural gas, meeting the need and helping Ukraine be free of the economic blackmail. We should move immediately in that regard not just because it would help Ukraine, not just because it would represent a serious blow to Russia when Russia relies on the revenue from those energy exports—if the United States steps up and provides it to them instead, that would be a serious economic blow to Russia—not just that but because it makes perfect sense from the perspective of the United States of America, our economic interests at a time when we have the lowest labor rate participation since 1978. When millions of people are out of work and hurting, we should be developing and expanding our resources, and energy provides an opportunity to transform the geopolitical playing field, to use our abundant resources in a free market manner to respond and help liberate the people of Ukraine.

There is also a financial component of the assistance for—Ukraine that it makes a world of sense should come from the International Monetary Fund, to which the United States is a contributor. That is what the IMF was created to do, and the IMF today stands fully capable of meeting that need.

My friend from Arizona has an admirable passion on this issue for the people of Ukraine and for standing up to Mr. Putin, and I commend my friend from Arizona for his passion in this regard. However, the reason this bill has not passed today is because the majority of this Chamber—the majority leader made a decision, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee made a decision to inject into the aid and sanctions plan for Ukraine an extraneous issue, an issue of the IMF that has nothing to do with the underlying issue. That was a mistake. That was a mistake.

I would suggest that the so-called IMF reforms are misguided policy. They don't make sense for four separate reasons.

No. 1, they are unnecessary. There is no need whatsoever for these reforms. Indeed, the IMF is perfectly capable of managing the task on hand, and estimates have shown that Ukraine aid would cost no more than 5 percent of its current resources. So the IMF portions are unnecessary, extrinsic. I agree with the Speaker of the House, JOHN BOEHNER, who says these so-called IMF reforms are unnecessary and extrinsic to this bill.

No. 2, these IMF provisions, if passed into law, would dramatically expand the financial exposure of the United States of America, effectively doubling our contribution, expanding our exposure. If that is good policy, that should be debated on its merits. We should not be opening the U.S. taxpayers to billions in additional financial liability without a debate on the merits. It shouldn't be just tied to Ukranian aid and forced through the Senate. That is the wrong approach.

No. 3, most inexplicably, these so-called reforms, if passed, would diminish U.S. influence on the IMF; would reduce our ability to control the decisions of the IMF; indeed, would move the funds from a fund in which we have veto authority into one in which we no longer have veto authority. We would have a smaller portion of influence over the IMF.

Astonishingly, No. 4, this bill would expand Russia's influence and control over the IMF. Let me repeat that. A bill that is being ostensibly introduced to punish Russia for their acts of war and aggression would expand Russia's influence over the IMF and decrease the influence of the United States of America.

I agree with my friend from Alabama who suggested moments ago that this is ''Through the Looking Glass.'' This makes no sense. I would challenge any of my friends here to stand here and explain why a sensible response to what Russia has done is to expand Russia's influence in the IMF and to diminish America's influence. That makes no sense whatsoever.

Madam President, I wish to close with two points. No. 1, we could pass aid for the people of Ukraine right now—today. The Senator from Wyoming rose and asked for unanimous consent to pass the bill that has already passed the House. Had the majority leader not stood up and objected on behalf of Senate Democrats, that bill would have passed into law. It would be already headed to the President's desk for signature. It is only because the majority leader objected that we are not sitting here today having already passed aid for the people of Ukraine.

I would note, by the way, that the majority leader had extended commentary about two businessmen, the Koch brothers, who I am beginning to think are characters almost out of ''Dr. Seuss'' in the majority leader's mind. They are the grinch who stole Christmas in his telling. I would note that the majority leader focuses on the IRS rules—not focusing on the abuse of power by the IRS, the Treasury inspector general chronicles, but instead on the need for a vote to regulate the IRS's abuse of power.

Let me say very simply that the House bill on Ukraine doesn't mention the IRS at all, doesn't mention P4s at all. So when the majority leader stood on the floor, this is all because of the nefarious Koch brothers. Set aside the impropriety of the majority leader of the U.S. Senate picking two private citizens—individuals engaged in political speech, standing up for what they believe, and the majority leader using his position of political power to lambaste them, to target them.

Interestingly enough, the majority leader does not seem to have a problem with the California billionaire who has publicly pledged to put $100 million behind Democrats to press them to pass climate change legislation that would cost millions of jobs across this country from blue-collar workers, from hard-working Americans. That billionaire, in the majority leader's view, is perfectly free to spend $100 million in the election, but the Koch brothers, because the two of them have stood and expressed their views, are subjected to vilification and personal attack from the majority leader.

The Senate rules allow a Member of this body, if his or her integrity is impugned, to raise an objection. Let me ask you something, Madam President. What Senate rule allows a private citizen to raise an objection when his integrity is impugned by the majority leader?

Those two brothers are not Members of this body, so they can have their reputation dragged through the mud. Yet they are denied a point of personal privilege to come and defend themselves. That is not the job of the U.S. Senate, to vilify private citizens.

I would note that the provision he is talking about is not in the House bill, which means when the Senator from Wyoming stood and asked for consent to pass the House bill, if the majority leader had simply refrained from objecting, we would have passed aid to Ukraine tonight. It has nothing to do with the Koch brothers, nothing to do with the IRS. That is not in the House bill. The reason the majority leader objected is that he wants to hold aid to Ukraine hostage to force through these misguided IMF reforms. That is the wrong decision.

One final point I wish to make. The world should understand, Russia should understand, the people of Ukraine should understand, and Mr. Putin should understand that all of us are united in standing with the people of Ukraine, that the United States will act. I am convinced it will act decisively to impose sanctions and serious consequences on Russia for this unprovoked act of war. We will act decisively to stand with the people of Ukraine. There should be no doubt in any observer's mind that this will unify both parties. We will stand together. We would have done so tonight had the majority leader not made the cynical decision to hold aid for Ukraine hostage to force a partisan bill that does not enjoy sufficient support in this body to pass otherwise. Politics

should end at the water's edge, and I think it is unfortunate to see the majority leader trying to use the crisis in Ukraine for political advantage. That is a mistake.

But there should be no ambiguity. We will impose sanctions. We will stand with Ukraine. And the people of America understand that Mr. Putin's aggression is reliving the days when the Soviet Union was an evil empire. It is reliving those days Mr. Putin called the collapse of the Soviet Union ''the greatest geopolitical catastrophe of modern times.'' Well, all of us surely hope he does not succeed in his intentions of restoring the Soviet Union, restoring that evil empire, restoring the cloud of oppression across Europe and across the world, and we stand united with the people of Ukraine and with the people surrounding Russia in support of freedom and against his unconscionable act of war.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Senator from Texas for his comments and for his eloquence. I believe he has touched on the right issues.

I would just add one thing. I was in Ukraine about 3 years ago; a delegation was there. We met with State Department people. We met with Tymoshenko, the fabulous leader of the Orange Revolution. She had those beautiful braids in her hair like peasants in the Ukraine wear, and she was concerned that she would be put in jail. I just couldn't believe it. The Ambassador told us she hadn't committed any crime, but she was placed in jail and served 2½ years. They have released her now. She was in a wheelchair, and you could tell she suffered from that.

I truly believe the people of Ukraine did a fabulous, wonderful thing when they stood for their country, for democracy. We need to stand with them. I stand with them just as I stood with and defended the people of Georgia when the Russians invaded Abkhazia and Ossetia.

I want to say unequivocally, bipartisanly, that this Congress—House and Senate—stands firmly with the people of the Ukraine. We want to help them. The one thing substantively we can do today that would make a difference for the people of Ukraine is to pass this bill that provides $1 billion in help to them. I truly believe we should do that. I am deeply disappointed that the majority insists that unless they get their reform of the International Monetary Fund that they want to see happen, which is unrelated directly to the needs of Ukraine, that they won't accept the legislation the House has already passed. I think that would be a mistake.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

UKRAINE

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I return to the floor because I can't let some of what has been said go unchallenged.

First of all, as it relates to the majority leader, the issue of the connection that has been made between IMF reform and the C–4 investigation—the unlimited, undefined, not-known secret money that goes into these entities in elections—was not first raised by the majority leader. It was first raised by Senator CORKER in an article. It was subsequently raised today on the floor by Senator MCCAIN. So casting aspersions upon the majority leader and suggesting he is ultimately impugning the reputation of anyone is pretty outrageous when the Members of his own side of the aisle recognize that it was simply wrong to connect IMF reform and the ability to help Ukraine in the most powerful way now with some C–4 investigation.

Secondly, only in Washington could someone have you believe that IMF reforms we are promoting means more power for Russia. Yes, we are rushing in this Chamber—JOHN MCCAIN and BOB CORKER are rushing into this Chamber to give more power to Russia. Only in Washington could anybody believe that.

Only in Washington could someone have you believe that our other colleagues on the committee who voted for the legislation to have IMF reform were actually voting—our Republican colleagues were voting—to give Russia more power so they could continue to oppress people. It stretches the incredulous nature of that argument.

On the contrary, why are we in the mess we are in? Because when Ukraine was having serious economic challenges, it was Putin and Russia that were coming with their money, not the IMF which—in a way—might have ultimately been important because the IMF needs the resources and the leveraging we create by virtue of this legislation.

You can't divorce it. If you really want to help Ukraine, you need to have the resources of the IMF that ultimately guarantees the full ability to bring Ukraine back into economic order, and from that, build on all the other elements of security as well.

Thirdly, the budget point of order: The ranking member on our committee made it very clear when he said, I want to be supportive, but we have to have this paid for, and we did. People can disagree with the pay-for, but it is paid for, which is something the House of Representatives didn't do. Let me tell you what else the House of Representatives didn't do. They didn't do anything about sanctions—nothing, zero, nada.

The bottom line is, we would send a message that, yes, we want to partially help Ukraine, but not in the most significant way we can, which is with IMF reform and the leveraging of the resources and our voice that we would bring to them in determining their future and the next crisis in the world, which is unfortunately around the corner.

So for those who claim they are all for helping Ukraine and national security, they should have allowed us to have this vote tonight.

Lastly, with reference to my dear friend and colleague, for whom I have a great deal of respect, Senator BARRASSO, who said I didn't permit his amendment on LNG to move forward, his amendment was ruled out of order because it was not within the jurisdiction of the committee. The reality is on the merits of it, it is not about helping Ukraine right now. Ukraine doesn't have the infrastructure for LNG. They obviously don't have the resources to build the infrastructure for LNG.

Turkey, which controls the Bosphorus Strait, has said they are not going to let the LNG go through because of their concerns for security. So the bottom line is that is not about helping Ukraine today. If all of that can be accomplished—infrastructure, the resources to build it, and getting Turkey on board—then maybe in the future that is part of a further, longer term solution, but it is not about right now.

What it is about right now is the loan guarantees. It is about the sanctions to make sure the Russians and those in Ukraine understand they are going to be subject to real consequences by virtue of corrupting Ukraine and undermining its territorial integrity. Lastly, having the long-term ability through the IMF to achieve the goals of stabilizing Ukraine economically and also preparing for the next emergency, that is what was at stake tonight.

We will get there, but when you see movements of Russian troops and the circumstances that are unfolding, and I hear colleagues say, ''We are not doing enough,'' and then just want to do a fraction of what is necessary to help the Ukraine, I begin to seriously wonder.

I hope the majority leader will have this as the first order of business when we return. I think there is bipartisan support for the package the way it is now. It is unfortunate that as our colleagues travel to Ukraine, they can't go with the final message that this was passed today, but it will pass.

As I said to the Prime Minister of Ukraine yesterday—an extraordinary individual who met with members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—in the long history of the world, only a few are called upon to answer the call of freedom in some of its most dangerous moments in history. He has been called upon to do that on behalf of his country at this time. We are called upon to stand against the aggression and to help a country be able to do so.

I hope we will be able to get past this issue of linking IMF reform with the whole question of campaign finance issues so we can achieve that goal.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

DEFENSE BUDGET

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam President, I very much appreciate the importance of the discussion going on, but I would like to talk about another very important issue that is facing us. One of the

biggest problems our country faces at the current time is one Washington has created—the out-of-control spending and our lack of fiscal discipline to put our country back on a path to fiscal responsibly.

Last week President Obama released his budget proposal for fiscal year 2015. That proposal continues Washington's reckless spending. It offers little in the way of real help to the millions of Americans struggling to get by in this very stagnant economy, which has not been helped by the President's policies.

What is worse is that the President finds a way to support the projects and priorities of his base but can't continue our country's commitment to our men and women who served and are serving our Nation in uniform.

The defense budget proposes to slash even more benefits our military families need. The Military Officers Association of America is rightfully highlighting these proposed cuts to military compensation and health care benefits.

The Washington Times published a story on this topic yesterday, saying retired servicemembers weighed in with frustration and anger, and rightfully so.

The proposal again caps the military pay raise at 1 percent, although the private sector wage growth is 1.8 percent. MOAA, the Military Officers Association, calculated what these cuts would mean to the bottom line of our active-duty military. An Army sergeant stands to lose nearly $5,000 in benefits annually and an Army captain will lose nearly $6,000 in benefits annually. This is certainly the wrong message to send to our men and women who put their lives on the line for this country.

When the President was elected, he promised to go through the budget with a scalpel; however, the only thing he seems capable of dissecting is military pay and benefits.

I am here today to say that these cuts on our military families are unacceptable. I will fight to preserve the benefits our military families were promised. Fortunately, as has been the case with the President's budgets from the past few years, this proposal will likely never see the light of day. Even the majority in the Senate doesn't have the desire to bring that proposal up for a vote. But this does not excuse those who continue to propose savings that come at the expense of our men and women in uniform or those who have served us in the past.

Our military members, their families, and our veterans should not have to bear the burden for Washington's irresponsible spending. Taking away benefits from our servicemembers has become a recurring problem. This is very troubling.

I stood here less than 2 months ago talking about our need to restore military retiree cuts that were unjustly taken away to help rein in spending. I opposed the budget agreement that cut the retirement benefit of our veterans and reducing the cost-of-living adjustment because it unfairly aimed to balance the budget on the backs of our retired military. Now the President seems determined to continue down that path.

We were able to restore most of those misguided military retirement cuts, but these benefits should have never been a target. Now the President wants to target servicemembers again. It is unconscionable considering he is intent on interjecting the Federal Government into private sector labor issues. He wants to force private entities to raise wages and increase benefits in a poor economy that his policies have created. When it comes to our men and women in uniform, he is all for stripping away their hard-earned benefits so he can continue to redistribute wealth, raise taxes, and increase Federal spending another $1 trillion.

We need to keep the promise we made to our servicemembers and maintain these benefits. Washington needs to find savings somewhere else. It can and must be done.

With that, I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mrs. HAGAN. Madam President, I come to the Senate floor today to discuss an issue of enormous importance to my State, our country, and future generations.

I thank my colleagues for bringing attention to the critical issue of climate change earlier this week. This is a pressing problem that needs to be addressed and too often gets pushed to the back burner.

As a Senator from North Carolina, I represent a State that is home to some of our country's most treasured landmarks and most precious natural resources—from the Great Smoky Mountains in the west to the Uwharrie National Forest in the Piedmont to Cape Hatteras National Seashore in the east.

Like so many North Carolinians, my family and I love spending time together outdoors whether it is hiking, fishing, biking, or just enjoying the views and being outside.

Visitors from across the country travel to North Carolina to experience the Blue Ridge Parkway in the fall or to take a vacation on the Outer Banks in the summer. Tourism is an important part of our State's economy—generating $25 billion in economic activity and supporting over 390,000 jobs in my State. However, rising temperatures and extreme weather are putting those landmarks and resources at risk.

In 2012, North Carolina experienced a total of 40 broken heat records, 4 broken snow records, 13 broken precipitation records, and 19 large wildlifes.

Since 2000, North Carolina has issued 14 disaster declarations from severe storms and flooding. This extreme weather doesn't just jeopardize the beauty of our coastline or put our forest at risk for wildfires, it also affects our economy and impacts people's everyday daily lives.

In 2011 Hurricane Irene ravaged our coast and affected approximately 1.3 million North Carolinians. Roads and highways were destroyed, homes and businesses were left inaccessible. The damage left some families with no other option but to live in tents.

The storm decimated tourism for the eastern part of our State at the height of the tourist season. The region got back on its feet only to be hit again a year later by Hurricane Sandy, which totally sliced through Highway 12, which is the lifeline of the Outer Banks. It cut it right down the middle.

This changing weather impacts another key part of North Carolina's economy, agriculture, which is our State's biggest industry. Agriculture generates $77 billion in economic activity and employs nearly one-fifth of our workforce.

Last year record rainfall flooded several counties in North Carolina, and our farmers lost tens of millions of dollars' worth of food crops. Tomatoes were wrought with disease. In some fields half of all of the sweet corn had been destroyed. Experts predicted losses could double for producers, some of whom are thinking twice before they plant a crop next year.

We are seeing the very real impact climate change is having on my State and its economy today. In the absence of action, this extreme weather is here to stay. Recent reports have shown that by 2099 climate change could increase temperatures by as much as 10.5 degrees Fahrenheit and cause over 1,000 more heat-related deaths just in my hometown of Greensboro. By midcentury, Greensboro is expected to increase from a historical average of 8 heat-excessive days in the summer to 59 and to reach a total of 70 days by the end of the century. This current path is unsustainable, and we must take steps now to slow and stop the effects of climate change.

This is a challenge that will need to be addressed from many different directions, but I am proud of the steps we took in North Carolina when I was in the State senate to invest in energy innovation. A bill I worked on in 2007 made North Carolina the only Southeastern State with a mandatory renewable energy standard, requiring electrical utilities to meet up to 12.5 percent of their energy needs through renewable sources by 2021. We also enacted the Clean Smokestacks Act in 2012, which made significant emission reductions from coal-fired powerplants in North Carolina and Tennessee.

I am proud of those accomplishments, but we must do more. I believe North Carolina and the United States are well positioned to lead and to take advantage of opportunities in the 21st-century energy economy.

I look at North Carolina's Research Triangle Park, which has become an international model for bringing together industry, research institutions,

and government to help develop clean energy technologies that reduce carbon emissions and make our country less dependent on fossil fuels. Companies and institutions across North Carolina are developing ways to reduce energy more efficiently, harnessing smart grid technologies and using renewables to provide new, power-intensive data centers in my State.

While addressing carbon emissions presents new economic opportunities, we must also be sure to minimize any economic burdens on the least fortunate and make efforts to ensure that we do not harm our global economic competitiveness.

The challenge before us is great, but if we come together, Democrats and Republicans, we can move forward with commonsense measures that reduce emissions, increase our energy independence, and put the United States back on a sustainable path, all while getting the people of this great country back to work.

Thank you, Madam President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, as we wrestle with the Ukraine situation, I hope we can—I wish we could have gotten together to be able to pass the core responsibility of this Congress, which would be to allow the loan program to go through—a $1 billion loan program that I think everybody in the House and the Senate agrees on, Republicans and Democrats. It was, in fact, complicated and made impossible tonight because the majority insisted that IMF reform, which is opposed and is unrelated to the Ukraine, be a part of this legislation. The House has not passed it. I don't think the House will pass it. So why were they insisting on that and refusing to take the money we were able to give tonight? It is just baffling to me.

I appreciate Senator MENENDEZ. He has shown real leadership and insight into international relations. He chairs the Foreign Relations Committee. I don't mean to attack his integrity or anything of that nature, but he is incorrect in saying this bill is paid for or doesn't violate the budget. It absolutely violates the budget. The Congressional Budget Office has analyzed the numbers, and they have concluded just what my Budget Committee staff has concluded, which is that it violates the budget. The numbers are plain.

Look, a lot of things around here are not perfect, but the idea that we would insist on passing International Monetary Fund reform that does not have to be a part of this bill and is not related to this situation, is going to cost $315 million to fund that program, that reform, which is very controversial, and half of the money explicitly comes from the Defense Department—Air Force missiles and Army procurement and aviation—at a time when the Russian army is occupying the Crimea in the Ukraine, we want to now cut the Defense Department and the Army of the United States even more.

The Budget Control Act has really tightened the military's defense budget. They are doing all they can do to meet that budget. I have tried to support the budget. I believe all of us need to tighten our belts. But I will just say this: We don't need to take more money out of the Defense Department budget at a time when we are already asking them to take unprecedented reductions. I feel strongly about that. It is disturbing to me that we have not reached that agreement.

In fact, what has happened is the Defense Department was forced to make some tough decisions, so they rescinded some of the money they had, and they intended to use it on other priorities, things they need to spend the money on. They made tough choices. What has Congress come in here now to do? Reach in there and take the money the Defense Department was trying to save so they can move it to something of high priority and spend it on this program. There is $4 trillion in U.S. Government spending. We can't find some other place to find this money? Aren't there legitimate offsets that don't violate the budget?

For the most part, all of these offsets for both programs are not legitimate. They are basically gimmes. We need to get away from that. We need honesty in budgeting. We really do need it. When we have a priority we want to act on, such as this Ukraine situation, there are plenty of opportunities for us to identify lesser priority spending and take that money and spend it. That is what the Defense Department was doing when they executed rescissions. They were making choices, setting priorities.

We should not do this. It is not a little bitty matter. Frankly, the House needs to be more careful about how they do their business. The bill they sent over here has problems with it. But to take another whack at a controversial program—$315 million—and take half the money from the military is really unacceptable.

I warned people about this in advance, but they persisted. They thought they could get to the last minute and they would stand here on the floor and emotionally argue that our objection had something to do with not caring about or being supportive of the people of the Ukraine, that we would just fold and give it to them. Well, that day is becoming a day of the past.

Somebody needs to stand here and say we are going to do these things right or we are going to have real problems on the floor of the Senate. If I have to do it, I will do it.

I am proud of the Senator from Wyoming, who sought to pass the House bill. We just have to accept it. That is something we could do and get it done tonight, and I would be willing to support that. I certainly want to help the Ukraine, and we can do it and do it in the right way.

I thank the Chair for the opportunity to speak tonight. I know we all love the country, and we are going to have to wrestle now with serious questions about Russia—what their agenda is, what kind of actions they may be taking. There needs to be no doubt that this Senator has no intention of standing idly by while Russia attempts to take over independent, sovereign nations on its border. It is absolutely unacceptable. We cannot accept it. It should not have happened. I believe if this President had been more firm and clear in his policies, it likely would not have happened, but it has.

The whole world now has to confront this crisis and deal with it. It is not going to be easy. I think all of us need to work hard to put our politics aside on this question and try to do what is in the national interests.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to proceed to S. 2124.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I send a cloture motion to the desk that I would ask the Chair to report.

I have to sign it and send it there first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to report 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 the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 329, S. 2124, a bill to support sovereignty and democracy in Ukraine, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Robert Menendez, Debbie Stabenow, Barbara Boxer, Patty Murray, Richard Blumenthal, Jeff Merkley, Carl Levin, Joe Donnelly, Christopher A. Coons, Jack Reed, Maria Cantwell, Barbara A. Mikulski, Tom Harkin, Tim Kaine, Jeanne Shaheen, Jon Tester.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF CHRISTOPHER REID COOPER TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. REID. I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 581.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Christopher Reid Cooper, of the District of Columbia, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to report 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 the nomination of Christopher Reid Cooper, of the District of Columbia, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Debbie Stabenow, Robert Menendez, Barbara Boxer, Patty Murray, Richard Blumenthal, Jeff Merkley, Carl Levin, Bernard Sanders, Joe Donnelly, Maria Cantwell, Barbara A. Mikulski, Tom Harkin, Tim Kaine, Jeanne Shaheen, Jon Tester.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I move to proceed now to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF M. DOUGLAS HARPOOL TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI

Mr. REID. I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 582.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of M. Douglas Harpool, of Missouri, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Missouri.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I send a cloture motion to the desk on this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to report 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 the nomination of M. Douglas Harpool, of Missouri, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Missouri.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Debbie Stabenow, Robert Menendez, Barbara Boxer, Patty Murray, Richard Blumenthal, Jeff Merkley, Carl Levin, Bernard Sanders, Joe Donnelly, Maria Cantwell, Barbara A. Mikulski, Tom Harkin, Tim Kaine, Jeanne Shaheen, Jon Tester.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF GERALD AUSTIN McHUGH, JR. TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. REID. I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 583.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gerald Austin McHugh, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to report 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 the nomination of Gerald Austin McHugh, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Debbie Stabenow, Robert Menendez, Barbara Boxer, Patty Murray, Richard Blumenthal, Jeff Merkley, Carl Levin, Bernard Sanders, Joe Donnelly, Maria Cantwell, Barbara A. Mikulski, Tom Harkin, Tim Kaine, Jeanne Shaheen, Jon Tester.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF EDWARD G. SMITH TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 584.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward G. Smith, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to report 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 the nomination of M. Edward G. Smith, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Debbie Stabenow, Robert Menendez, Barbara Boxer, Patty Murray, Richard Blumenthal, Jeff Merkley, Carl Levin, Bernard Sanders, Joe Donnelly, Maria Cantwell, Barbara A. Mikulski, Tom Harkin, Tim Kaine, Jeanne Shaheen, Jon Tester.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent we proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CORINTHIAN COLLEGES

Mr. DURBIN. Last December I spoke about a news article that revealed another disturbing scam perpetuated by the for-profit college industry. The article reported that Corinthian Colleges, Incorporated, a publicly-traded corporation, that owns for-profit schools in the United States and Canada, has engaged in deceptive job placement practices in order to artificially boost job placement rates and avoid scrutiny by its creditors.

It turns out Corinthian schools were paying employers what they called an onboarding fee of $2,000 per student so the companies would hire their graduates temporarily so that could be counted as an official permanent job placement.

Corinthian college subsidiary schools have been criticized in the past for having high dropout rates, high tuition, and some of the highest loan default rates in the Nation. Nearly 40 percent of Corinthian college students who should have begun to pay their Federal student loans in 2008 were defaulting on their student loans. This is the highest rate of any publicly-traded company in that sector. Yet, over the last 10 years Corinthian Colleges has been rewarded for its poor performance with $10 billion in Federal student aid. On an annual basis American taxpayers fund more than 80 percent of Corinthian Colleges' total revenue. This includes the salary of Corinthian's CEO, Jack Massimino, who received compensation of $3.1 million in 2012, thanks to the taxpayers. This was seven times the average compensation for presidents of public universities, which is about $440,000.

Corinthian also spent $400 million on marketing and admissions in 2013, about $3,700 for each newly admitted student. How could they afford it? Because the taxpayers are subsidizing this for-profit college. Corinthian's marketing strategy has come under scrutiny recently because it targets low-income people. Why? If you are a low-income new student at Corinthian you automatically qualify for a Pell grant and a college student loan. They can't wait for you to come through the door, sign the papers, and then watch what happens next. Most of these students falter, fail, drop out, or if they were, I guess, lucky—and I use that word advisedly—they end up with a worthless diploma. These students attracted by the prospect of a better life and the dream of a college education end up far worse off, deeply in debt with nothing to show for it.

Eric Parms, an Everest college grad, completed a 9-month heating, ventilation, and air conditioning repair program. What he ended up with at the end of it was a $17,000 student loan for a 9-month program on HVAC and no job. After he graduated he had to beg the career counselors at Everest to set up some interviews. Frankly, Eric wasn't worth that much to them after he graduated. They wanted him to sign up for the loans. He did it and they lost interest in him.

Finally, he was set up by career services to work in a contract position laying electric wires. However, after less than 2 months on the job he was laid off and cut off from any career service counseling at Everest College, part of the Corinthian operation.

The school had effectively placed Eric in a short-term internship program, and once it was over, there was no incentive for that company to hire him when they could vacate a space for another graduate who would get a $2,000 Corinthian subsidy, so their numbers would look better to the public and to the Federal Government. Then Everest could shuttle in another graduate for a part-time position leading nowhere.

Eric lost out on the deal with a $17,000 student loan for a worthless education at Everest College, part of the Corinthian family of schools. To get a Georgia HVAC contractor license he needed to have significant work experience and references. No one would hire him with a degree from Everest. Everest College, part of Corinthian, gave him a worthless degree.

After reading the December article and stories like Eric's, I sent four letters. One letter was to the CEO of Corinthian, asking him to explain these practices and to outline steps the company is going to take to put an end to it. His response to me was not surprising but disappointing. Corinthian's CEO Jack Massimino, the multimillion dollar CEO defended the school's policies and practices. He did admit that at one time three Everest campuses provided incentives to employees.

This is a scandal that has to come to an end. I tell folks repeatedly, if you want to know about for-profit schools and universities in America, remember three numbers: 10 percent of high school grads end up in for-profit colleges; 20 percent of all the Federal aid to education goes to these colleges; 46 percent of all the student loan defaults come out of these colleges. These are worthless, by and large. There are some exemptions, but most of them are worthless, and we as taxpayers are being taken to the cleaners by this industry.

When we don't have enough money to do the important things in America such as medical research and assistance for education at good, worthwhile schools, we ought to say shame on ourselves for not taking a look at this for-profit college industry which is fleecing the American taxpayers.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. First let me thank Senator DURBIN for his commitment on this issue. We know education is a great equalizer in America. We know there are major concerns on access to higher education because of costs, and that we have to do a better job to make college education affordable. We also have to have accountability in higher education, to make sure those institutions are providing quality products to their students and are doing it in a cost-effective way, particularly when taxpayers are providing a lot of the aid.

Mr. DURBIN. If I could ask the Senator from Maryland to yield for a moment.

Mr. CARDIN. I would be glad to.

Mr. DURBIN. I just had a meeting with people from the Pentagon and we talked about military education, members of the military who are seeking education while in the military through the GI bill and such. We talked about some of the worst examples of for-profit schools. The best example I could come up with of a worthy education through the military is the University of Maryland. They have been doing it for decades. I steer all my friends in the military and their families to the flagship university in the Senator's State of Maryland. Maryland does a good job.

Mr. CARDIN. I am glad I yielded to my colleague. We are very proud of the University of Maryland and the programs for the Department of Defense. We believe it is a cost-effective way and a quality education, exactly what the Senator from Illinois is talking about; and that is we have to get value for our dollars and we have to get accountability. I appreciate the Senator bringing that to our attention.

FILING CLOTURE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, the majority leader, the Senator from Nevada, came to the floor last night to take exception to my criticisms of how the Senate operates these days.

I have criticized the actions of the current majority leadership, of which he is the head.

However, I would like to point out that I have tried to avoid singling him out personally because it is not my intention to engage in personal attacks or name calling.

Still, the fact that he takes my criticisms of the Senate's dysfunction so personally should tell us something.

Yesterday, I criticized the abuse of same-day cloture motions.

In response, Senator REID said, ''He claims that I file too many cloture motions.''

Well, it often is the majority leader who files the cloture motions, but sometimes it is other members of the majority leadership, and on rare occasions, other Senators.

The fact is, this majority leader has instigated more of the cloture motions than any leader in recent times.

Senator Frist filed about 72 percent of all cloture motions when he was Majority Leader, Senator Daschle filed about 32 percent during his leadership, Senator Lott about 69 percent, and Senator Dole about 50 percent.

Senator REID has personally filed 94 percent of all the cloture motions since he became majority leader.

And, that is 94 percent of a much bigger number since cloture filings have more than doubled under this majority leadership.

So if the Senator from Nevada takes my criticism of cloture abuse personally, perhaps there is a reason he does.

He also blames Republicans for the fact that he has abused the cloture process, just as I predicted in my speech, which struck such a nerve.

However, I want to be absolutely clear that my criticisms were focused on same-day cloture filings related to legislative business.

In other words, I was specifically criticizing the practice of moving to end consideration of a legislative matter that is subject to amendment before there has been an opportunity for any debate or amendments.

The majority leader went off on a tangent complaining about how many nominees are waiting for confirmation. I don't need to remind anybody that the ability of the minority party to block nominees was eliminated using the nuclear option. Besides, the focus of my speech was on the legislative process.

We can argue about how much debate is too much and how many amendments are too many. But no one can claim that same-day cloture motions were in response to Republican obstruction when there hasn't been any deliberation whatsoever before they are filed.

The majority leader can criticize me and stoop to petty name-calling, but the data I cited was from the non-partisan Congressional Research Service.

This data on same-day cloture speaks for itself. His excuse, ''The Republicans made me do it'' won't fly. In fact, Senator REID has been caught before trying to blame Republicans for his cloture motions.

The Washington Post Fact Checker gave him two Pinocchios for his claim that Republicans were to blame for a record number of cloture motions.

He tried to claim that every cloture motion represented a Republican filibuster. However, the source he cited was a report by the Congressional Research Service containing a long section under the heading ''Cloture Motions Do Not Correspond With Filibusters.''

That heading pretty much says it all, but it contains about a page and a half of explanation as to why it is erroneous to claim that all cloture motions are in response to filibusters.

Certainly, cloture motions which are filed before there has been one word of debate cannot possibly be in response to a filibuster. Those are the cloture motions my criticism was directed at yesterday.

This is also the problem addressed by the Stop Cloture Abuse Resolution which I introduced yesterday with 25 of my colleagues.

The majority leader did not even attempt to defend the practice of same-day cloture, and understandably so. There is no justification for it.

The majority leader's refusal to acknowledge such a blatant problem, much less put a stop to it, just confirms the need for the Stop Cloture Abuse Resolution.

I should add that the deliberative process can work if it is allowed to, and the bill we have been debating yesterday and today is evidence of that.

It isn't just Republicans who would prefer to go back to the way we did things when the Senate functioned as a deliberative body as it was designed to.

The manager of S. 1086, Senator MIKULSKI, said earlier today, ''This is one of the first times in a couple of years where we have had an open amendment process, and in some ways we're getting adjusted to how that actually works. This is terrific.''

So even prominent Members of the majority party acknowledge an open amendment process is the way things should work. I have offered a constructive idea along with 25 colleagues to make that the norm again.

Instead of criticizing me, the majority leader should join me and become part of the solution instead of part of the problem.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, the issue of climate change is a pressing issue and so I wish to commend the work of my colleagues, and to reiterate my concerns.

Climate change is real. Unfortunately, while so many of my colleagues across the aisle talk about the need to address our debt to avoid burdening future generations, too many of these same Senators refuse to take action to address the climate debt we are passing on. Most frustrating of all, we know what can be done to fix this problem.

We know the solutions to reduce pollution and emissions that cause climate change create good-paying jobs. Jobs that put money back in families' pockets through low-cost energy sources and increased efficiencies in homes. These solutions make our Nation more energy independent, and our businesses more globally competitive. They give us cleaner air and water, and protect the health of our children and grandchildren.

I know that we can take these steps because I have seen it in my home State of Washington. In Washington, our biodiesel producers are replacing imported oil with clean, renewable, home-grown fuels. Companies like McKinstry, who have made a home in the Northwest, are leaders in helping cities, hospitals, and others create energy efficient, sustainable buildings.

In the past, the United States has led the world in innovative ways to create energy, but recently we have ceded our clean energy leadership to countries like China and Germany because too many have stood in the way of making necessary investments. When we passed the Bipartisan Budget Act this past December, we proved that Democrats and Republicans can put ideology aside and work together to make progress on our Nation's challenges.

Climate change is no less a challenge than any of the other issues we face, and we have a moral obligation to address it. As I have said, addressing this challenge will create good-paying jobs here at home in fields like pollution management, energy efficiency, and renewable energy goods. And best of all, we can pass a healthier planet on to our children.

I'm hopeful that Republicans and Democrats can find common ground and come together to move us forward.

TRIBUTE TO JOAN BARRON

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, at a small desk on the third floor of the Wyoming State Capitol sits Joan Barron. For 48 years, Joan has served as a reporter for the Casper Star Tribune, sharing Wyoming's government with Wyoming's people. On March 21, 2014, Joan is retiring.

Joan started her career in Rock Springs, WY. She was a nurse, but answered an ad to freelance for the Casper Star Tribune in 1966. The editors were impressed with Joan's work, and asked her to move to Cheyenne. Armed with a notebook and a typewriter, she became the capitol bureau reporter in 1969—a position she has held to this day.

Historians will undoubtedly use Joan's work to understand the State of Wyoming. She covered seven governors, 50 legislative sessions, three boom and bust cycles. She knows the issues, she knows the players, she does her homework. Throughout her career, Joan has been a trusted source, delivering the news of the day to the people of Wyoming. When an article has the byline, Joan Barron, Star-Tribune capitol bureau, a reader can be assured of fact-based, comprehensive reporting.

While Joan says she never wanted to be the story, she has had a tremendous impact on how those in Wyoming government conduct business. She was integral to the creation of the Wyoming Open Meetings Law in 1973. Due in part to Joan's observations, questions and perseverance, the Wyoming legislature passed ethics legislation. She held people accountable—and our State is better for it.

Just last week, Joan quietly announced her retirement—not wanting any fanfare. That is typical of her. She is always the observer, never the center of attention.

I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Joan Barron for 48 years of reporting. She has recorded over one-third of Wyoming's history—and her perspective will be missed. Wyoming owes her a great debt of gratitude.

WOMEN'S ACCESS TO PREVENTIVE SERVICES

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, the U.S. Supreme Court will soon hear arguments on the Tenth Circuit's overly expansive decision to allow a secular, for-profit corporation's owners or shareholders to impose their religious beliefs on employees by denying female employees access to preventive health care, including insurance coverage for contraception.

As detailed in the amicus brief filed by myself and 18 fellow Senators in January, Congress never intended such a broad and unprecedented expansion of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, RFRA, to deny women access to health care benefits. We urged the Court to clarify that RFRA does not allow for-profit companies to deny health coverage to employees based on the religious objections of the company's owners.

It should be clear that the Tenth Circuit's decision runs counter to a plain-text reading of RFRA and the law's extensive and informative legislative history. Congress passed RFRA to advance a single, limited purpose: to restore the compelling-interest test to government actions that burden the free exercise of religion. But the test only extended free-exercise rights only to individuals and religious, non-profit organizations. No Supreme Court precedent had extended free-exercise rights to secular, for-profit corporations.

Congress enacted the Affordable Care Act with full understanding of RFRA—and of its limited purpose. Congress also recognized the need to balance the government's compelling interest in extending women's access to preventive health care with respect for the traditional free-exercise rights of individuals and religious organizations, which is why Congress included the Affordable Care Act's religious exemptions for individuals and religious organizations. These exemptions strike such a balance precisely and accurately, and appropriately recognize the free-exercise rights Congress intended for RFRA to protect.

It's unacceptable and inappropriate for bosses at for-profit corporations to pick and choose which health care services their employees can receive. So far, 360,000 Oregon women have benefited from expanded access to preventive services, including contraceptives. Women's health choices should be made between them and their doctors—not their bosses.

TAIWAN RELATIONS ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Madam President, I wish to speak about U.S.-Taiwan relations. In just a few weeks, on April 10, 2014, we will recognize the 35th anniversary of the enactment of the Taiwan Relations Act, TRA. This important legislation has served as the legal basis for our relations with Taiwan and has been critical in defining our diplomatic, economic, and strategic relationship.

Although I was not yet a Member of Congress in 1979 when this legislation was passed, I have had the pleasure over the past 28 years to be active in U.S.-Taiwan matters and have seen the benefits of the TRA.

Over the past several decades we have seen our relationship with Taiwan grow. Taiwan's innovative and expanding economy has led to significant trade opportunities for both of our countries. Particularly in the area of agriculture—which is South Dakota's No. 1 industry—Taiwan has grown to be a key trading partner, representing one of the most significant consumers of South Dakota corn, soybeans, and wheat. Our trade relationship has only strengthened over the years, and I am hopeful that market opportunities will continue to expand.

While we mark this important milestone in U.S.-Taiwan relations, I would also like to say farewell to Representative King Pu-tsung, Taiwan's chief envoy to the United States. Ambassador King was recently appointed to be the Secretary-General of the Republic of China (Taiwan)'s National Security Council, a position equivalent to our National Security Advisor to the President. I congratulate him on this new opportunity and trust that in his new role we will continue to work together to further strengthen close ties between our two countries.

The people of Taiwan have proven to be true friends of the United States, and I look forward to continuing this friendship well into the future.

SUPPORTING JOSH HARDY

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I would like to take a moment to express sincere gratitude to the students, faculty and staff of Hugh Mercer Elementary School and the entire Fredericksburg, VA region—for the way the community has rallied together to support one of their own: seven-year-old Josh Hardy.

Josh is at St. Jude Children's Research Hospital in Memphis recovering from a life-threatening virus following a bone marrow transplant in January. This week, I am pleased our office had an opportunity to work with Josh's family and Josh's friends and fans in Fredericksburg to get this young fighter access to an experimental medication that could save his life.

Since Josh was an infant, he has battled cancer—successfully. While he was undergoing chemotherapy—in kindergarten, mind you—Josh and his two brothers worked to raise almost $5,000 to help other sick children who were being treated at St. Jude Children's Hospital.

Doctors at St. Jude Children's Hospital believe the only drug that can help Josh is still in the testing phase by its manufacturer, Chimerix. And unfortunately, it appeared that policies of the FDA and Chimerix would prevent Josh from receiving the drug.

Upon hearing that news, family, friends, Mercer teachers and classmates, local businesses, and nonprofit groups across the Fredericksburg region rallied together to make sure that Josh's voice was heard, here on Capitol Hill and across the country.

They used social media to enlist the support of tens of thousands of people from across the country and around the world. Josh's family and friends contacted our office to see if we might be able to help.

That is when we reached out both to the FDA and the drug manufacturer to try to expedite the process to allow Josh to get access to this potentially life-saving medication. We got the good news Tuesday night, directly from the CEO of Chimerix. By the following morning, Josh was undergoing treatment with this new drug. It is still too soon to know if this experimental medication will help, but we are all pulling for this remarkable boy.

Today I want to salute Josh's teachers and classmates at High Mercer Elementary School for all that they have done to rally around this family. The commitment of Josh's teachers to advocate on behalf of the Hardy family is a testament to their dedication to public service and to creating stronger communities and a better Virginia.

And I am grateful and proud of the Fredericksburg community, where folks truly came together in a good cause on behalf of Josh and his family. Their persistence and dedication exemplifies what we call ''the Virginia spirit.''

I also want to publicly thank the executives and employees of Chimerix, and officials at the Food and Drug Administration, for moving so quickly to look for a way to be helpful to the Hardy family. My staff is already in conversation with the FDA about ways we might streamline the process to allow families in the Hardy's situation to have easier access to potentially life-saving drugs even as these drugs are being evaluated by the FDA.

We are all pulling for Josh Hardy. We are praying for his family and his medical team, and we are so grateful for the tremendous support Josh Hardy is receiving from his Hugh Mercer teachers and classmates and the entire Fredericksburg community.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

OUR ENERGY FUTURE

• Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I ask that a copy of my remarks to the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners be printed in the RECORD.

The remarks follow.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REGULATORY UTILITY COMMISSIONERS

Five years ago, all the talk in the United States was about a cap-and-trade program and deliberately raising the price of energy as a way of achieving clean energy independence. Two years ago, I visited Germany—a country that has adopted such a policy—and what I found was an energy mess.

The Germans are subsidizing wind and solar, and closing their nuclear plants—but because they are a big manufacturing country they still need nuclear, coal and natural gas for reliable electricity. So to meet those needs, the Germans are buying nuclear power from France, and gas from an unreliable partner, Russia. They're even building their own new coal plants in order to have enough reliable electricity.

The end result of this bizarre policy is that Germany has among the highest household electricity prices in the European Union. When I asked an economic minister what he would say to a manufacturer concerned about energy costs in Germany, he said, ''I would suggest he go somewhere else.''

This concern in Germany is spreading across Europe. A recent headline in the New York Times reads ''Europe, Facing Economic Pain, May Ease Climate Rules.'' The accompanying article stated that ''the European Union proposed an end to binding national targets for renewable energy production after 2020.''

Europeans may end some of their climate targets to avoid throwing a big, wet regulatory blanket over their economies. The point is: in a competitive world, energy policies have a lot to do with a country's economic well-being.

When you compare our country's energy needs with the example of Germany, you can see that we are at a fork in the road on our national energy policy. Which path we take will help determine how well the United States competes in a 21st-century economy.

The surest path toward cheap, clean, reliable energy is to end Washington's obsession with wasteful energy subsidies and to instead rely on free enterprise and government-sponsored research.

Or, we can take the path of Germany, which is where we are headed if we continue to waste tax dollars on subsidies that prop up one type of energy over another.

In the United States today, production of electricity from natural gas has grown to 28 percent of total production. This is at the expense of coal, which is down to 39 percent. Nuclear power holds relatively steady at 19 percent. Hydro is 7 percent. Wind, solar, biomass and geothermal make up only 6 percent, of which 4 percent is wind.

In Washington and in state capitols, there are debates about whether to push this 6 percent of electricity by renewables to a much higher number by forcing a so-called national renewable energy standard, or by further subsidizing an energy source because it's deemed ''clean,'' or by implementing carbon regulations even though Congress has never approved carbon regulations. To avoid the path of Germany and maintain our competiveness, I suggest four grand principles for the United States' energy future: 1) cheaper, not more expensive, energy; 2) clean, not just renewable, energy; 3) research and development, not government mandates; and 4) free market, not government picking ''winners and losers.''

The first step on the right path to our energy future—and a prime example of how to apply these principles—is to not extend the massive wind production tax credit that expired on January 1. I believe energy companies basically should enjoy the same tax benefits non-energy companies receive, which is largely the case today with traditional forms of energy.

I believe that through tax reform we should simplify the tax code and eliminate most preferences for specific types of energy production. This would save a lot of money, which could be better spent on doubling energy research and reducing the federal debt.

The worst culprit for wasteful energy subsidies is Big Wind. Under current law, the wind production tax credit will have provided an estimated $22 billion to wind producers between 1992 and 2022, according to the Congressional Research Service. And that doesn't include the $12.9 billion that wind received from President Obama's federal stimulus bill.

I've been fighting against this subsidy for years because I think it is a bad deal for American taxpayers, a bad deal for rate payers, and a bad deal for U.S. competitiveness. And if we want to see what the result of those policies would be let's look again at Germany, and other parts of Europe.

Just last week energy expert Daniel Yergin wrote that one of the biggest themes at this year's World Economic Forum in Davos was ''competitiveness.'' ''This particular rivalry [competitiveness] pits the United States head-on against Europe,'' he said.

Yergin says that energy is one way to measure competitiveness, and that was the focus at Davos. He went on to say, ''European industrial electricity prices are twice as high as those in some countries and are much higher than those in the United States. To a significant degree, this is the result of a pell-mell push toward high-cost renewable electricity (wind and solar), which is imposing heavy costs on consumers and generating large fiscal burdens for governments.'' A January 2014 New York Times article entitled ''German Energy Official Sounds a Warning'' reports that, ''The minister, Sigmar Gabriel, in his first major policy speech, said at an annual energy conference organized by the publication Handelsblatt in Berlin that annual consumer costs for renewables of about 24 billion euros, or about $32.5 billion, were already pushing the limits of what the German economy, Europe's most powerful, could handle.'' In a BBC News article, ''Can Germany afford its energy bender' shift to green power?'' a minister for economics in Germany says that Germany's ''law on renewable energy will not only lead to increased electricity prices, but it is also a non-market, planned system that endangers the industrial base of'' the German economy.

This doesn't sound like the path down which America should go to build a 21st-century economy. And yet, forces in Congress are preparing to renew the expired wind subsidy and continue to take us down the path that's currently causing problems in Germany. The problem here is not being ''for or against renewable'' energy or just wasting taxpayers' tax dollars. The problem is that these huge subsidies are propping up renewable energy at the expense of reliable energy. In the case of wind, this increases the occurrence of negative pricing.'

Government subsidies are so generous that in some markets wind developers can give away electricity and still make a profit. Such negative pricing' rewards expensive, unreliable power like wind and undercuts and punishes cheap, reliable power from nuclear and coal plants. This is a growing problem in the U.S. The more wind we subsidize and the more we build, the bigger the problem becomes. For a snapshot of where we are going, let's take another look at Europe.

A Wall Street Journal opinion piece by Rupert Darwall entitled ''Europe's Stark Renewables Lesson'' reports that ''the European Commission acknowledges that, because member states over-incentivized investment in renewables, they compounded the challenges'' posed by non-dispatchable electricity generation like wind.

The same threat applies to some markets here in the U.S., according to the Center for Strategic and International Studies. Negative pricing' caused by wind power tied to energy subsidies undercuts the operation of nuclear plants and could contribute to closing as many as 25 percent of our nuclear plants by 2020.

So, these subsidies are putting at risk our largest source of clean, cheap, reliable electricity—nuclear—and more importantly, putting at risk energy diversity.

This audience understands more than most the importance of energy diversity to help reduce price spikes and have a more reliable grid.

The recent polar vortex cold wave reminded us of the importance of diversity. When natural gas prices spiked, and demand was unusually high, nuclear and coal generations saved the day. You can't put a price on diversity, but when you need the lights to come on and the heater to kick in, diversity can be lifesaving, and wind subsidies are threatening that.

We need to go down a path to cheap, clean, reliable electricity.

That path would provide a pro-growth, pro-jobs energy policy that puts us more firmly on the path toward a competitive future and protects households and business across the country, especially during extreme conditions.

To start, the best way to achieve cheap, clean, reliable energy is through market-driven solutions. Some will say, well what about oil and gas, what about nuclear subsidies? The president in his State of the Union address called for an end to tax policy that gives ''$4 billion a year to fossil fuel industries.'' To begin with, fossil fuels contribute 67 percent of our electricity. ''Big Wind'' received $1.4 billion through the wind production tax credit last year but only produces 4 percent of America's electricity.

The president often likes to cite the billions of dollars in subsidies for the oil and gas industry. But here's the catch: many of these ''Big Oil'' subsidies the president likes to highlight are the same or similar to tax provisions that benefit other industries.

For example, Xerox, Microsoft and Caterpillar all benefit from tax provisions like the manufacturing tax credit, amortization, or depreciation of used equipment that the president is counting as ''Big Oil'' subsidies. And, of course, wind energy companies also benefit from many similar tax provisions—but the production tax credit for wind is in addition to regular tax code provisions that benefit many companies.

We should end wasteful, long-term special tax breaks, both for ''Big Oil'' and ''Big Wind.'' We should use the money we save from ending wasteful subsidies to reduce the federal debt and double energy research. Then we can let the free market determine the course forward, rather than the government picking ''winners and losers.''

In addition to supporting research, I believe it is appropriate for the government to jumpstart new technologies to allow time for the free enterprise system to take the reins, but these should be narrowly defined and temporary.

For example: Unconventional gas benefited from government research and a temporary tax credit—that expired in 1992. The full tax credit for plug-in electric cars was capped at 200,000 vehicles per manufacturer. The government provided research and licensing support for small modular reactors—but that ends after five years. There is a production

tax credit for nuclear power plants but it's limited to 6,000 megawatts.

On the other hand, we have the temporary wind production tax credit that was enacted in 1992 to jumpstart an industry, and according to the Congressional Research Service will cost taxpayers a total of $22 billion from 1992 through 2022. The most recent one-year extension—which gives wind developers 10 years of subsidies—would cost $12 billion over 10 years, according to the Joint Committee on Taxation. This is for what President Obama's former energy secretary called a ''mature technology'' that produces only 4 percent of our electricity and only works when the wind blows.

President Reagan used to say ''the nearest thing to eternal life we'll ever see on this Earth is a government program'' and that's too often the case with energy subsidies. The most glaring example is the more than 20-year-old subsidy for wind power, a technology that has matured. The United States uses 20 percent of all the electricity produced in the world for our computers, our businesses, our homes and our national defense. To rely on unreliable wind power when nuclear, coal and natural gas are available is the energy equivalent of going to war in sailboats. Those who oppose the path I am suggesting like to say that nuclear and coal aren't clean forms of electricity.

While this path isn't without its challenges, I'll take that argument on. Nuclear power is our largest source of air-pollution-free electricity, 60 percent. Then people opposing nuclear power will say, ''what about the waste?'' This is an issue of great concern to many of you. To address this challenge, I have cosponsored legislation with Senators Wyden, Murkowski and Feinstein that would implement the recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future.

The bill would create a new federal agency to oversee the nuclear waste program, and ensure that progress on consolidated storage sites and repositories moves along parallel tracks. The federal government should not be collecting fees without keeping its promise to dispose of the nuclear waste now sitting in your states. The D.C. Court of Appeals opinion in your case has made this point clear.

The Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee has held two hearings on the legislation, and we are working toward having the committee hold a markup and favorably report the bill so it can move to the Senate floor.

We know how to control mercury, smog and soot, and many utilities are leading the way in installing these technologies, including the Tennessee Valley Authority.

So in order to burn coal in a clean way, the only remaining obstacle is carbon emissions from coal plants. The best way to solve that problem is not through a cap-and-trade system, which would raise prices, but instead through research and development, which could lower them. Finding a way to capture carbon from coal plants and turn it into a product that can be sold is the Holy Grail of energy research—and we are working on solutions that will do just that.

ARPA-E, a small energy research agency, is working with private companies to take the carbon from coal plants and feed it to microbes that with electricity can produce liquid transportation fuels. Such a solution might even make coal cheaper than it is today.

When you think about it that way, this crossroads I'm talking about—this fork in the road between clean, cheap, reliable energy and the mess of Germany and other European countries—is not just a challenge, but an opportunity.

It's true that our energy needs are great, and that there are obstacles to meeting them. But we also have an opportunity to get Washington out of the way and to liberate our free enterprise system. If we do, the path toward cheap, clean, reliable energy is full of possibility.●

TRIBUTE TO MITCH FOX

● Mr. HELLER. Madam President, today I wish to honor Nevadan Mitch Fox for his dedication to journalistic fairness and quality of character.

With almost 39 years of experience working for Las Vegas PBS, Mitch has come to be recognized as a journalist of integrity. Facilitating debate over a multitude of topics, Mitch has shown nothing but respect to his guests, always appreciating and inviting differences of opinion. Whether moderating a debate or a roundtable interview, the respect that Mitch commands encourages quality conversation and civil dialogue.

Mitch's legacy of nonpartisan journalism has made him a go-to source for news coverage. He serves as a shining example within his profession.

I will remember Mitch's welcoming and professional demeanor fondly, and I wish him luck on the next phase of his already distinguished career.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring this respectable Nevada journalist.●

TRIBUTE TO WILLIE McTEAR

● Mr. HELLER. Madam President, I wish to honor long-time Las Vegas resident and veteran, Willie McTear, who served our Nation in Vietnam.

Our Nation's veterans—the very men and women who put themselves in harm's way—protect the freedoms that Americans enjoy every day. I am grateful to these brave men and women in the Armed Forces, as well as their families, who make significant sacrifices in service to our Nation.

I am humbled to honor Mr. McTear for his dedication while serving in the military as a Rifleman/90mm Specialist. Mr. McTear is a veteran of Charlie Company, which was one of the last combat infantries of 160 men to be drafted, trained, and sent to fight in Vietnam. Despite significant risks and challenges, the men of the 4th Battalion of the 47th Infantry saw their service as a rite of passage. However, it did not come without the wounds of war and the loss of close comrades, and for that, our Nation is indebted to these servicemembers.

Serving on the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, I recognize that Congress has a responsibility not only to honor these brave individuals, but to ensure they are cared for when they return home. I remain committed to upholding this promise for our veterans and servicemembers in Nevada and throughout the Nation.

Today, we commend Mr. McTear for his acts of valor and the continuous sacrifices made by all of our servicemembers to ensure the safety and security of our Nation. We owe them and their families a great deal of gratitude for their commitment to America. I am proud to join the citizens of Nevada in recognizing Mr. McTear, and I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring him for his service on behalf of this great Nation.●

2014 PARALYMPIANS

● Mr. HELLER. Madam President, today I wish to extend a well-deserved congratulations to Amy Purdy, a Nevadan who has earned the unique distinction of being named to the 2014 United States Paralympic Team. Amy is the only double amputee competing in snowboard cross. Ranking internationally as the No. 2 athlete in the sport in her field, I am proud to recognize her and some of our Nation's greatest athletes as members of Paralympic Team USA.

A Las Vegas native, Amy embodies the epitome of battle born having defeated a number of setbacks after contracting a deadly strain of meningitis at only 19 years of age. Amy overcame this significant challenge without hesitation and stands stronger than ever today. Just 3 months after her release from the hospital in 2001, Amy was back on her snowboard, shredding all statistics that said she should not have been alive.

The snow is not the only place where Amy showcases her talents. Upon her return from Sochi, Amy will compete on season 18 of Dancing with the Stars, where she hopes to raise awareness for the Paralympic movement.

In addition to challenging herself athletically, Amy champions all unique levels of abilities through her founding work with Adaptive Action Sports, an action sport development program for youth, young adults, and wounded veterans, all with permanent, physical disabilities.

I wish Amy the best of luck on her trip in Sochi. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating this remarkable athlete and Silver State citizen as we show support for the entire U.S. Paralympic Team.●

TRIBUTE TO ED VOGEL

● Mr. HELLER. Madam President, I wish to honor Nevadan Ed Vogel for his longtime dedication to journalistic integrity and for providing Nevadans with quality reporting. Working 35 years with the Las Vegas Review-Journal, Ed has covered the gamut of news stories as the RJ's Capital Bureau Chief.

My fondest memories of Ed go as far back as when I served as secretary of state. It was with great pleasure that Ed and I operated with an open-door policy. Whenever he walked into my office, I knew I should settle in for an interesting story or an entertaining

anecdote. I look back on those conversations fondly. Ed is a true character, and one that will be greatly missed in the halls of our Nation's Capitol.

Well-known throughout Nevada for his endless curiosity, Ed was introduced to the Nevada Newspaper Hall of Fame in 2012. His experience spans the better part of four decades, beginning back in 1971, he serves as an example within his profession. Committed to the story, truth above all, his words' worth today is immeasurable.

As Ed announces his retirement, I reflect fondly upon our interviews together and wish him the best of luck in his new era of life.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this upstanding Nevada journalist.●

TRIBUTE TO LAWRENCE SELLERS

● Mr. KIRK. Madam President, on the afternoon of January 29, 2013, Lawrence D. Sellers, Jr. and his friends were relaxing in Chicago's Vivian Gordon Harsh Park after finishing their high school final exams. Shots rang out. Lawrence pushed his girlfriend out of harm's way. A bullet struck his left leg below the calf. And as the group tried to run away, Lawrence heard a scream and turned around to see his friend, Hadiya Pendleton, falling to the ground.

Hadiya's murder has become a rallying cry in Chicago to give law enforcement the tools they need to reduce gang and gun violence. I remain committed to passing legislation that bears her name to stop the straw purchasing and trafficking of guns that can end up in the hands of dangerous gangs like the Gangster Disciples. I will continue working with Chicago Mayor Rahm Emanuel and Chicago Police Superintendent Garry McCarthy to ensure additional Federal resources are promptly delivered to implement a holistic, all-of-government strategy to make our communities safer.

But today I wish to recognize Lawrence for his bravery and heroism—because inside this tragedy, we can find a spark of hope to restore our faith in what is possible when good people are not afraid to do the right thing. Lawrence is that spark.

A senior at King College Prep in North Kenwood with aspirations of becoming a math teacher, Lawrence is an Eagle Scout, and, just last month, he received the Honor Medal from the Boy Scouts of America.

''Doing the right thing, you shouldn't get an award for it,'' Lawrence said with great humility. ''But I am honored to receive it, of course; I just feel like it's just the right thing.''

In a community torn apart by gang violence, it is not always easy to do the right thing—or to always know what the right thing is in the first place. That is what makes groups like the Boy Scouts and other community youth groups so important in a holistic antigang violence strategy.

I am proud to join the Boy Scouts of America in honoring Lawrence Sellers. Lawrence is a role model to his peers and a reminder that supporting civic-minded youth organizations like the Boy Scouts must be a part of our antiviolence, antigang strategy.●

TRIBUTE TO PATRICK SULLIVAN

● Mr. KIRK. Madam President, I wish to recognize and thank Mr. Patrick Sullivan, the retiring director of the Captain James A. Lovell Federal Health Care Center—FHCC—in North Chicago, IL. Lovell Hospital is a first-of-its-kind partnership between the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense—DoD,—integrating all medical care into the Nation's first truly joint Federal health care facility with a single combined VA and Navy mission. The men and women of Lovell Hospital serve approximately 67,000 servicemembers, veterans, and their families through a network of eight facilities in Illinois and Wisconsin.

Mr. Sullivan served as the facility's first director when it was formally established in October 2010. As director, he took on the daunting task of integrating the North Chicago VA Medical Center and Naval Health Clinic Great Lakes and combining the missions of caring for active duty military members, their families, military retirees and veterans.

Mr. Sullivan has skillfully led a VA/DoD team of over 3,000 as they have developed a national model for integrated Federal health care.

Mr. Sullivan had a long and successful career caring for our Nation's heroes. He served as the director of the North Chicago VA Medical Center before its integration into the Lovell FHCC. He has worked at VA Medical Centers across the country, including centers in Prescott, AZ, Portland; OR, Martinez, CA and Poplar Bluff, MO. Mr. Sullivan also extends his leadership skills to his community, serving on the board of several community organizations in Lake County, Ill.

I wish to personally thank Pat Sullivan for his service to our country and its veterans. His tireless efforts to make the Lovell Hospital vision a reality will not be forgotten. His work was ahead of its time and stands as a model for the future.●

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I rise today to honor GEN Robert Cone, commanding general of the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command. After 35 years of service, General Cone has announced he will retire from the Army on March 17, 2014, and it is my pleasure to celebrate General Cone's career and express the pride that all New Hampshire citizens feel in recognizing his accomplishments. As one of only 10 4-star generals in the U.S. Armed Forces, General Cone has reached the pinnacle of success for a professional soldier. Perhaps more importantly, he has left an indelible mark on the character of the U.S. Army and the young men and women who comprise the heart and soul of it.

Born and raised in Manchester, NH, General Cone is a graduate of Memorial High School, where as a member of the football team he was inspired by his coach to pursue an appointment to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. After successfully completing his studies at West Point, General Cone was commissioned as an armor officer and began a career that would take him around the United States and the world in a range of leadership roles, including Afghanistan as the commander of the Combined Security Transition Command and Iraq as commander of the III Corps.

In addition to his role as an Army officer, General Cone embraced the role of scholar, earning a master's degree in sociology from the University of Texas, Austin, which he leveraged as an instructor and assistant professor at West Point in the Department of Behavioral Sciences and Leadership. General Cone also earned advanced degrees from the Command and General Staff College and the Naval War College. Fully engaged in the Army's efforts to improve training and leadership development, General Cone was appointed military director of the Joint Advanced Warfighting Program at the Institute of Defense Analysis, and also led the Joint Forces Command's Lessons Learned Team in Iraq. During his command of the Army's National Training Center at Fort Irvin, General Cone oversaw a shift in training towards counterinsurgency operations at a crucial time in the War on Terror.

In 2011 General Cone assumed command of U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command, TRADOC, placing him at the forefront of planning for the future of the Army. He has approached each challenge with the fundamental understanding that war is a human endeavor dependent on a person's will just as much as equipment and machinery. Just one of many examples of the leadership and foresight exhibited by General Cone, he has served as an articulate proponent of ''Soldier 2020'', a service-wide effort to maximize combat effectiveness by casting aside gender constructs. General Cone leaves behind a well-established legacy as commander of TRADOC.

The U.S. Army will no doubt continue to benefit from General Cone's leadership and vision for years to come. I ask my colleagues and all Americans to join me in thanking GEN Robert Cone for his service to our country and wish him the best in his retirement.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:31 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 4138. An act to protect the separation of powers in the Constitution of the United States by ensuring that the President takes care that the laws be faithfully executed, and for other purposes.

At 4:34 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following joint resolution, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 32. Joint resolution providing for the reappointment of John W. McCarter as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

At 7:38 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 93. Concurrent resolution directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make technical corrections in the enrollment of H.R. 3370.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 4138. An act to protect the separation of powers in the Constitution of the United States by ensuring that the President takes care that the laws be faithfully executed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 2122. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare sustainable growth rate and to improve Medicare and Medicaid payments, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

H.R. 3474. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of the employer mandate under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

H.R. 3979. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 2148. A bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, 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–4927. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Oranges and Grapefruit Grown in Lower Rio Grande Valley in Texas and Imported Oranges; Change in Size Requirements for Oranges'' (Docket No. AMS–FV–14–0009; FV14–906–1 IR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–4928. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Oranges and Grapefruit Grown in Lower Rio Grande Valley in Texas; Change in Size and Grade Requirements for Oranges'' (Docket No. AMS–FV–14–0015; FV14–906–2 IR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–4929. A communication from the Regulatory Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Base III Conforming Amendments Related to Cross-References, Subordinated Debt and Limits Based on Regulatory Capital'' (RIN1557–AD73) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 11, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4930. A communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 2013 report (covering trade in calendar year 2012) relative to the impact of the Andean Trade Preference Act on U.S. trade and employment; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4931. A communication from the Chief of the Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Extension of Import Restrictions on Archaeological and Ecclesiastical Ethnological Materials from Honduras'' (RIN1515–AE00) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4932. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Application of Section 871(m) to Specified Equity-Linked Instruments'' (Notice 2014–14) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 11, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4933. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Information Reporting of Minimum Essential Coverage'' ((RIN1545–BL31) (TD 9660)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 11, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4934. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report certifying for fiscal year 2014 that no United Nations agency or United Nations affiliated agency grants any official status, accreditation, or recognition to any organization which promotes and condones or seeks the legalization of pedophilia, or which includes as a subsidiary or member any such organization; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4935. A communication from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits'' (29 CFR Part 4022) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4936. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Strategic Plan for the Department of Health and Human Services for fiscal years 2014–2018; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4937. A communication from the Members of the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's Congressional Justification of Budget Estimates Report for fiscal year 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4938. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''General Services Administration Acquisition Regulation; Electronic Contracting Initiative (ECI)'' (RIN3090–AJ36) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4939. A communication from the Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting, pursuant to law, the strategic plan for the Office of Government Ethics for fiscal years 2014 through 2018; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4940. A communication from the President of the James Madison Memorial Fellowship Foundation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Foundation's Annual Report for the year ending September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4941. A communication from the Deputy Associate Director for Management and Administration and Designated Reporting Official, Office on National Drug Control Policy, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Director of National Drug Control Policy, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2014; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4942. 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 ''Disclosures to Participate in State Prescription Drug Monitoring Programs'' (RIN2900–AO45) received in the Office of the

President of the Senate on March 12, 2014; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–4943. A communication from the Chairwomen of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Federal Trade Commission Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years 2014–2018''; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4944. A communication from the Administrator, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Administration's decision to enter into a contract with a private security screening company to provide screening services at Kansas City International Airport; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4945. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Houma Navigation Canal, Mile Marker 35.5 to 36.5, and Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Mile Marker 59.0 to 60.0, West of Harvey Locks, bank to bank; Houma, Terrebonne Parish, LA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2012–0880)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4946. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Bone Island Triathlon, Atlantic Ocean; Key West, FL'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0905)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4947. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Vessel Movement, Christina River; Wilmington, DE'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–1002)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4948. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; BWRC Southwest Showdown Three; Parker, AZ'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–1034)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4949. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone for Ice Conditions; Baltimore Captain of the Port Zone'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0509)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4950. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Olympus Tension Leg Platform'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0070)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4951. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Potomac and Anacostia Rivers; Washington, D.C.'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–1050)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4952. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Security Zone; On the Water in Kailua Bay, Oahu, HI'' ((RIN1625–AA87) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0934)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4953. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Security Zone; North American International Auto Show; Detroit River, Detroit, MI'' ((RIN1625–AA87) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0034)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4954. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Security Zone; Mississippi River, New Orleans, LA'' ((RIN1625–AA87) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0994)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4955. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulations; Eleventh Coast Guard District Annual Marine Events'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0361)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4956. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Anchorage Grounds and Safety Zone, Delaware River; Marcus Hook, PA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–1014)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4957. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Anchorage Regulations: Pacific Ocean at San Nicolas Island, CA; Restricted Anchorage Areas'' ((RIN1625–AA01) (Docket No. USCG–2012–0967)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4958. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Alaska Marine Highway System Port Valdez Ferry Terminal, Port Valdez; Valdez, AK'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2012–0365)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4959. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report related to the Colorado River System Reservoirs for 2014; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–4960. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Annual Report to Congress on the Medicare and Medicaid Integrity Programs Report for Fiscal Year 2012''; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4961. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Review Group, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Farm Storage Facility Loan Program; Security Requirements'' (RIN0560–AI19) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–4962. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country regarding any possible affects such a sale might have relating to Israel's Qualitative Military Edge over military threats to Israel (OSS–2014–0271); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. CARPER for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

*L. Reginald Brothers, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary for Science and Technology, 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.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE—TREATIES

The following executive reports of committee were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Treaty Doc. 112–4: Agreement on Port State Measures to Prevent, Deter, and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported, and Unregulated Fishing with 1 declaration (Ex. Rept. 113–1);

Treaty Doc. 113–1: Convention on the Conservation and Management of High Seas Fishery Resources in the South Pacific Ocean with 1 declaration (Ex. Rept. 113–2);

Treaty Doc. 113–2: Convention on the Conservation and Management of High Seas Fisheries Resources in the North Pacific Ocean with 1 declaration (Ex. Rept. 113–3); and

Treaty Doc. 113–3: Amendment to the Convention on Future Multilateral Cooperation in the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries with 1 declaration (Ex. Rept. 113–4)

The text of the committee-recommended resolutions of advice and consent to ratification are as follows:

[Treaty Doc. 112–4 Agreement on Port State Measures to Prevent, Deter, and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported, and Unregulated Fishing]

RESOLUTION OF ADVICE AND CONSENT TO RATIFICATION OF THE PORT STATE MEASURES AGREEMENT

Resolved, (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein),

Section 1. Senate Advice and Consent Subject to a Declaration.

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the Agreement on Port State Measures to Prevent, Deter, and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported, and Unregulated Fishing, done at the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, in Rome, Italy, November 22, 2009, and signed by the United States November 22, 2009 (the ''Agreement'') (Treaty Doc. 112–4), subject to the declaration of section 2.

SEC. 2. Declaration.

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following declaration: The Agreement is non self-executing.

[Treaty Doc. 113–1 Convention on the Conservation and Management of High Seas Fishery Resources in the South Pacific Ocean]

RESOLUTION OF ADVICE AND CONSENT TO RATIFICATION OF THE HIGH SEAS FISHERIES CONVENTION—SOUTH PACIFIC

Resolved, (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein),

Section 1. Senate Advice and Consent Subject to a Declaration.

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the Convention on the Conservation and Management of High Seas Fishery Resources in the South Pacific Ocean, done at Auckland, New Zealand, November 14, 2009, and signed by the United States January 31, 2011 (the ''Convention'') (Treaty Doc. 113–1), subject to the declaration of section 2.

Sec. 2. Declaration.

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following declaration: The Convention is not self-executing.

[Treaty Doc. 113–2 Convention on the Conservation and Management of High Seas Fisheries Resources in the North Pacific Ocean]

RESOLUTION OF ADVICE AND CONSENT TO RATIFICATION OF THE HIGH SEAS FISHERIES CONVENTION—NORTH PACIFIC

Resolved, (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein),

Section 1. Senate Advice and Consent Subject to a Declaration.

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the Convention on the Conservation and Management of High Seas Fisheries Resources in the North Pacific Ocean, done at Tokyo February 24, 2012, and signed by the United States May 2, 2012 (the ''Convention'') (Treaty Doc. 113–2), subject to the declaration of section 2.

Sec. 2. Declaration.

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following declaration: The Convention is not self-executing.

[Treaty Doc. 113–3 Amendment to the Convention on Future Multilateral Cooperation in the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries]

RESOLUTION OF ADVICE AND CONSENT TO RATIFICATION OF THE AMENDMENT TO HIGH SEAS FISHERIES CONVENTION—NORTH ATLANTIC

Resolved, (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein),

Section 1. Senate Advice and Consent Subject to a Declaration.

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the Amendment to the Convention on Future Multilateral Cooperation in the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, adopted at the Twenty-Ninth Annual Meeting of the North Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO) (the ''Amendment'') in Lisbon, Portugal, September 28, 2007 (Treaty Doc. 113–3), subject to the declaration of section 2.

Sec. 2. Declaration.

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following declaration: The Amendment is not self-executing.

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. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

S. 2125. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to ensure the integrity of voice communications and to prevent unjust or unreasonable discrimination among areas of the United States in the delivery of such communications; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mr. KIRK):

S. 2126. A bill to launch a national strategy to support regenerative medicine through the establishment of a Regenerative Medicine Coordinating Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 2127. A bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 relative to the powers of the Department of Justice Inspector General; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 2128. A bill to name the Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in Waco, Texas, as the ''Doris Miller Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico:

S. 2129. A bill to amend the Department of Energy Organization Act to improve technology transfer at the Department of Energy by reducing bureaucratic barriers to industry, entrepreneurs, and small businesses, as well as ensure that public investments in research and development generate the greatest return on investment for taxpayers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 2130. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to temporarily waive certain vehicle weight limits for covered logging vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BEGICH (for himself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 2131. A bill to amend the statutory authorities of the Coast Guard to strengthen Coast Guard prevention and response capabilities in the Arctic, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. ENZI):

S. 2132. A bill to amend the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act of 2005, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 2133. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and other statutes to clarify appropriate liability standards for Federal antidiscrimination claims; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MANCHIN:

S. 2134. A bill to withdraw approval for the drug Zohydro ER and prohibit the Food and Drug Administration from approving such drug unless it is reformulated to prevent abuse; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. LEVIN):

S. 2135. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that products derived from tar sands are crude oil for purposes of the Federal excise tax on petroleum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 2136. A bill to ensure that oil transported through the Keystone XL pipeline into the United States is used to reduce United States dependence on Middle Eastern oil; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 2137. A bill to ensure that holders of flood insurance policies under the National Flood Insurance Program do not receive premium refunds for coverage of second homes; considered and passed.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN:

S. 2138. A bill to provide a payroll tax holiday for newly hired veterans; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 2139. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the exclusion for small business stock, to provide incentives for small business high technology research investment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico):

S. 2140. A bill to improve the transition between experimental permits and commercial licenses for commercial reusable launch vehicles; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 2141. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide an alternative process for review of safety and effectiveness of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. KIRK):

S. 2142. A bill to impose targeted sanctions on persons responsible for violations of human rights of antigovernment protesters in Venezuela, to strengthen civil society in Venezuela, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN:

S. 2143. A bill to increase access to capital for veteran entrepreneurs to help create jobs; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL:

S. 2144. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to apply Medicare competitive bidding to vacuum erection systems and to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to implement a national mail order program for such devices; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. REID, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 2145. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to permit facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs to be designated as voter registration agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. COBURN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. FLAKE):

S. 2146. A bill to establish a United States Patent and Trademark Office Innovation Promotion Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HAGAN (for herself, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. NELSON):

S. 2147. A bill to amend Public Law 112–59 to provide for the display of the congressional gold medal awarded to the Montford Point Marines, United States Marine Corps, by the Smithsonian Institution and at other appropriate locations; considered and passed.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. HELLER, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. KIRK):

S. 2148. A bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S.J. Res. 34. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to give States the right to repeal Federal laws and regulations when ratified by the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. WALSH):

S. Res. 383. A resolution designating March 2014 as ''National Middle Level Education Month''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WARNER, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KING, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. Res. 384. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate concerning the humanitarian crisis in Syria and neighboring countries, resulting humanitarian and development challenges, and the urgent need for a political solution to the crisis; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mr. ENZI):

S. Res. 385. A resolution expressing the Sense of the Senate regarding the use of electronic devices on the floor of the Senate; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. COONS, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota):

S. Res. 386. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Professional Social Work Month and World Social Work Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. BEGICH):

S. Res. 387. A resolution celebrating the 2014 Arctic Winter GAmes, in Fairbanks, Alaska; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CHAMBLISS (for himself and Mr. CASEY):

S. Res. 388. A resolution designating March 22, 2014, as ''National Rehabilitation Counselors Appreciation Day''; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. Res. 389. A resolution designating the week of March 9, 2014, through March 15, 2014, as ''National Youth Synthetic Drug Awareness Week''; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. Res. 390. A resolution designating March 11, 2014, as ''World Plumbing Day''; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. HATCH):

S. Res. 391. A resolution designating Jean M. Manning as Chief Counsel for Employment Emeritus of the United States Senate; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. Res. 392. A resolution to authorize document production and representation in Care One Management LLC, et al. v. United Healthcare Workers East, SEIU 1199, et al; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 15

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 15, a bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law.

S. 56

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 56, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the credit for employers establishing workplace child care facilities, to increase the child care credit to encourage greater use of quality child care services, to provide incentives for students to earn child care-related degrees and to work in child care facilities, and to increase the exclusion for employer-provided dependent care assistance.

S. 132

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) were added as cosponsors of S. 132, a bill to provide for the admission of the State of New Columbia into the Union.

S. 375

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 375, a bill to require Senate candidates to file designations, statements, and reports in electronic form.

S. 557

At the request of Mrs. HAGAN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 557, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to medication therapy management under part D of the Medicare program.

S. 772

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 772, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to clarify the Food and Drug Administration's jurisdiction over certain tobacco products, and to protect jobs and small businesses involved in the sale, manufacturing and distribution of traditional and premium cigars.

S. 842

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 842, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an extension of the Medicare-dependent hospital (MDH) program and the increased payments under the Medicare low-volume hospital program.

S. 895

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 895, a bill to improve the ability of the Food and Drug Administration to study the use of antimicrobial drugs in food-producing animals.

S. 933

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 933, a bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the authorization of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program through fiscal year 2018.

S. 987

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 987, a bill to maintain the free flow of information to the public by providing conditions for the federally compelled disclosure of information by certain persons connected with the news media.

S. 1011

At the request of Mr. JOHANNS, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1011, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes.

S. 1086

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1086, a bill to reauthorize and improve the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, and for other purposes.

S. 1114

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1114, a bill to provide for identification of misaligned currency, require action to correct the misalignment, and for other purposes.

S. 1174

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1174, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 65th Infantry Regiment, known as the Borinqueneers.

S. 1188

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1188, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of full-time employee for purposes of the individual mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 1256

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1256, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to preserve the effectiveness of medically important antimicrobials used in the treatment of human and animal diseases.

S. 1406

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. WALSH) were added as cosponsors 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. 1410

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1410, a bill to focus limited Federal resources on the most serious offenders.

S. 1456

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1456, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Shimon Peres.

S. 1462

At the request of Mr. JOHANNS, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1462, a bill to extend the positive train control system implementation deadline, and for other purposes.

S. 1507

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1507, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the treatment of general welfare benefits provided by Indian tribes.

S. 1622

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1622, a bill to establish the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children, and for other purposes.

S. 1708

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1708, a bill to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect to the establishment of performance measures for the highway safety improvement program, and for other purposes.

S. 1729

At the request of Mr. KAINE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1729, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide further options with respect to levels of coverage under qualified health plans.

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1729, supra.

S. 1737

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) 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. 1956

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1956, a bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to review the discharge characterization of former members of the Armed Forces who were discharged by reason of the sexual orientation of the member, and for other purposes.

S. 2013

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2013, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal of Senior Executive Service employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs for performance, and for other purposes.

S. 2037

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 2037, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to remove the 96-hour physician certification requirement for inpatient critical access hospital services.

S. 2058

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2058, a bill to establish a loan guarantee program for natural gas distribution grids to be installed in areas with extremely high energy costs.

S. 2059

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2059, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit for the purchase of heating and cooling equipment which meets the Energy Star program requirements and is used in certain high-cost energy communities, and for other purposes.

S. 2066

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2066, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the intentional discrimination of a person or organization by an employee of the Internal Revenue Service.

S. 2067

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2067, a bill to prohibit the Department of the Treasury from assigning tax statuses to organizations based on their political beliefs and activities.

S. 2068

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2068, a bill to provide for the development and use of technology for personalized handguns, to require that, within 3 years, all handguns manufactured or sold in, or imported into, the United States incorporate such technology, and for other purposes.

S. 2069

At the request of Mr. KAINE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2069, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand and modify the credit for employee health insurance expenses of small employers.

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2069, supra.

S. 2082

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2082, a bill to provide for the development of criteria under the Medicare program for medically necessary short inpatient hospital stays, and for other purposes.

S. 2086

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 2086, a bill to address current emergency shortages of propane and other home heating fuels and to provide greater flexibility and information for Governors to address such emergencies in the future.

S. 2091

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms.

MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2091, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the processing by the Department of Veterans Affairs of claims for benefits under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 2105

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2105, a bill to prohibit the Federal funding of a State firearms ownership database.

S. 2118

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2118, a bill to protect the separation of powers in the Constitution of the United States by ensuring that the President takes care that the laws be faithfully executed, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 33

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 33, a concurrent resolution celebrating the 100th anniversary of the enactment of the Smith-Lever Act, which established the nationwide Cooperative Extension System.

S. RES. 377

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 377, a resolution recognizing the 193rd anniversary of the independence of Greece and celebrating democracy in Greece and the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 2807

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2807 intended to be proposed to S. 1086, a bill to reauthorize and improve the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2808

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2808 intended to be proposed to S. 1086, a bill to reauthorize and improve the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2810

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2810 intended to be proposed to S. 1086, a bill to reauthorize and improve the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2822

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2822 proposed to S. 1086, a bill to reauthorize and improve the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2834

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2834 proposed to S. 1086, a bill to reauthorize and improve the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2835

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2835 intended to be proposed to S. 1086, a bill to reauthorize and improve the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2839

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2839 proposed to S. 1086, a bill to reauthorize and improve the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2842

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2842 proposed to S. 1086, a bill to reauthorize and improve the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2843

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2843 intended to be proposed to S. 1086, a bill to reauthorize and improve the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

S. 2125. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to ensure the integrity of voice communications and to prevent unjust or unreasonable discrimination among areas of the United States in the delivery of such communications; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss a widespread problem affecting rural communities in South Dakota and across our country. This issue represents both a public safety and economic issue for rural America.

For far too long, rural communities have experienced problems with long-distance or wireless telephone calls that are not being properly connected. The call completion problem extends beyond South Dakota and has affected telephone customers in dozens of states. These call failures create frustration and concern for family members trying to connect with friends and family, as well as small businesses losing business because they miss calls from customers. The problem also poses a serious public safety threat, such as when a police dispatcher cannot reach law enforcement or when a doctor cannot call a patient regarding follow-up care. Rural telephone customers affected by this problem are rightfully frustrated and demand a solution.

I first learned about this issue from the manager of a rural health clinic in Canistota, SD. The clinic has experienced a decline in business as a result of the call completion problems. Incoming calls regularly do not reach the clinic and therefore go unanswered. Additionally, some patients have heard misleading messages about the clinic's number being disconnected, which leads them to believe the clinic has closed. This is just one example of the negative impact this problem is having on communities and Main Street businesses across rural America.

To be honest, I could barely believe it when I first learned about this issue. Today, we should be worried about narrowing the digital divide not worrying whether rural communities have access to basic telephone service. While many factors could be at play, the Federal Communications Commission believes the use of third-party ''least cost routers'' to connect calls is a leading cause of the problem. It appears that some of these intermediate providers are failing to properly complete calls to avoid the higher access charges associated with rural telephone networks. It is particularly challenging to resolve the problem because calls are often dropped before they reach the rural telephone network, making it difficult for rural providers to pinpoint when and where problems occur.

Over the past few years, I have worked with many of my Senate colleagues, the FCC, telephone providers, and consumers to fix this problem and hold those causing this problem accountable. I would like to say a special thank you to Senators AMY KLOBUCHAR and DEB FISCHER for joining me in introducing a Sense of the Senate resolution last May that directed the FCC to take action to end these discriminatory practices. Since our resolution

was introduced, the commission unanimously approved rules to strengthen its ability to monitor and enforce the delivery of calls to rural areas. Although the commission's rulemaking and ongoing investigation represent a step in the right direction, a more immediate resolution is needed.

Today, I introduced the Public Safety and Economic Security Communications Act. This legislation takes immediate action to stop the bad actors that are failing to complete calls to rural areas. The bill includes common sense reforms that will help end the discriminatory delivery of calls by requiring voice providers to register with the FCC and comply with basic service quality standards. The legislation will help ensure that small businesses, families, and emergency responders in every corner of South Dakota and across our country can once again rely upon connection of their incoming telephone calls.

I invite my colleagues to join me in stopping this problem by cosponsoring the Public Safety and Economic Security Communications Act.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 2128. A bill to name the Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in Waco, Texas, as the ''Doris Miller Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. CORNYN. 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. 2128

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On October 12, 1919, Doris Miller was born in Waco, Texas.

(2) On September 16, 1939, Miller enlisted in United States Navy as mess attendant, third class at Naval Recruiting Station, Dallas, Texas to serve for a period of six years.

(3) On February 16, 1941, Miller received a change of rating to mess attendant, second class.

(4) On June 1, 1942, Miller received a change of rating to mess attendant, first class.

(5) On June 1, 1943, Miller received a change of rating, to cook, third class.

(6) On November 25, 1944, Miller was presumed dead by the Secretary of the Navy a year and a day after being carried as missing in action since November 24, 1943 while serving aboard U.S.S. Liscome Bay when that vessel was torpedoed and sunk in the Pacific Ocean.

(7) Miller was awarded the Navy Cross Medal, Purple Heart Medal, American Defense Service Medal, Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal, and World War II Victory Medal.

(8) Miller's citation for the Navy Cross said ''for distinguished devotion to duty, extraordinary courage and disregard for his own personal safety during the attack on the Fleet in Pearl Harbor, Territory of Hawaii, by Japanese forces on December 7, 1941. While at the side of his Captain on the bridge, Miller, despite enemy strafing and bombing and in the face of a serious fire, assisted in moving his Captain, who had been mortally wounded, to a place of greater safety, and later manned and operated a machine gun directed at enemy Japanese attacking aircraft until ordered to leave the bridge.''.

(9) On June 20, 1973, the U.S.S. Miller (FF-1091), a Knox-class frigate, was named in honor of Doris Miller.

SEC. 2. NAME OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTER, WACO, TEXAS.

The Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in Waco, Texas, shall after the date of the enactment of this Act be known and designated as the ''Doris Miller Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center''. Any reference to such medical center in any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States shall be considered to be a reference to the Doris Miller Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico:

S. 2129. A bill to amend the Department of Energy Organization Act to improve technology transfer at the Department of Energy by reducing bureaucratic barriers to industry, entrepreneurs, and small businesses, as well as ensure that public investments in research and development generate the greatest return on investment for taxpayers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, New Mexico is blessed with some of the world's finest scientists. Each day, brilliant researchers at our universities and national labs go to work, and the results are amazing. At the same time, entrepreneurs in New Mexico and across the country are looking for opportunities to leverage innovation and to create new high-tech products and applications.

I rise to introduce the Accelerating Technology Transfer to Advance Innovation for the Nation—what we are calling the ATTAIN Act. That is a long title and an important goal: to improve the Department of Energy's technology transfer mission and to move innovation from the lab to the market. This grows our economy and creates a greater impact from our research and development dollars.

But before I talk to my colleagues about what the bill does, I wish to explain why it is so important. Tech transfer may seem to be just some technical issue, affecting bureaucratic rules or regulations, but it is more. It is how innovation in the lab today helps create jobs tomorrow.

In the 21st century, our national labs are the birthplace of innovation that creates new products and businesses and entire industries. Scientists are developing cutting-edge ways to power computers, to transmit new information, to heal the body. These innovations have great market potential in aviation, the military, medicine. They can be spun into high-tech businesses, changing the world, putting people to work.

In New Mexico, many companies have been formed as a result of discoveries at Los Alamos and Sandia National Labs. For example, Mustomo, Inc., a startup using technology developed at LANL, provides 3D ultrasound tomography for the detection of breast cancer, and technology from Sandia, used by TEAM Technologies, has created a device that can disable improvised explosive devices. Since 2010 over 4,000 units have been deployed and are saving lives in war zones right now.

But despite these amazing successes, we are operating at just a fraction of the potential. My home State could do so much more. New Mexico has all the ingredients to become a high-tech powerhouse. There are great minds at our national labs and military bases. We have fantastic universities and a booming energy industry. We need to create an environment to allow it to reach that potential. This is a major initiative of mine to help create the right formula to help industry take off in New Mexico. That is the purpose of my bill.

Almost a decade ago Congress created a Department of Energy Technology Transfer Coordinator to move innovation from the lab bench to the marketplace, to spur businesses and cutting-edge product development in New Mexico and across the Nation, to help entrepreneurs outside of the big-city powerhouses on the coasts get access to capital, to help them find partners in industry. But the Department has not come close to meeting its potential. A recent inspector general's report tells the story. It cited numerous deficiencies at DOE. The Department is over 7 years delinquent in finalizing its Technology Transfer Execution Plan, nor has DOE implemented a forward-looking process for its commercialization fund—over 2 years after being directed to do so by the former Secretary. In addition, the Technology Transfer Coordinator post at the Department has been vacant since April 2013. That is nearly 1 year after the previous Coordinator's departure. This position should be filled as quickly as possible with a qualified and motivated candidate.

Technology transfer is important in New Mexico and to the Nation, and the Department's failure to perform is unacceptable. My bill addresses these shortfalls. We can do better, and we have to. The first step is to make tech transfer a priority. Our goals are clear: consolidate bureaucracy, streamline contracting, and use models that have proven successful.

There are three key elements to my legislation.

First, it permanently authorizes new tools for the Secretary of Energy's new Department-wide technology transfer office to enable DOE and DOE's new Tech Transfer Coordinator to meet their responsibilities and to measure and report their progress. Better coordination is absolutely crucial so we can reduce barriers and efficiently use

the limited resources available. My bill requires that this office be accountable and responsible, that it work with the national labs and with industry in the right way at the Department and fully implement the EPACT Energy Technology Commercialization Fund—something DOE has yet to do according to Congress's original intent.

Second, the bill authorizes a new tech transfer corps, modeled on the National Science Foundation's Innovation Corps, to support investments in entrepreneurs, mentors, scientists, and engineers. It authorizes technology commercialization challenges that push—getting innovative technologies into the market—and also pull—enabling partnerships with industry to identify and focus on common challenges. It will also improve coordination of technology transfer and entrepreneurship priorities with universities, foundations, and nonprofits, both regionally and nationally.

Third, we adapt an existing public-private partnership model used by the Small Business Administration and apply it to technology transfer to increase access to capital for promising startup companies.

We are not asking for more money. We need to do more with what we have. We are not asking—and I want to emphasize that—we are not asking for more money. We need to do more with what we have. The bill requires DOE and SBA to work together, to use the strengths of each agency—DOE's innovative technology and SBA's financial acumen—and it increases investment in new technologies via the SBIC Impact and Early Stage Initiatives. The Impact Initiative includes SBA matching funds of up to $1 billion, and the Early Stage Initiative includes $1 billion more.

This collaboration addresses an important concern. Since 2008 less than 6 percent of these venture capital funds have been invested in seed funds and tech maturation, and 70 percent of that went into just three States—California, New York, and Massachusetts. There are great opportunities outside these three States. This bill will help those funds find them. States such as New Mexico have a surplus of innovative ideas and a lack of investment dollars. With this bill we can balance that equation.

The benefits are clear: new technology, new partnerships, and new opportunities. Cutting-edge research today means high-paying jobs tomorrow. American inventions and intellectual property fuel our economy. Mr. President, 75 U.S. industries are classified as intellectual property intensive. They added $5.8 trillion to U.S. output last year. They are 38 percent of our GDP. They directly or indirectly supply over 55 million jobs—jobs that on average pay 30 percent higher wages. These IP companies account for 74 percent of our exports.

We need to do all we can to support innovation and to improve technology transfer—the bridge between new discovery and new opportunity—to grow our economy, to create high-paying jobs. I believe this is something we can all support.

Last August I cohosted a tech transfer conference in Santa Fe. I met with nearly 200 of New Mexico's most successful entrepreneurs, innovators, and investors. We talked about the challenges and opportunities of technology transfer and how important it is to the future.

We have always succeeded by being one step ahead of the competition. American innovation has led the world in industry, in health care and transportation, in science and technology. The ATTAIN Act will help move that innovation from the lab to the marketplace, helping businesses grow, creating jobs, and keeping us competitive in a global marketplace.

For a student with a bright idea, for an entrepreneur with the drive to chase their dream, it can be a long road. Fortunately, they do not give up easily. They are as tough as they come. They are already giving so much with hard work, with taking risks. They do their part. DOE needs to do its part as well.

We all want to move innovation forward and to better coordinate the handoffs. I am committed to working with the Department of Energy to make this a reality. This is an important goal, and it should be an equally important priority. That is why I am introducing this bill today.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. ENZI):

S. 2132. A bill to amend the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act of 2005, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce S. 2132, the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act Amendments of 2014.

In recent years, the Committee on Indian Affairs has received concerns from Indian tribes and the energy industry that the Federal laws governing the development of tribal energy resources are complex and often lead to significant costs, delays, and uncertainty for all parties. These costs, delays, and uncertainties discourage development of tribal energy resources and drive investments away from tribal lands.

According to the National Congress of American Indians, Indian tribes hold nearly a quarter of American onshore oil and gas reserves. Yet, existing tribal energy production represents less than 5 percent of the current national production. If we can remove the costs and delays of developing energy on Indian lands, we could potentially see the country's energy production, and thus energy independence, increase significantly.

Over 8 years ago, Congress passed the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act. This act created a new, alternative process for Indian tribes to take control of developing their energy resources on their own lands without the burdens of administrative review, approval, and oversight. This approach gives Indian tribes the option to enter into tribal energy resource agreements with the Secretary of the Interior. Once an Indian tribe enters into this agreement, it has the authority to enter into subsequent leases, business agreements, and rights-of-way affecting energy development, without further review and approval by the Secretary—a significant departure from the standard laws, and consequent bureaucracy, applicable to tribal contracts. That approach was a step in the right direction.

However, the agreements and process authorized under the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act have not been utilized to the extent that they could be, primarily because the implementation of the act has been made more complex than it should be. It is time we make key improvements to the law so that Indian tribes can take advantage of these agreements and significantly reduce bureaucratic burdens to energy development. Years of consultation and outreach to Indian tribes have produced targeted solutions to address the concerns about the process for entering these agreements.

The bill that I am introducing today, S. 2132, would streamline the process for approving the tribal energy resource agreements and make it more predictable for Indian tribes.

I would like to highlight some of the key provisions in this bill. This bill includes a number of amendments to improve the review and approval process for the tribal energy resource agreements. For example, the bill provides clarity regarding the specific information required for tribal applications for these agreements. In addition, the bill sets forth specific timeframes for Secretarial determinations on the agreement applications. Moreover, if an application is disapproved, this bill would require the Secretary of the Interior to provide detailed explanations to the Indian tribe and steps for addressing the reasons for disapproval.

This bill also has various provisions that would improve technical assistance and consultation with Indian tribes during their energy planning and development stages. The bill also includes an amendment to the Federal Power Act that would put Indian tribes on a similar footing with States and municipalities for preferences when preliminary permits or original licenses for hydroelectric projects are issued.

Additionally, S. 2132 would allow Indian tribes and third parties to perform appraisals to help expedite the Secretary's approval process for tribal agreements for mineral resource development. This bill does not focus on only traditional resource development,

but includes renewal resource development components as well. For example, the bill would create tribal biomass demonstration projects to provide Indian tribes with more reliable and potentially longterm supplies of woody biomass materials.

My bill is intended to provide Indian tribes with the tools to develop and use energy more efficiently. In passing this bill, Congress will enhance the ability of Indian tribes to exercise self-determination over the development of energy resources located on tribal lands, thereby improving the lives and economic well-being of Native Americans.

Before I conclude, I would like to thank Senators ENZI, THUNE, HOEVEN, and MCCAIN for joining me in cosponsoring the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act Amendments of 2014. I urge my colleagues to join me in advancing S. 2132 expeditiously.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. REID, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 2145. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to permit facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs to be designated as voter registration agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to reintroduce the Veteran Voting Support Act, which is cosponsored by Senators LEAHY, DURBIN, and REID.

Almost 7 years ago, during the previous administration, I learned that a Department of Veterans Affairs facility in California had barred voter registration groups from accessing veterans in the facility. Similar reports emerged in other parts of the country.

This was unacceptable. Therefore, then-Senator Kerry and I worked with the VA to establish a fair, nonpartisan policy to facilitate voter registration and voting for veterans who receive services at VA facilities.

We held a hearing in the Rules Committee on a previous version of this bill on September 15, 2008, when I was Chairman of that committee.

One week before that hearing, the VA issued a directive that created a new and substantially improved policy to permit state and local election officials, as well as nonpartisan groups, to access VA facilities.

Yet many expressed concerns that it did not go far enough. For example, the Brennan Center for Justice, American Association for People with Disabilities, Common Cause, Demos, and the League of Women Voters sent me a letter stating that the directive was ''an important step in the right direction'' but stressed ''that the VA's recent directive will not be sufficient to protect the voting rights of the men and women served by the VA.''

Paul Sullivan, then Executive Director of Veterans for Common Sense, said: ''There is a veteran voting rights crisis. As many as 100,000 of our veterans living in VA facilities may not be able to vote in our November 4 election.''

Mr. Sullivan also explained a key problem facing veterans who live at a VA facility: ''When a veteran moves into a VA facility, the veteran's old registration becomes invalid. The veteran must re-register before he or she can vote again.''

In short, while many believed the VA's directive was not perfect, they also acknowledged it was an improvement.

I am sad to report that the 2008 voting assistance directive expired at the end of September 2013. That means no voting assistance directive is in place at the VA, with the mid-term elections only a few months away.

This is unacceptable. There is no justification for it. Veterans' voting rights, like the voting rights of others, do not have an expiration date.

There is no question about the continuing need for VA action in this area.

While the VA's directive was in place, from 2008 to 2012, veteran voter registration ticked up only slightly, from 77 to 78 percent, according to the Census Bureau's Current Population Survey.

But during the same period, actual voting by veterans dropped as a percentage of the veteran population—from 70.9 percent to 70.3 percent.

In raw numbers, there remain over 4.6 million veterans who either are unregistered or for whom the Census Bureau's data reports no response.

In the 2012 election, there were over 6.2 million veterans who either did not vote or for whom the Census data reports no response.

Thus, there is much more to do to help our veterans register and cast their ballots.

The VA is the agency best suited to do the job because it comes into contact with several million veterans each year.

In fact, in 2013, according to the VA's latest statistics, there were over 6.41 million unique patients in the VA health care system, up from 5.65 million in 2008, a 15 percent increase.

Today, I am reintroducing the Veteran Voting Support Act, which, unlike a VA directive, cannot be rescinded by the VA and would not expire.

This bill would take important steps to improve veterans' ability to register and vote.

First, the bill would require the VA to provide a veteran seeking to enroll in the VA health care system with a mail-in voter registration form. Such a form would also have to be provided to currently enrolled veterans upon a change of address or enrollment status.

The VA would be required to send such forms to the appropriate state election official within 10 days, or within five days if the form is received within five days before a registration deadline.

Second, the VA would be required to provide assistance to veterans seeking to register to vote using the mail-in form. Such assistance would be nonpartisan.

Third, the bill would require the director of a VA community living center, domiciliary, or medical center to provide assistance to veterans with respect to voting by absentee ballot, consistent with state and local laws. This section is limited to residents of a community living center or domiciliary and inpatients of a medical center.

Fourth, the bill would ensure that the VA provides access for nonpartisan organizations to provide voter registration and assistance at VA facilities.

This is subject to reasonable time, place, and manner restrictions, including limiting activities to regular business hours and requiring advance notice to the facility.

Fifth, the bill would prevent the VA from prohibiting access to VA facilities by election administration officials at the state and local levels, as long as the officials provide only nonpartisan information about voting, such as voter registration, voting systems, absentee balloting, and polling locations. This is also subject to reasonable, time, place, and manner restrictions.

Finally, the bill would require the VA to report annually on the number of veterans helped by this bill.

We owe our veterans a great debt. That debt includes a promise we will not deny them the right to vote and will commit to involving them in the process of choosing leaders who may send Americans into harm's way. This bill would help veterans register to vote, and it would help veterans living in VA facilities cast their ballots.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Veteran Voting Support Act.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. COBURN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. FLAKE):

S. 2146. A bill to establish a United States Patent and Trademark Office Innovation Promotion Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to protect and secure the user fees paid by America's inventors and businesses to the Patent and Trademark Office, and to stabilize that Office's funding, by introducing the Patent Fee Integrity Act. I want to thank my co-sponsors on this bill, Senators COBURN, KLOBUCHAR, and FLAKE.

Throughout most of its history, taxpayers supported the operations of the Patent and Trademark Office, or PTO, through appropriations from general funds. However, in 1990, Congress established a 69 percent user fee ''surcharge,'' so that the PTO became funded entirely through fees paid by its users, the American inventors who make our country the world's technological leader.

Unfortunately, almost immediately, Congress began using the funds that inventors paid to protect their inventions for other purposes. In 1992, $8.1

million in user fees were diverted. In 1993, $12.3 million was diverted. In 1994, $14.7 million. So it continued, growing each year, until what started as a trickle became a flood in 1998, with $199 million in PTO user fees diverted.

PTO user fees continued to be diverted in most of the following years, at varying levels. In fiscal year 2011, as Congress was finishing its work on major patent reform, a new fee diversion record was set, a staggering $209 million in user fees diverted from the PTO that year.

Meanwhile, at the same time that these fees were being taken away, the length of time that it took to get a patent out of the Patent Office steadily increased. In fiscal year 1991, average patent pendency was 18.2 months. By fiscal year 1999, it had increased to 25 months. By fiscal year 2010, average patent pendency had increased all the way to 35.3 months.

These are not just numbers. This is innovation being stifled from being brought to market. The longer it takes to get a patent approved, the longer a new invention, a potential technological breakthrough, sits on the shelf, gathering dust instead of spurring job growth and scientific and economic progress.

Ultimately, this dulls our country's competitive edge in the global economy. America's record of innovation is the envy of the world; it has provided us a marked competitive edge over the decades and even centuries. When we stifle the progress of our innovation within the PTO, we lose some of this competitive advantage, and the jobs and other economic benefits that accompany it.

Obviously, there is a direct relationship between fee diversion and patent pendency. The more fees that are diverted away from the PTO, the fewer patent examiners they can hire, the more patents each examiner has to process, and the longer it takes them to get to any individual patent—a longer patent pendency.

But it is not just the time that it takes to get a patent that is hurt by diversion of resources. The quality of the patents issued is harmed as well.

As members of this body know, the Senate Judiciary Committee is actively considering legislation to address abuses of the patent system, and the House of Representatives passed its own legislation on the subject by a strong bipartisan vote of 325–91.

A variety of businesses all over the country are being sued and subjected to letters demanding payment, often based on very questionable patents that should never have been issued by the Patent Office in the first place.

Businesses and lawyers have asserted patents for, by way of example: Scanning and e-mailing a document; completing a purchase on a website with one click, as opposed to multiple clicks; and e-mailing a press release, something that I think it's safe to say that every member of this body does many times each month.

When there aren't enough patent examiners to give patent applications sufficient attention, bad patents get issued.

As the President and CEO of the Internet Association, which represents leading Internet companies like Amazon, eBay, Expedia, Facebook, Hotels.com, Netflix, Twitter, and Yahoo!, puts it: ''the Patent Fee Integrity Act . . . would provide the Patent and Trademark Office with adequate funding and resources to improve overall patent quality. Improving patent quality is an essential step in improving the entire patent ecosystem by shutting off the supply of low-quality patents that fuel litigation by patent trolls.'' The Coalition for Patent Fairness, which includes such major companies as Blackberry, Cisco, Dell, Google, Oracle, and Verizon, notes that ''When patent quality suffers, innovation throughout America's economy is stymied, and patent trolls are able to prosper.''

To make sure the Patent and Trademark Office has the resources it needs to issue patents in a timely manner and to improve patent quality, in 2011, in the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act, we gave the PTO the authority to increase its user fees.

Some of us fought at that time to end the practice of fee diversion, led by my co-sponsor Senator COBURN, to make sure that the users got the full benefit of their increased fees. Unfortunately, our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol watered down the language that the Senate passed to accomplish this purpose.

One of the sponsors defended that language when it came back to the Senate, arguing that the bill ''creates a PTO reserve fund for any fees collected above the appropriated amounts in a given year—so that only the PTO will have access to these fees.''

I warned then that the House's changes provided no assurance that that is what would actually happen.

So what happened? Well, the PTO went ahead and raised its fees, as expected.

Did it get to keep all those new fees?

Unfortunately, the government wasted little time in diverting the new fees. In fiscal year 2013, $121 million in PTO user fees were diverted, due to sequestration. This pushed the total of PTO user fees diverted since PTO was made self-sufficient in 1990 to over $1 billion, $171 million, to be exact.

Requiring the payment of higher patent fees which are then used for general government purposes really amounts to a tax on innovation which is the last thing we should be burdening in today's technology-driven economy.

The fact that this latest round of fee diversion occurred through sequestration provides another reason why the legislation we are introducing today is needed. PTO never should have been subject to sequestration in the first place. As I have described, it is not supported at all by taxpayer funds—it is completely funded by user fees. These users pay for a service when they send in their fees: the timely consideration and processing of their patent or trademark application or renewal. They are entitled to have the benefit of what they paid for. These funds should not be sequestered, to pay for other government services, for which there is a deficit. The PTO does not contribute at all to the deficit, and that has been the case for more than 20 years.

As a result of PTO's budgetary shortfall, in which sequestration played a significant part: information technology modernization was scaled back significantly; the process of opening new PTO satellite offices, called for in the America Invents Act, was frozen; hiring of most support personnel was stopped; and travel and training was virtually eliminated.

Last fall brought another unfortunate budgetary disruption: the shutdown of the federal government. Fortunately, the PTO was able to keep operating for that limited time, with the balances it had in its account. However, had the shutdown continued, PTO, too, would have been forced to close up—despite the fact that it collects fees that make it self-sustaining.

There is no good reason why PTO should be subject to sequestration and shutdown. As the Business Software Alliance states in their supporting letter, ''This bill would ensure the USPTO can continue conducting self-funded operations that produce tremendous economic and social value for the United States.''

The Patent Fee Integrity Act strikes current language that makes PTO subject to the appropriations process, which has been the principal avenue through which its funding has been diverted, and ensures that it can keep its funding. However, we also include measures to maintain accountability for the agency; the bill: requires the PTO Director to submit an annual report and operations plan to Congress; requires the PTO Director to submit an annual spending plan to the Appropriations Committees; and requires an annual independent financial audit.

This bill is supported across the width and breadth of the patent user community. It is endorsed by: Bayer Corporation; Biocom; The Biotechnology Industry Organization; BSA, The Software Alliance; The Coalition for Patent Fairness; The Coalition for 21st Century Patent Reform, which represents a broad group of nearly 50 global corporations who employ hundreds of thousands of Americans in a variety of sectors, including 3M, Caterpillar, General Electric, General Mills, Procter & Gamble, Johnson & Johnson, Medtronic, and Northrop Grumman; Fallbrook Technologies; The Innovation Alliance, which includes innovative small, medium, and large businesses, including Dolby Laboratories and QUALCOMM; the Intellectual Property Owners Association, which

represents more than 200 companies and 12,000 individuals in the U.S. who own intellectual property; The Internet Association; Mattel; Motor & Equipment Manufacturers Association; National Association of Manufacturers; Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America; and Xerox.

Many of these groups disagree vehemently with each other about patent reform. However, they all come together to unite in support of the bill we are introducing today, the Patent Fee Integrity Act.

BSA, The Software Alliance aptly observes, ''with their funds constantly under attack, the USPTO faces an endless and unnecessary challenge to provide the services for which American innovators have already paid. The Patent Fee Integrity Act will help the USPTO continue to increase patent quality, provide critical, time-sensitive services, and guarantee continuity of its operations independent of continually-shifting political considerations.''

I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this critical bill. As the Coalition for 21st Century Patent Reform and others observed in the letter they sent to me in support of this bill: ''Your legislation would empower the USPTO to fully support America's innovators without adding a single penny to the deficit.''

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that letters of support be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BSA/THE SOFTWARE ALLIANCE,
Washington, DC, March 13, 2013.

Hon. DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR FEINSTEIN: On behalf of BSA/The Software Alliance and its members, which are among the world's most innovative companies, I write to express strong support for the Patent Fee Integrity Act, which would remove the US Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) from the congressional appropriations process. This bill would ensure the USPTO can continue conducting self-funded operations that produce tremendous economic and social value for the United States.

The USPTO plays an indispensable role in sparking the growth of America's economy by protecting intellectual property (IP) and promoting innovation. Over the last two decades, however, the federal government has withheld, diverted, or sequestered more than $1 billion in USPTO user fee collections. This bill recognizes that with their funds constantly under attack, the USPTO faces an endless and unnecessary challenge to provide the services for which American innovators have already paid.

The Patent Fee Integrity Act will help the USPTO continue to increase patent quality, provide critical, time-sensitive services, and guarantee continuity of its operations independent of continually-shifting political considerations. Moreover, it will protect against reducing the USPTO's operating capacity at a time when it needs to expand to enable American businesses to bring new innovations to market.

We commend you for your leadership in introducing the Patent Fee Integrity Act and look forward to working with you and others to ensure it garners the broad bipartisan support it deserves.

Sincerely,

VICTORIA A. ESPINEL,
President and CEO.

MARCH 13, 2014.

Hon. DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR FEINSTEIN: We commend you for introducing the Patent Fee Integrity Act and we offer our full support.

America's economic future depends on our continued ability to innovate and commercialize new products and processes. American businesses are among the most dynamic and innovative in the world. We develop the technology that creates jobs and stimulates our economy. Our nation's universities partner with business to conduct the ground-breaking research, as well as educate the creative people, that fuel the innovative dynamism of the business sector. Such investment is not without risk, which is why the Patent Fee Integrity Act has never been more critical.

U.S. innovators rely on patents to protect their investment in the research and development of breakthrough innovations such as manufacturing and product technologies and life-saving drugs. Valid and enforceable patent rights are essential in this process and enable the United States to maintain its competitive edge. An adequately funded United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) is vital in ensuring that high quality patent rights are promptly granted. Yet, the precarious funding situation of the USPTO makes the realization of this essential mission impossible.

Over the last two decades, the government has withheld, diverted, or sequestered hundreds of millions of USPTO user fee dollars. With uncertain and insufficient funding, the USPTO faces an endless and unnecessary challenge in providing the services for which American innovators have requested and paid. The Patent Fee Integrity Act would end this problem by removing the USPTO from the Congressional appropriations process and allow all of its user fees to fund its operations. Your legislation would empower the USPTO to fully support America's innovators without adding a single penny to the deficit.

Our innovation based economy demands a fully-funded USPTO. The USPTO needs predictability and certainty in its budgeting so that it can provide the patent protection needed champion America's innovators. We support quick passage of the Patent Fee Integrity Act.

American Intellectual Property Law Association (AIPLA); Bayer Corporation; Biocom; Biotechnology Industry Organization (BIO): Boston Scientific Corporation; Bristol-Myers Squibb Company; Caterpillar Inc.; Corning Incorporated; The Cummins Allison Corporation; Cummins Inc.; DuPont; Eli Lilly and Company; Greatbatch, Inc.; IBM Corporation; Illinois Tool Works (ITW); International Test Solutions Inc.; Johnson & Johnson; Leggett & Platt; The Manitowoc Company, Inc.; Mattel, Inc.; Motor & Equipment Manufacturers Association; National Association of Manufacturers (NAM); Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America; PPG Industries, Inc.; The Procter & Gamble Company; Smiths Group; United Technologies Corporation; Xerox Zimme.

COALITION FOR
PATENT FAIRNESS
Washington, DC, March 13, 2014.

Statement on the Patent Fee Integrity Act,

The Coaliton for Patent Fairness (CPF) thanks Senator Dianne Feinstein (D–CA) for introducing the Patent Fee Integrity Act.

As patent holders, CPF members recognize the importance of an adequately funded U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (PTO). We applaud Senator Feinstein for taking steps to ensure that the PTO has the resources it needs to fulfill its essential mission and to maintain patent quality.

Improving patent quality is a vital piece of the patent puzzle. When patent quality suffers, innovation throughout America's economy is stymied, and patent trolls are able to prosper. Quite clearly, patent reviews conducted today will have a lasting impact in the future; by helping to establish adequate funding of the PTO, the Patent Fee Integrity Act will support innovation.

The U.S. patent system plays an important role in helping America's economy flourish, and abuses of that system pose a significant threat to innovation and economic growth. We thank Senator Feinstein for her leadership and will continue to work with her and her colleagues toward the passage of patent litigation reform.

FALLBROOK TECHNOLOGIES,
Cedar Park, TX, March 13, 2014.

Hon. DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR FEINSTEIN: As CEO of an emerging technology company with roots in California, I write to enthusiastically endorse your effort to introduce patent legislation that is critically important to America's innovation ecosystem and the U.S. economy, the Patent Fee Integrity Act. Although Fallbrook Technologies cautions the Senate to tread extremely cautiously with other proposed patent legislation, the Patent Fee Integrity Act represents the only patent reform bill which advances the one issue that unifies intellectual property stakeholders across the innovation spectrum and thus should be advanced by the Senate without delay.

Fallbrook is an emerging manufacturing and technology development company dedicated to improving the flexibility of power transmission within a wide variety of mechanical devices. Currently, Fallbrook is located in Texas, but we have California ties as our technology was invented in Fallbrook, California, a large number of our investors are in California and some key employees currently reside in San Diego. Our core technology is the patented and award-winning NuVinci® continuously variable planetary (CVP) transmission system. Fallbrook's NuVinci CVP technology is a standard component on more than 60 major bicycle brands throughout Europe, and can improve the performance and efficiency of products that use a transmission, such as automobiles, agricultural equipment, light electric vehicles, outdoor power equipment and wind turbines. Fallbrook employs over 130 people in the U.S. (as of the date of this letter), including about 30 of the best engineers in the transmission sector. We currently hold over 600 patents and pending applications worldwide and are working with our key automotive licensees to bring gas-saving vehicles to the marketplace.

As you are aware, for more than a decade, American innovators like Fallbrook have had our U.S. Patent and Trademark Office user fees diverted by Congress for other purposes. Essentially, such fee diversion has worked as an innovation tax which slows the technology development process and hinders job creation. The Patent Fee Integrity Act will repeal this innovation tax and is long overdue. Full USPTO funding will provide the USPTO the resources it needs to improve patent quality while Congress determines whether further actions may be needed to improve the patent system.

We applaud you and your bipartisan cosponsors for introducing the bill and stand ready to assist you in any way necessary.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM KLEHM,
Chairman and CEO.

INNOVATION ALLIANCE,
MARCH 13, 2014.

Hon. DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
U.S Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR FEINSTEIN: The Innovation Alliance, a coalition of research and development-focused companies, thanks you and your cosponsors for introducing the Patent Fee Integrity Act, which will put an end to fee diversion once and for all. We have long maintained that ending fee diversion, and thereby giving the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office (''USPTO'') all of the fees it is paid by patent applicants, is the single most important change policymakers can make to improve the U.S. patent system.

Over the last 20 years, approximately $1 billion in fees paid by patent applicants has been diverted from its proper use at the USPTO. This unwarranted diversion of fees has resulted in more than 600,000 unexamined patent applications and more than 28 months in the average patent pendency time. Ending this tax on innovation is perhaps the one change to the patent law that unites stakeholders from all parts of the innovation ecosystem in the United States.

The Innovation Alliance thanks you for your leadership on this critically important issue for the patent system. We look forward to working with you and your cosponsors to pass the Patent Fee Integrity Act into law as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

BRIAN POMPER,
Executive Director.

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
OWNERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, March 12, 2014.

Hon. DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR FEINSTEIN: Intellectual Property Owners Association (IPO) writes to express its strong support for the Patent Fee Integrity Act, to provide for the permanent funding of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO).

IPO is a trade association representing companies and individuals in all industries and fields of technology who own or are interested in intellectual property rights. IPO's membership includes more than 200 companies and more than 12,500 individuals who are involved in the association either through their companies or as inventor, author, law firm, or attorney members. Our members all agree that the United States needs a fully-funded USPTO to keep our nation competitive, encourage innovation and create new jobs.

Over the last two decades the government has withheld, diverted or sequestered about $1 billion in USPTO user fee collections. Removing the USPTO from the congressional appropriations process is the most promising approach we know for stopping the hemorrhaging of USPTO fees. We hope the Senate will move ahead with the bill as soon as possible.

Thank you for your help in securing full, permanent funding for the USPTO. We stand ready to assist in any way we can.

Sincerely,

HERBERT C. WAMSLEY,
Executive Director.

THE INTERNET ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, March 13, 2014.

STATEMENT OF MICHAEL BECKERMAN, PRESIDENT AND CEO OF THE INTERNET ASSOCIATION, ON SENATOR FEINSTEIN'S INTRODUCTION OF THE PATENT FEE INTEGRITY ACT

The Internet Association commends Senator Feinstein's introduction of the Patent Fee Integrity Act, which would provide the Patent and Trademark Office with adequate funding and resources to improve overall patent quality. Improving patent quality is an essential step in improving the entire patent ecosystem by shutting off the supply of low-quality patents that fuel litigation by patent trolls. That is why The Internet Association also supports an expanded review of the covered business method patent program to eliminate patents that never been granted in the first instance. An expanded review program, coupled with strong fee shifting and discovery provisions, make up the necessary components of a meaningful response to the patent troll epidemic. We look forward to working with Senator Feinstein and Members of the Senate Judiciary Committee as they prepare to address these important issues in the coming weeks.

ABOUT THE INTERNET ASSOCIATION

The Internet Association, the unified voice of the Internet economy, represents the interests of the leading Internet companies including Airbnb, Amazon, AOL, eBay, Expedia, Facebook, Gilt, Google, IAC, Linkedln, Lyft, Monster Worldwide, Netflix, Practice Fusion, Rackspace, reddit, Salesforce.com, SurveyMonkey, TripAdvisor, Twitter, Uber Technologies, Inc., Yelp, Yahoo!, and Zynga. The Internet Association is dedicated to advancing public policy solutions to strengthen and protect Internet freedom, foster innovation and economic growth, and empower users. http://www.internetassociation.org.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 383—DESIGNATING MARCH 2014 AS ''NATIONAL MIDDLE LEVEL EDUCATION MONTH''

Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. WALSH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 383

Whereas the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the Association for Middle Level Education, the National Forum to Accelerate Middle-Grades Reform, and the National Association of Elementary School Principals have declared March 2014 as ''National Middle Level Education Month'';

Whereas schools that educate middle level students are responsible for educating nearly 24,000,000 young adolescents between the ages of 10 and 15, in grades 5 through 9, who are undergoing rapid and dramatic changes in their physical, intellectual, social, emotional, and moral development;

Whereas young adolescents deserve challenging and engaging instruction, knowledgeable teachers and administrators who are prepared to provide young adolescents with a safe, challenging, and supportive learning environment, and organizational structures that banish anonymity and promote personalization, collaboration, and social equity;

Whereas the habits and values established during early adolescence have a lifelong influence that directly affects the future health and welfare of the United States;

Whereas research indicates that the academic achievement of a student in eighth grade has a larger impact on the readiness of that student for college at the end of high school than any academic achievement of that student in high school; and

Whereas in order to improve graduation rates and prepare students to be lifelong learners who are ready for college, a career, and civic participation, the people of the United States must have a deeper understanding of the distinctive mission of middle level education: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates March 2014 as ''National Middle Level Education Month'';

(2) honors and recognizes the importance of middle level education and the contributions of the individuals who educate middle level students; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe National Middle Level Education Month by visiting and celebrating schools that are responsible for educating young adolescents in the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 384—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING THE HUMANITARIAN CRISIS IN SYRIA AND NEIGHBORING COUNTRIES, RESULTING HUMANITARIAN AND DEVELOPMENT CHALLENGES, AND THE URGENT NEED FOR A POLITICAL SOLUTION TO THE CRISIS

Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WARNER, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KING, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. CRUZ) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 384

Whereas United Nations Security Council Resolution 2139, adopted on February 22, 2014, expresses grave alarm at the significant and rapid deterioration of the humanitarian situation in Syria, in particular the dire situation of hundreds of thousands of civilians trapped in besieged areas, most of whom are besieged by the Syrian armed forces and some by opposition groups, as well as the dire situation of over 3,000,000 people in hard-to-reach areas, and deplores the difficulties in providing, and the failure to provide, access for the humanitarian assistance to all civilians in need inside Syria;

Whereas widespread and systematic attacks on civilians, schools, hospitals, and other civilian infrastructure, in violation of international humanitarian law, continue in Syria, and parties to the conflict are blocking humanitarian aid delivery, including food and medical care from many civilian areas;

Whereas the World Health Organization estimates that 70 percent of Syria's health professionals, up to 80,000 people, have fled the country, cases of typhoid, tuberculosis, polio and other diseases are rampant and increasing, and medical personnel inside Syria are deliberately targeted by parties to the conflict;

Whereas the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) has registered

more than 2,500,000 Syrian refugees, nearly 80 percent of whom are women and children, and by the end of this year, the United Nations estimates the number of refugees will increase to 4,000,000;

Whereas nearly 500,000 refugees from the Syrian conflict are children under the age of five, and more than 11,000 children have been killed and thousands more have suffered severe injuries, including burns, shrapnel wounds, the severing of limbs, and spinal cord injuries;

Whereas over 5,000,000 children affected by the conflict desperately need food, clean water, shelter, medical care and psychosocial support;

Whereas, since 2011, nearly 3,000,000 Syrian children have been forced to quit their education as fighting has destroyed classrooms, left children too terrified to go to school, and forced families to flee the country;

Whereas the refugee crisis threatens the stability of the Middle East, putting immense burdens on Syria's neighbors, most notably Lebanon and Jordan, as well as Turkey and Iraq; and

Whereas the United States Government has played a leading role in addressing the Syria crisis, providing $1,700,000,000 in humanitarian assistance to those suffering inside Syria, as well as to refugees and host communities in the neighboring countries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) strongly condemns the unlawful use of violence against civilians by all parties to the conflict in Syria, particularly the ongoing violence and widespread human rights violations perpetrated against the people of Syria by the Government of Syria;

(2) urges all parties to the conflict to immediately halt indiscriminate attacks on civilians and civilian infrastructure;

(3) affirms the neutrality of medical professionals providing humanitarian assistance and health care on a non-political basis, and condemns attacks against such personnel or interference in the provision of medical care;

(4) urges all parties in Syria to allow for and facilitate immediate, unfettered access to humanitarian aid throughout the Syrian Arab Republic, respecting the safety, security, independence, and impartiality of humanitarian workers and ensuring freedom of movement to deliver aid;

(5) supports the immediate and full implementation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2139 (2014), which calls for unimpeded access of humanitarian assistance to all Syrians to addresses the rapid deterioration of the humanitarian situation in Syria, in particular the dire situation of hundreds of thousands of civilians trapped in besieged areas, most of whom are besieged by the Syrian armed forces and some by opposition groups, as well as the dire situation of over 3,000,000 people in hard-to-reach areas;

(6) calls on the international community to assist the people of Syria, especially internally displaced persons and refugees, in meeting basic needs, including access to food, health care, shelter, and clean drinking water;

(7) calls on the international community to support civilians and innocent victims of the conflict in Syria, particularly women and children who are displaced and vulnerable to physical and psychological exploitation;

(8) calls on the international community to implement steps that prevent gender-based violence, and assure the protection of women and girls against sexual exploitation, human trafficking, and rape;

(9) calls on the international community to continue to support neighboring countries and host communities who are generously supporting refugees fleeing the conflict in Syria;

(10) calls on the international community to increase investment for education in host communities to expand learning opportunities for refugee children and to support programs that help children gain access to quality education, protect them from violence and abuse, and provide counseling and psychosocial support;

(11) calls on countries that are hosting refugees in the region to support refugee self-reliance and dignity by expanding employment opportunities for refugees;

(12) calls on international donors and aid agencies to integrate humanitarian relief and longer term development programs through a comprehensive regional strategy to address the protracted crisis in Syria; and

(13) calls on the President to develop and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress within 90 days from adoption of this resolution a strategy for United States engagement in addressing the Syrian humanitarian crisis, to include assistance and development, and protecting human rights inside Syria and in the region.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, today, along with Senator RUBIO, I am submitting a bipartisan resolution to coincide with the third anniversary of the Syria crisis.

We are witnessing one of history's greatest humanitarian catastrophes unfolding before our eyes. The numbers are staggering. Nearly 3 million Syrians have fled to neighboring countries. Syrians are about to pass Afghans as the world's biggest refugee population.

The UN released a report this week stating Syria has become the world's most dangerous place for children. This is truly heartbreaking. More than 5.5 million children are in need of desperate humanitarian assistance and three million are out of school. 40,000 babies have been born as refugees.

Conditions inside are even Syria worse. There are nearly 7 million internally displaced persons and over 9 million in need of humanitarian assistance. Nearly 250,000 remained besieged, mostly at the hands of the Assad regime, and are suffering from disease and starvation.

The Syria Humanitarian Resolution of 2014 strongly condemns the unlawful use of violence against civilians by all parties to the conflict in Syria, particularly the ongoing violence and widespread human rights violations perpetrated against the people of Syria by the Government of Syria.

The resolution urges all parties to the conflict to immediately halt indiscriminate attacks on civilians and to allow for immediate, unfettered access to humanitarian aid throughout the Syrian Arab Republic, respecting the safety, security, independence, and impartiality of humanitarian workers and ensuring freedom of movement to deliver aid. We call on the international community to assist the people of Syria, especially internally displaced persons and refugees, in meeting basic needs, including access to food, health care, shelter, and clean drinking water. Finally we call for the full implementation of UN Security Council 2139 and call on the President to submit to the appropriate committees of Congress within 90 days a strategy for United States engagement in addressing the Syrian humanitarian crisis, to include assistance and development, and protection of human rights inside Syria and in the region.

The solution to the Syrian conflict will be complicated. But the people of Syria should not continue to suffer in the interim. I refuse to accept that there is nothing more we can do to end the suffering. Humanitarian relief and access are fundamental principles all parties should adhere to. History will harshly judge those who do not.

SENATE RESOLUTION 385—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE USE OF ELECTRONIC DEVICES ON THE FLOOR OF THE SENATE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mr. ENZI) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 385

Resolved, That it is the Sense of the Senate that—

(1) certain uses of electronic devices by Senators on the floor of the Senate are necessary and proper in the conduct of official Senate business, would not distract, interrupt, or inconvenience the business of Members of the Senate, and should therefore be permissible, including—

(A) delivering floor remarks from text displayed on personal digital assistant devices and tablet computers;

(B) reviewing and editing documents on personal digital assistant devices and tablet computers while seated or standing at a desk, except when the Senator who wishes to use the device holds the floor or seeks to be recognized; and

(C) sending email and other data communication using personal digital assistant devices and tablet computers while seated or standing at a desk, except when the Senator who wishes to use the device holds the floor or seeks to be recognized;

(2) necessary and proper uses of electronic devices on the floor of the Senate do not include—

(A) transmitting sound for any purpose other than through earphones or in such a manner as would not disturb proceedings on the floor of the Senate for the purpose of assisting a person with a disability;

(B) using telephones or other devices for voice communication; or

(C) using desktop computers, laptop computers, or other large devices;

(3) the Committee on Rules and Administration should consider an amendment to the Rules for the Regulation of the Senate Wing consistent with the principles stated above; and

(4) any amendment to the Rules for the Regulation of the Senate Wing should take into account possible future changes in technology.

SENATE RESOLUTION 386—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL PROFESSIONAL SOCIAL WORK MONTH AND WORLD SOCIAL WORK DAY

Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. COONS, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs.

FEINSTEIN, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 386

Whereas the social work profession has been instrumental in achieving advances in civil and human rights in the United States and across the world for more than a century;

Whereas the primary mission of social work is to enhance human well-being and help meet the basic needs of all people, especially the people who are most vulnerable;

Whereas the programs and services provided by professional social workers are essential elements of the social safety net in the United States;

Whereas social workers have a critical impact on adolescent and youth development, aging, family caregiving, child protection and family services, health care navigation, mental and behavioral health treatment, assistance to members and veterans of the Armed Forces, nonprofit management and community development, and poverty reduction;

Whereas social workers function as specialists, consultants, private practitioners, educators, community leaders, policymakers, and researchers;

Whereas social workers influence many different organizations and human service systems and are employed in a wide range of workplaces, including private and public agencies, hospices and hospitals, schools, clinics, businesses and corporations, military units, elected offices, think tanks, and foundations;

Whereas social workers seek to improve social functioning and social conditions for people in emotional, psychological, economic, or physical need;

Whereas social workers are experts in care coordination, case management, and therapeutic treatment for biopsychosocial issues;

Whereas social workers have roles in more than 50 different fields of practice;

Whereas social workers believe that the strength of a country depends on the ability of the majority of the people to lead productive and healthy lives;

Whereas social workers help people, who are often navigating major life challenges, find hope and new options for achieving their maximum potential; and

Whereas social workers identify and address gaps in social systems that impede full participation by individuals or groups in society: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Professional Social Work Month and World Social Work Day;

(2) acknowledges the diligent efforts of individuals and groups who promote the importance of social work and observe National Professional Social Work Month and World Social Work Day;

(3) encourages the people of the United States to engage in appropriate ceremonies and activities to promote further awareness of the life-changing role that social workers play; and

(4) recognizes with gratitude the contributions of the millions of caring individuals who have chosen to serve their communities through social work.

SENATE RESOLUTION 387—CELEBRATING THE 2014 ARCTIC WINTER GAMES, IN FAIRBANKS, ALASKA

Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. BEGICH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. RES. 387

Whereas the Arctic Winter Games, held every 2 years, is a premier sporting and cultural event and a true celebration of athletic competition, friendship, and cooperation among individuals living in the Arctic;

Whereas the Arctic Winter Games, as envisioned over 40 years ago by Alaska Governor Wally Hickel and commissioners from the Northwest Territories and Yukon, continues to promote the core values of its creation: athletic competition, cultural exhibition, and social interchange;

Whereas the Fairbanks North Star Borough has a uniquely qualified community to welcome the vast cultural benefits that accompany serving as the host of the 2014 Arctic Winter Games;

Whereas the 2014 Arctic Winter Games welcomes more than 1,400 athletes from 9 contingents, representing nations that include the United States, Canada, Greenland, and Russia;

Whereas the State of Alaska is proud to contribute to the Arctic Winter Games 287 Alaskan athletes, ages 13 to 24; and

Whereas the 2014 Arctic Winter Games marks the fifth Arctic Winter Games hosted in Alaska since the first competition in 1970: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the dedicated athletes, coaches, volunteers, leaders, and staff who contribute to the mission and success of the 2014 Arctic Winter Games;

(2) welcomes the return of the Arctic Winter Games to Fairbanks, Alaska, for the first time since 1988; and

(3) celebrates the continuing friendly competition among northern circumpolar countries and the great cultural exchange that keeps northern traditions alive.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise today in support of a resolution I submitted in recognition and celebration of the 2014 Arctic Winter Games. This year's games are being held in Fairbanks, AK, and run for one week, from this Saturday to next. I feel honored that I am able to attend. In fact, I will be attending the opening ceremony with the honorable Leona Aglukkaq, Minister of the Environment, Minister of the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency, and Chair of the Arctic Council. I am excited to be able to show her Fairbanks and cheer on our respective teams.

The Arctic Winter Games was envisioned over 40 years ago by Alaska Governor Wally Hickel and commissioners from the Northwest Territories and Yukon to provide an opportunity for athletic competition for northern athletes and coaches. Today, the games have grown to be an important opportunity to share cultural values from northern regions around the world, and have some good old fashioned fun.

The 2014 games welcome more than 2,100 athletes from 9 contingents, from the United States, Canada, Greenland, and Russia, including 287 Alaskans. Twenty different sports are included, both winter and summer—from dog mushing to hockey to gymnastics to soccer to wrestling. I wish the best of luck to all the athletes. I thank Fairbanks for hosting the event, as well as the 2,600 volunteers who will contribute to the success of this year's games.

I hope you will join me in supporting this resolution.

SENATE RESOLUTION 388—DESIGNATING MARCH 22, 2014, AS ''NATIONAL REHABILITATION COUNSELORS APPRECIATION DAY''

Mr. CHAMBLISS (for himself and Mr. CASEY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 388

Whereas rehabilitation counselors conduct assessments, provide counseling, support families, and plan and implement rehabilitation programs for individuals in need of rehabilitation;

Whereas the purpose of professional organizations for rehabilitation counseling and education is to promote the improvement of rehabilitation services available to individuals with disabilities through quality education for counselors and rehabilitation research;

Whereas various professional organizations have vigorously advocated up-to-date education and training and the maintenance of professional standards in the field of rehabilitation counseling and education, including—

(1) the National Rehabilitation Association;

(2) the Rehabilitation Counselors and Educators Association;

(3) the National Council on Rehabilitation Education;

(4) the National Rehabilitation Counseling Association;

(5) the American Rehabilitation Counseling Association;

(6) the Commission on Rehabilitation Counselor Certification;

(7) the Council of State Administrators of Vocational Rehabilitation; and

(8) the Council on Rehabilitation Education;

Whereas, on March 22, 1983, Martha Walker of Kent State University, who was President of the National Council on Rehabilitation Education, testified before the Subcommittee on Select Education of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives, and was instrumental in bringing the need for qualified rehabilitation counselors to the attention of Congress; and

Whereas the efforts of Martha Walker led to the enactment of laws that require rehabilitation counselors to have proper credentials, in order to provide a higher quality of service to those in need of rehabilitation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates March 22, 2014, as ''National Rehabilitation Counselors Appreciation Day''; and

(2) commends—

(A) rehabilitation counselors, for the dedication and hard work rehabilitation counselors provide to individuals in need of rehabilitation; and

(B) professional organizations, for the efforts professional organizations have made to assist those who require rehabilitation.

SENATE RESOLUTION 389—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF MARCH 9, 2014, THROUGH MARCH 15, 2014, AS ''NATIONAL YOUTH SYNTHETIC DRUG AWARENESS WEEK''

Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 389

Whereas around the United States, there have been many incidents of violent acts, some leading to serious injury and death, committed by people under the influence of synthetic drugs;

Whereas the effects of synthetic drugs on their users include elevated heart rate and blood pressure, hallucinations, seizures, and extreme agitation;

Whereas a lack of public understanding of the potential harm of synthetic drugs makes raising public awareness about the dangers posed by such drugs extremely important;

Whereas deceptive marketing by sellers of synthetic drugs and easy access to synthetic drugs online and in many convenience stores create a false perception, particularly among youth, that synthetic drugs are legal and safer than street drugs;

Whereas in 2010, 18-year-old David Rozga of Indianola, Iowa committed suicide shortly after ingesting a synthetic drug called ''K2'', making his death one of the first in the United States linked to synthetic drugs;

Whereas March 17, 2014, marks the third anniversary of the tragic death of 19-year-old Trevor Robinson, who overdosed on a synthetic drug called ''2C-E'' at a house party in Blaine, Minnesota;

Whereas in addition to Trevor Robinson, 10 other teens and young adults at the same house party had to be rushed to hospitals after snorting the same drug, illustrating the urgent need to raise awareness among youth about the dangers of synthetic drugs;

Whereas according to the 2012 Monitoring the Future survey of youth drug-use trends, 1 in every 9 United States high school seniors surveyed admitted to using synthetic marijuana in the past year;

Whereas according to a 2013 report by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration Drug Abuse Warning Network, there were 28,531 emergency department visits involving a synthetic cannabinoid product and 22,904 emergency department visits involving bath salts in 2011; and

Whereas educating the public, and especially our youth, on the dangers of synthetic drugs and promoting prevention of synthetic drug abuse are critical components of what must be a multi-pronged effort to curb synthetic drug abuse: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of March 9, 2014, through March 15, 2014, as ''National Youth Synthetic Drug Awareness Week''; and

(2) urges communities to carry out appropriate programs and activities to educate parents and youth about the dangers associated with synthetic drug abuse.

SENATE RESOLUTION 390—DESIGNATING MARCH 11, 2014, AS ''WORLD PLUMBING DAY''

Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. HATCH) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 390

Whereas the plumbing industry plays an important role in safeguarding the public health of the people of the United States and the world;

Whereas 780,000,000 people around the world do not have access to safe drinking water;

Whereas 2,500,000,000 people around the world live without adequate sanitation facilities;

Whereas the lack of water and sanitation is the largest barrier to childhood survival, public health, education, and economic productivity;

Whereas in the developing world, 24,000 children under the age of 5 die every day from preventable causes, such as diarrhea contracted from unclean water;

Whereas safe and efficient plumbing saves money and reduces future water supply costs and infrastructure costs;

Whereas the installation of modern plumbing systems must be accomplished in a specific, safe manner by trained professionals in order to prevent widespread disease, which can be crippling and deadly to the community;

Whereas the people of the United States rely on plumbing professionals to maintain, repair, and rebuild the aging water infrastructure of the United States;

Whereas Congress and plumbing professionals across the United States and the world are committed to safeguarding public health; and

Whereas the founding organization of World Plumbing Day, the World Plumbing Council, is actively supported by organizations in the United States such as the International Association of Plumbing and Mechanical Officials: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate designates March 11, 2014, as ''World Plumbing Day''.

SENATE RESOLUTION 391—DESIGNATING JEAN M. MANNING AS CHIEF COUNSEL FOR EMPLOYMENT EMERITUS OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE

Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. HATCH) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 391

Whereas Jean M. Manning will retire from the United States Senate after having served with distinction as the Senate's first Chief Counsel for Employment from 1993 to 2014;

Whereas Jean M. Manning has dedicated her Senate service to providing legal representation, legal advice and legal training to all senators and their management staff with respect to all matters arising under the Government Employee Rights Act of 1991, and the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995;

Whereas Jean M. Manning has represented Senate offices with distinction before the federal courts;

Whereas Jean M. Manning has upheld the high standards and traditions of the Senate with abiding devotion and has performed her Senate duties in an impartial, professional manner; and

Whereas Jean M. Manning has earned the respect, affection and esteem of the United States Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That, upon her retirement on March 19, 2014, as a token of the appreciation of the Senate for her long and faithful service, Jean M. Manning is hereby designated as Chief Counsel for Employment Emeritus of the United States Senate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 392—TO AUTHORIZE DOCUMENT PRODUCTION AND REPRESENTATION IN CARE ONE MANAGEMENT LLC, ET AL. V. UNITED HEALTHCARE WORKERS EAST, SEIU 1199, ET AL

Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 392

Whereas, in the case of *Care One Management LLC, et al. v. United Healthcare Workers East, SEIU 1199, et al.*, No. 2:12–cv–06371, pending in the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey, the plaintiffs have issued a subpoena for testimony and production of documents from Senator Richard Blumenthal;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§288b(a) and 288c(a)(2), the Senate may direct its counsel to represent Members of the Senate with respect to any subpoena, order, or request for testimony relating to their official responsibilities;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may, by the judicial or administrative process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate; and

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may promote the administration of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistent with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Senator Blumenthal is authorized to provide documents in the case of *Care One Management LLC, et al. v. United Healthcare Workers East, SEIU 1199, et al.*, except concerning matters for which a privilege or objection is asserted.

SEC. 2. The Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent Senator Blumenthal in this matter.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2844. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1086, to reauthorize and improve the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2845. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1086, supra.

SA 2846. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1086, supra.

SA 2847. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1086, supra.

SA 2848. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1086, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2849. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1086, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2850. Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1086, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2851. Mr. REID (for Mr. BENNET) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1456, to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Shimon Peres.

SA 2852. Mr. REID (for Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. LEE)) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 376, supporting the goals of International Women's Day.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2844. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1086, to reauthorize and improve the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 138, line 8, insert ''and whose family assets do not exceed $1,000,000'' after ''size''.

SA 2845. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1086, to reauthorize and improve the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 99, strike lines 16 through 20 and insert the following:

tivity described in clause (iii)).'';

(iii) by striking '', with priority'' and all that follows through the period and inserting the following: ''. In using those amounts for child care services, the State shall give priority for services first to children with disabilities from low-income families (whose family income does not exceed 85 percent of the State median income for a family of the same size), then to children of families with very low family incomes (taking into consideration family size), and then to children with disabilities.''; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

''(ii) REPORT BY INSPECTOR GENERAL.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—Not later than September 30 of the first full fiscal year after the date of enactment of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014, and September 30 of each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services shall prepare and submit to the Secretary a report that contains a determination about whether each State uses amounts provided to such State for the fiscal year involved under this subchapter in accordance with the priority for services described in clause (i).

''(II) PENALTY FOR NONCOMPLIANCE.—For any fiscal year that the report of such Inspector General described in subclause (I) indicates that a State has failed to give priority for services in accordance with clause (i), the Secretary shall—

''(aa) inform the State that the State has until the date that is the last day of such fiscal year, or 6 months after the Inspector General has issued such report, whichever is later, to fully comply with clause (i); and

''(bb) if the State does not so comply, by the date described in item (aa), withhold 5 percent of the funds that would otherwise be allocated to that State in accordance with this subchapter for the first full fiscal year after that date.

''(iii) CHILD CARE RESOURCE AND REFERRAL SYSTEM.—''

SA 2846. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1086, to reauthorize and improve the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 141, insert at the end the following:

SEC. 13. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCING CHILD POVERTY BY CALENDAR YEAR 2019.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the United States has the highest rate of childhood poverty among 34 major countries in the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, including Denmark, Finland, Norway, Iceland, Cyprus, Austria, Sweden, the Czech Republic, Germany, Slovenia, Hungary, South Korea, the United Kingdom, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Ireland, France, Malta, Luxembourg, Slovakia, Estonia, Belgium, New Zealand, Poland, Canada, Australia, Japan, Portugal, Greece, Italy, Lithuania, Latvia, Spain, and Bulgaria;

(2) a record-breaking 46,496,000 individuals lived in poverty in the United States in 2012, which is an increase of 14,915,000 individuals since 2000;

(3) 16,073,000 children in the United States lived in poverty in 2012, which is an increase of 4,486,000 children since 2000;

(4) more than 7,100,000 children in the United States, 40 percent of children living in poverty in the United States, live in extreme poverty (defined as living in families with an income that is less than half of the poverty level);

(5) nearly 1,200,000 public school students in the United States were homeless in the 2011–2012 school year, an increase of 73 percent since the 2006–2007 school year;

(6) in an average month in fiscal year 2011, 1,200,000 households with children in the United States did not have any cash income and, for food, depended only on benefits under the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.);

(7) in 2012, government assistance programs removed from poverty 9,000,000 children, including 5,300,000 children through the earned income tax credit under section 32 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the child tax credit under section 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and 2,200,000 children through the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.);

(8) in 2012, child poverty would have been 57 percent higher, and extreme poverty would have been 240 percent higher, without government tax credits and food, housing, and energy benefits;

(9) in 2013, an individual working full-time at the Federal minimum wage could not afford the fair market rent for a 2-bedroom rental unit and have enough money for food, utilities, and other necessities;

(10) in school years 2009–2010 and 2010–2011, less than half of children ages 3 and 4 were enrolled in preschool;

(11) Early Head Start programs carried out under the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 et seq.) served only 4 percent of the 2,900,000 eligible poor infants and toddlers each day in fiscal year 2012, and Head Start programs carried out under such Act served only 41 percent of the 2,000,000 eligible poor children ages 3 and 4;

(12) more than 220,000 children are on waiting lists for child care assistance; and

(13) child poverty costs the United States not less than $500,000,000 each year in additional education, health, and criminal justice costs and in lost productivity.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the President should immediately present to Congress a comprehensive plan to significantly reduce child poverty in the United States by calendar year 2019.

SA 2847. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1086, to reauthorize and improve the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 120, strike line 12 and insert the following:

preceding 5 years; or

''(E) has been convicted of a violent misdemeanor committed as an adult against a child, including the following crimes: child abuse, child endangerment, sexual assault, or of a misdemeanor involving child pornography.

SA 2848. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1086, to reauthorize and improve the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 98, strike line 15 and insert the following:

view.

''(U) IDENTIFICATION.—The plan shall contain an assurance that the State will—

''(i) require, as a condition of eligibility for assistance for child care services under this subchapter, that each parent who applies for the assistance with respect to a child furnish to the State the child's social security account number (or numbers, if the child has more than one such number); and

''(ii) check the number before providing the assistance.'';

SA 2849. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1086, to reauthorize and improve the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 98, strike line 15 and insert the following:

view.

''(U) IDENTIFICATION.—The plan shall contain an assurance that the State will—

''(i) require, as a condition of eligibility for assistance for child care services under this subchapter, that each parent who applies for the assistance with respect to a child furnish each number for the child that is required under section 1137(a)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320b–7(a)(1)); and

''(ii) check the number furnished before providing the assistance for child care services.'';

SA 2850. Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1086, to reauthorize and improve the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 136, strike lines 16 and 17 and insert the following:

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(1) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—From amounts reserved under subsection (a)(2), the Secretary may make grants to or enter into contracts with Indian tribes or tribal organizations that submit applications under this section, for the planning and carrying out of programs or activities consistent with—

''(i) the purposes of this subchapter; and

''(ii) the goals of the Native American Languages Act (25 U.S.C. 2901 et seq.).

''(B) EFFECT.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) affects any grant made or contract entered into under that subparagraph before the date of enactment of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014.''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following:

SA 2851. Mr. REID (for Mr. BENNET) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1456, to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Shimon Peres; as follows:

On page 4, line 18, strike ''in honor of'' and insert ''to''.

SA 2852. Mr. REID (for Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. LEE)) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 376, supporting the goals of International Women's Day; as follows:

Strike the twelfth whereas clause of the preamble.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Senate Committees on Energy and Natural Resources. The hearing will be held on Tuesday, March 25, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of this oversight hearing is importing energy, exporting jobs. Can it be reversed?

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify be invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record may do so be sending it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, DC 20510–6150, or by e-mail to John__Assini@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Todd Wooten at (202) 224–3907, Abigail Campbell at (202) 224–4905, or John Assini (202) 224–9313.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Indian Affairs will meet on Wednesday, March 26, 2014, in room SD–628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''the President's Fiscal Year 2015 Budget for Tribal Programs.''

Those wishing additional information may contact the Indian Affairs Committee at (202) 224–2251.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 13, 2014, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 13, 2014, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 13, 2014, at 11 a.m. in room SR–253 of the Russell Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled, ''The U.S. Aviation Industry and Jobs: Keeping American Manufacturing Competitive.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 13, 2014, at 10 a.m. in room SD–215, Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Innovative Ideas to Strengthen and Expand the Middle Class.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 13, 2014, at 11:15 a.m., to hold a hearing entitled, ''Keystone XL and the National Interest Determination.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 13, 2014, at 9:30 a.m. in room SD–430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Protecting the Public Health: Examining FDA's Initiatives and Priorities.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Ms. MIKULSKI. 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 March 13, 2014, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''The Homeland Security Department's Budget Submission for Fiscal Year 2015.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 13, 2014, in room SD–628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Tribal Transportation: Pathways to Infrastructure and Economic Development in Indian Country.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 13, 2014, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 13, 2014, at 2 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT, INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS, AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Emergency Management, Intergovernmental Relations, and the District of Columbia of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 13, 2014, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''The Federal Emergency Management Agency's Budget Submission for Fiscal Year 2015.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AWARDING CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO SHIMON PERES

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1456, and the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1456) to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Shimon Perez.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I know the day is long; I feel it as much, if not more, than anyone else. But before consent is granted, I can't let the night go by and this about to pass without saying something about this good man.

I have had the good fortune to travel the world meeting Kings, Presidents, Prime Ministers, and many people, but I have never met anyone more impressive than this man. He is a visionary. What he has done for the small country of Israel, which is so important to us, is something the history books will report for generations to come.

I spoke with him earlier this week about another matter. I haven't been to Israel a lot of times, but I have been there a few times. Every time I go, I make sure to take my delegation to visit him. I always tell them this is my favorite. I think so much of this man. It is the least we can do for someone who has done so much for world peace and so much for our country.

I will be fairly quick. I was a Member of the House of Representatives and was on a delegation led by the late Tom Lantos, a Hungarian Jew who escaped the Holocaust because of Raoul Wallenberg. There have been a lot of Members of Congress there and a number of delegations, but Tom Lantos said to him in that beautiful speaking voice he had in that Hungarian accent: Here is our delegation, Mr. Prime Minister. We are so sorry to bother you. We know how busy you are, how many difficult situations you have in your country.

I will never forget this. He said: You don't understand. I am never too busy to meet with the delegation from the Congress of the United States. They have done so much for my country.

He said a few other things. I have said—and I want the RECORD to so reflect—this is something we need to do as quickly as possible.

AMENDMENT NO. 2851

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the Bennet amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read three times and passed, and the motion to reconsider be made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 2851) was agreed to, as follows:

On page 4, line 18, strike ''in honor of'' and insert ''to''.

The bill (S. 1456) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 1456

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Shimon Peres was born in Poland in 1923.

(2) The Peres family emigrated to Tel Aviv in 1934, and all of the family members of Shimon Peres who remained in Poland were murdered during the Holocaust.

(3) Before Israel gained independence, Shimon Peres earned the respect of senior leaders in the independence movement in Israel, most notably David Ben-Gurion.

(4) The founding generation of Israel was central to the development of Israel, and Shimon Peres is the only surviving member of that founding generation.

(5) Shimon Peres has served in numerous high-level cabinet positions and ministerial posts in Israel, including head of the Israeli Navy, Minister of Defense, Foreign Minister, Prime Minister, and President, among many others.

(6) Shimon Peres has honorably served Israel for over 70 years, during which he has significantly contributed to United States interests and has played a pivotal role in forging the strong and unbreakable bond between the United States and Israel.

(7) By presenting the Congressional Gold Medal to Shimon Peres, the first to be awarded to a sitting President of Israel, Congress proclaims its unbreakable bond with Israel and reaffirms its continual support for Israel as we commemorate the 65th anniversary of the independence of Israel and the 90th birthday of Shimon Peres, which are both significant milestones in Israeli history.

(8) Maintaining strong bilateral relations between the United States and Israel has been a priority of Shimon Peres since he began working with the United States in the days of John F. Kennedy. The strong bond is exemplified by the following:

(A) President Reagan said to Shimon Peres upon his visit to the United States, ''Mr. Prime Minister, I thank you very much for your visit. It's been an occasion to renew a friendship and to review and enhance the strength of our unique bilateral relationship.''

(B) At another point President Reagan said of Shimon Peres, ''His vision, his statesmanship and his tenacity are greatly appreciated here.''

(C) While visiting with Shimon Peres at the Residence of the President in Jerusalem, President Obama described Shimon Peres as ''. . . a son of Israel who's devoted his life to keeping Israel strong and sustaining the bonds between our two nations''.

(D) On March 20, 2013, Shimon Peres reaffirmed his belief in the relationship between the United States and Israel, stating, ''America stood by our side from the very beginning. You support us as we rebuild our ancient homeland and as we defend our land. From Holocaust to redemption.''

(E) On March 21, 2013, Shimon Peres stated, ''. . . America is so great and we are so small. But I learned that you don't measure us by size, but by values. When it comes to values, we are you and you are us. . . . As I look back, I feel that the Israel of today has exceeded the vision we had 65 years ago. Reality has surpassed our dreams. The United States of America helped us to make this possible.''

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) AWARD AUTHORIZED.—The President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall make appropriate arrangements for the award, on behalf of Congress, of a single gold medal of appropriate design to President Shimon Peres.

(b) DESIGN AND STRIKING.—For the purpose of the award referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury shall strike a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 3. DUPLICATE MEDALS.

Under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, the Secretary may strike duplicate medals in bronze of the gold medal struck pursuant to section 2 and sell such duplicate medals at a price sufficient to cover the costs of the medals, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses.

SEC. 4. NATIONAL MEDALS.

Medals struck pursuant to this Act are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 5. AUTHORITY TO USE FUND AMOUNTS; PROCEEDS OF SALE.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF CHARGES.—There is authorized to be charged against the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund, such amounts as may be necessary to pay for the costs of the medals struck pursuant to this Act.

(b) PROCEEDS OF SALE.—Amounts received from the sale of duplicate bronze medals under section 3 shall be deposited in the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund.

PROVIDING FOR THE DISPLAY OF THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 2147, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2147) to amend Public Law 112–59 to provide for the display of the congressional gold medal awarded to the Montford Point Marines, United States Marine Corps, by the Smithsonian Institution and at other appropriate locations.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the bill be read three times and passed and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 2147) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 2147

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

SECTION 1. DISPLAY OF CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL BY THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

Section 2 of the Act entitled ''An Act to grant the congressional gold medal to the Montford Point Marines'', approved November 23, 2011 (31 U.S.C. 5111 note), is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Following the award of the gold medal in honor of the Montford Point Marines, United States Marine Corps, under subsection (a), the gold medal shall be given to the Smithsonian Institution, where it will be displayed as appropriate and made available for research.

''(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Smithsonian Institution should make the gold medal received under paragraph (1) available for display elsewhere, particularly at other appropriate locations associated with the Montford Point Marines, United States Marine Corps.''.

HHEATT ACT OF 2014

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to H.R. 4076, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4076) to address shortages and interruptions in the availability of propane and other home heating fuels in the United States, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and

passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 4076) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time and passed.

ALLOWING LEASE OR TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LAND

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Indian Affairs Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2650 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2650) to allow the Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa in the State of Minnesota to lease or transfer certain land.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I further 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. 2650) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

CONCERNING CRISIS IN THE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 324, S. Res. 375.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 375) concerning the crisis in the Central African Republic and supporting United States and international efforts to end the violence, protect civilians, and address root causes of the conflict.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment and an amendment to the preamble, as follows:

(Insert the part printed in italic.)

(Strike the preamble and insert the part printed in italic.)

S. RES. 375

Whereas, for more than 50 years, successive governments in the Central African Republic have struggled to build a durable system of democratic institutions, to effectively secure and control the country's territory and borders, and to ensure a basic level of socio-economic development for the country's people;

Whereas, despite its natural resource wealth, the Central African Republic remains one of the poorest countries in the world and one of the lowest ranking countries in terms of human development according to the United Nations Development Program;

Whereas, in January 2013, regional leaders brokered the Libreville Agreements between the government of then-President Francois Bozizé and the loosely allied rebel militia known as Séléka, which resulted in the formation of a government of national unity;

Whereas, despite the Libreville Agreements, President Bozizé was ousted in March 2013 by the Séléka coalition, and the Séléka leader, Michel Djotodia, declared himself president;

Whereas, in April 2013, regional leaders issued the N'djamena Declaration in an effort to pursue a return to constitutional order based on the Libreville Agreements;

Whereas an influx of foreign fighters, especially from Chad and Sudan, has been a major factor in the increased number of Séléka fighters, from approximately 5,000 in March 2013, to an estimated 20,000 as of December 2013;

Whereas both Séléka forces and armed militia groups known as ''anti-balakas'', some of which formed initially as a means of protecting communities against Séléka, have been implicated in ethnically-motivated violence and grave and systemic human rights abuses against civilians;

Whereas, over the course of the crisis, Séléka and anti-balaka groups have displayed weak control and command structures, and committed crimes against humanity with impunity;

Whereas, according to UNICEF, thousands of child soldiers are involved in armed groups in the Central African Republic, amid the near-total collapse of the country's primary education system;

Whereas interethnic, intercommunal, and interreligious tensions and violence have risen to alarming levels and led to systematic human rights abuses in the Central African Republic, including targeted killings, rapes, acts of torture, looting, and arbitrary detention;

Whereas the United States Embassy in Bangui suspended operations on December 28, 2012, and the ordered departure of country team staff has temporarily suspended the diplomatic presence and consular services of the United States in the Central African Republic;

Whereas more than 700,000 civilians have been internally displaced; another 290,000 have sought refuge in neighboring countries, including the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Chad, Cameroon, and South Sudan; 2,600,000 people, or over half of the population of the Central African Republic, are in need of humanitarian assistance; and 60 percent of households have no available food stocks;

Whereas a failure of the international community to appropriately respond to and address the rapidly deteriorating situation in the Central African Republic could result in further atrocities, mass displacement, and protracted instability with significant repercussions for regional and international security;

Whereas United Nations Security Council Resolution 2127 (2013) called for urgent and increased international assistance to the African Union International Support Mission in the Central African Republic (MISCA) to ensure that the force can fulfill its mandate to restore security and protect civilians, and placed an arms embargo on the Central African Republic;

Whereas United Nations Security Council Resolution 2127 requested the Secretary-General to establish an international commission of inquiry to investigate reports of human rights abuses in the Central African Republic in order to ensure accountability for perpetrators of violence;

Whereas the United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Office in the Central African Republic has been hindered by a lack of resources and constrained by insecurity;

Whereas, consistent with United Nations Security Council Resolution 2127, the Government of France launched a stabilization operation, Operation Sangaris, in the Central African Republic to assist MISCA in fulfilling its mandate;

Whereas, on March 3, 2014, United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon recommended to the United Nations Security Council a transition to a United Nations peacekeeping mission with a primary mandate to protect civilians; and

Whereas the United States Government has provided crisis and humanitarian assistance commitments totaling $182,500,000 in response to instability in the Central African Republic, including support for conflict resolution efforts, humanitarian assistance to refugees and internally displaced persons, and assistance to troop contributing countries to MISCA such as airlift, non-lethal equipment, military logistics, and training, as well as logistical support for French forces: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the violence, atrocities, abuses, and human rights violations committed by all parties to the conflict in the Central African Republic;

(2) commends the efforts of religious and community leaders in the Central African Republic condemning violence and engaging in conflict prevention and conflict resolution activities;

(3) welcomes the mobilization of international peacekeeping, conflict mitigation, humanitarian, and diplomatic resources, and encourages continued efforts to help address humanitarian needs, bring an end to the violence, and develop sustainable democratic institutions in the Central African Republic;

(4) welcomes the January 2014 decision of the Transitional National Council on the election of Catherine Samba-Panza as the Central African Republic's new transitional president;

(5) commends the African Union and its troop and police contributing countries for their work establishing and supporting MISCA;

(6) recognizes the Economic Community of Central African States (CEEAS) for its leadership in the political transition process;

(7) commends France for its swift intervention under United Nations Security Council Resolution 2127, and for its contributions to stabilization efforts and other forms of assistance;

(8) welcomes the United Nations Security Council support for MISCA and the Department of Peacekeeping Operation's ongoing contingency planning for a possible transition to a United Nations peacekeeping operation;

(9) affirms support for multilateral peacekeeping and policing capacities and recognizes the important contributions these efforts have made in protecting civilians in the Central African Republic and promoting international peace and stability;

(10) calls on the President to work with international partners to develop a short-term strategy to support a full and immediate cessation of armed conflict in the Central African Republic, including attacks targeting civilians and the recruitment of child soldiers;

(11) calls on the President to develop a long-term United States strategy, in support of international and domestic efforts, to establish a durable peace and greater security for the Central African Republic and to enhance regional stability, including—

(A) engagement and coordination with the international community, including the African Union, the Economic Community of Central African States, the United Nations, and other partners;

(B) appropriate assistance to help provide emergency relief and *support* reconciliation for the people of the Central African Republic;

(C) technical, logistical and other forms of assistance, as appropriate, in support of effective disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration of fighters; and

(D) support for appropriate mechanisms to ensure accountability for perpetrators of human rights abuses and violence; and

(12) urges the Secretary of State to consider the expeditious reestablishment of a United States diplomatic presence in the Central African Republic.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I further ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment to the resolution be agreed to, the resolution, as amended, be agreed to, the committee-reported amendment to the preamble be agreed to, the preamble, as amended, be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment to the resolution was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 375), as amended, was agreed to.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute to the preamble was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

SUPPORTING INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 325, S. Res. 376.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 376) supporting the goals of International Women's Day.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the amendment to the preamble, which is at the desk, be agreed to; the preamble, as amended, be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 376) was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 2852) to the preamble was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To strike the quotation from the United States Agency for International Development regarding educated women)

Strike the twelfth whereas clause of the preamble.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

193RD ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF GREECE

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 326, S. Res. 377.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 377) recognizing the 193rd anniversary of the independence of Greece and celebrating democracy in Greece and the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, that the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 377) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of March 10, 2014, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration en bloc of the following resolutions which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 388, S. Res. 389, S. Res. 390, S. Res. 391, and S. Res. 392.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

S. RES. 392

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this resolution concerns a subpoena for documents and deposition testimony in a civil action pending in New Jersey Federal District Court. Plaintiffs in the case own and manage five assisted-living facilities in Connecticut and are in a labor dispute with the employees of those facilities. They have sued the union representing those employees for allegedly criminal and fradulent tactics in this labor dispute.

Plaintiffs have sent a subpoena to Senator BLUMENTHAL seeking testimony and documents involving a broad scope of matters beyond merely the underlying labor dispute. Senator BLUMENTHAL has agreed to seek Senate authorization to provide written communications between his office and the union regarding the underlying labor dispute. However, the Senator believes this subpoena presents an undue burden as it is overly broad in scope and seeks material that is not relevant to the lawsuit, and also encroaches on areas subject to privilege, and therefore objects to producing other documents and to the request for deposition testimony.

This resolution would authorize the production of documents from Senator BLUMENTHAL's office except where a privilege or objection is asserted. The resolution also authorizes the Senate Legal Counsel to represent Senator BLUMENTHAL in this matter.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

PROVIDING FOR TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS IN THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 3370

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to H. Con. Res. 93.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 93) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make technical corrections in the enrollment of H.R. 3370.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 93) was agreed to.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 2122

Mr. REID. I understand S. 2122 is due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2122) to amend titles XVII and XIX of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare sustainable growth rate and to improve Medicare and Medicaid payments, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. I object to any further proceedings with respect to this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 3474, H.R. 3979, AND S. 2148

Mr. REID. I am told there are three bills at the desk and I ask for their first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2148) to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 3474) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of the employer mandate under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

A bill (H.R. 3979) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Mr. REID. Have all three titles been read, Madam President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have.

Mr. REID. I now ask for a second reading of each of the bills but object to my own request, en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bills will receive their second reading on the next legislative day.

APPOINTMENT AUTHORIZATION

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the upcoming recess or adjournment of the Senate, the President of the Senate, the President pro tempore, and the majority and minority leaders be authorized to make appointments to commissions, committees, boards, conferences, or interparliamentary conferences authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses, or by order of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SIGNING AUTHORIZATION

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment or recess of the Senate from Thursday, March 13 through Monday, March 24, Senators KING, REED, ROCKEFELLER, and CASEY be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE AGENDA

Mr. REID. Madam President, I have a brief statement that I know everyone is excited to hear, but everyone should be advised that when we return after next week, there is so much, so much to do. We need to pass the Ukrainian bill that Foreign Relations reported yesterday. We have a new bipartisan unemployment insurance compromise introduced today that was put together by a group of bipartisan Senators. We have the SGR, the so-called doc fix, to prevent a 24-percent cut in Medicare payments to doctors, which would be extremely hurtful to patients. We have to do that. We have a backlog of nominations we have to do.

Everyone should understand—I hope it is not necessary—because of the enormous amount of work we have to do this month, Senators should be on notice—all Senators—that there is a high probability that we need to be in session on the weekend of March 29 and 30, before the end of the month.

ORDERS THROUGH MONDAY, MARCH 24, 2014

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn and convene for pro forma sessions only with no business conducted on the following dates and times; and that following each pro forma session, the Senate adjourn until the next pro forma session: Friday, March 14, at 10:30 a.m.; Tuesday, March 18, at 10:30 a.m.; and Friday, March 21, at 9 a.m.; and that the Senate adjourn on Friday, March 21 until 2 p.m. on Monday, March 24, 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 Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 2124; that at 5:30 p.m. the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to S. 2124.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Madam President, the next rollcall vote will be on Monday, March 24, at 5:30 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:15 p.m., adjourned until Friday, March 14, 2014, at 10:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

JOHN W. DEGRAVELLES, OF LOUISIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA, VICE JAMES J. BRADY, RETIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

DEIRDRE M. DALY, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE DAVID B. FEIN, RESIGNED.

JAMES WALTER FRAZER GREEN, OF LOUISIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE DONALD J. CAZAYOUX, JR., RESIGNED.

RONALD LEE MILLER, OF KANSAS, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE WALTER ROBERT BRADLEY, RETIRED.

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

JUDITH M. DAVENPORT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 31, 2020, VICE DAVID H. PRYOR, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

BRADFORD RAYMOND HUTHER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, VICE DOUGLAS A. CRISCITELLO.

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS VICE COMMANDANT OF THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD AND TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 47:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. PETER V. NEFFENGER

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. BRADLEY A. HEITHOLD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. ROBERT I. MILLER

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. BENNET S. SACOLICK

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS CHIEF OF CHAPLAINS, UNITED STATES NAVY, AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 5142:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) MARGARET G. KIBBEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. MICHELLE C. SKUBIC

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. DAVID A. LANE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. BRENT W. SCOTT

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

RANDOLPH S. WARDLE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

RODNEY E. GARFIELD

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 13, 2014:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DWIGHT L. BUSH, SR., OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF MOROCCO.

TIMOTHY M. BROAS, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF THE NETHERLANDS.

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

JOSEPH PIUS PIETRZYK, OF OHIO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 13 , 2014.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

PUNEET TALWAR, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (POLITICAL–MILITARY AFFAIRS).

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

ARUN MADHAVAN KUMAR, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE AND DIRECTOR GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES AND FOREIGN COMMERCIAL SERVICE.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

CAROLINE DIANE KRASS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING ZEIDERS ENTERPRISES ON ITS 30TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the many contributions of Zeiders Enterprises in communities here and across the Nation since its founding 30 years ago in Prince William County, VA.

The more than 1,000 staff members of Zeiders Enterprises serve in crucial roles as clinical counselors, victim advocates, new parent support specialists, personal financial counselors, transition specialists, spouse education and career counselors, and relocation specialists. Through these activities, Zeiders Enterprises has made a direct, positive difference in the lives of individuals, families, their communities, and the organizations in which they serve. Particularly noteworthy is the role that Zeiders plays in supporting the special needs of military servicemembers and their families. Zeiders Enterprises is a founding sponsor of The Quality of Life Foundation, whose mission is to honor and serve our severely injured combat servicemembers and their families by helping them face the life-changing challenges unique to their situations.

Employees at Zeiders contribute outside the workplace through extensive volunteer service. They support the American Red Cross, Peace Corps, local schools, youth development programs, mentoring programs, victim advocate programs, youth sports programs, community orchestras, volunteer fire and rescue departments, and the National Guard and Reserve. Leading by example and helping to create a culture of public service is Mr. Michael Zeiders, CEO and founder. Mr. Zeiders has supported families of wounded warriors nationwide through the Quality of Life Foundation, served on the Northern Virginia Workforce Investment Board, and is working with the City of Virginia Beach to develop the American Dream Theater to foster emerging artists.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join with me to congratulate Zeiders Enterprises on its 30th anniversary and to pay tribute to the significant contributions its employees have made in improving our communities and the lives of our brave men and women who serve in the United States Armed Forces.

HONORING CAPTAIN CHRISTOPHER MERCER, USN

HON. JOHN K. DELANEY

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize and honor Captain Christopher Mercer, USN, for his incredible courage and bravery on September 16, 2013 during the Navy Yard Shooting.

Captain Mercer served admirably, as he both ensured the safety of himself and three others during the shooting, and helped the police in their efforts, all while trapped inside of his office in the Navy Yards Building 197. His incredible courage should not be left in vain.

I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues help me in honoring Captain Christopher Mercer, USN, for his distinguished acts of courage during the Navy Yard Shooting on September 16, 2013. Captain Mercer is a hero for his acts on that day, and should be recognized for his remarkable bravery.

CONGRATULATING THE MOTHER McAULEY LIBERAL ARTS HIGH SCHOOL SCIENCE BOWL TEAM ON THEIR REGIONAL SCIENCE BOWL VICTORY

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Mother McAuley Liberal Arts High School Science Bowl Team on their Regional Science Bowl win on February 22, 2014. This victory advances the school to the National Science Bowl Championship held in Washington D.C. I appreciate all of the hard work and dedication the team members have put in to advance their knowledge of science and would like to congratulate them on this tremendous accomplishment.

The Department of Energy created the National Science Bowl in 1991 to encourage students to excel in mathematics and science and to pursue careers in these fields. More than 225,000 students have participated in the National Science Bowl through its 23-year history. It is one of the nation's largest science competitions.

The Regional Science Bowl Competition held at Evanston High School brought both middle school and high school science bowl teams together to compete by answering questions in a round robin format covering a range of science topics including biology, physics, math, astronomy, earth science, and computer science. The Mother McAuley team could not be beat that day and won a paid trip to Washington D.C. for Nationals, where they will compete in a fast-paced question-and-answer format solving technical problems and answering questions on a range of science topics.

The winning Mother McAuley Science Bowl team is the only one from Illinois to advance to Nationals. This winning team is comprised of 8 students, Seniors Tiffany Anderson, Siobhan Bennett, Rayn Davis, Montana Ford, and Diana Sanchez, and Juniors Sarah Dynia, Juliana Magnan, and Jessica Marchetti.

Mother McAuley Liberal Arts High School is a Catholic educational community sponsored by the Sisters of Mercy and is committed to providing a quality secondary education for young women. The school opened in 1956 and is located in the Third Congressional District on the Southwest Side of Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Mother McAuley Science Bowl Team on their remarkable achievement and I wish them the best at Nationals.

35TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TAIWAN RELATIONS ACT

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the robust U.S.-Taiwan relationship and mark the 35th anniversary of the Taiwan Relations Act, TRA, of 1979.

The TRA set in motion a bond between the people of the United States and Taiwan that continues today. It is more critical now than ever before that we understand the value of that bond and work to promote it at every opportunity. Members of Congress who have been here long enough to see the benefits of the TRA in action know that it is an integral part of sustaining the mutual security and commercial interests of our two governments.

Our commitment to Taiwan has remained steady in times of amity and times of crisis. In July 1995, when Beijing conducted a series of missile tests in the Taiwan Strait in a brazen attempt to intimidate the Taiwanese people, the U.S. deployed the largest military fleet in Asia since the Vietnam War. Thankfully, disaster was averted. Today, an atmosphere of peaceful coexistence is maintained across the Taiwan Strait. But our nation's choices during that tense period were a potent symbol of our steadfast support of Taiwan.

The United States recognizes Taiwan's unfailing determination to promote a free and fair democratic society. We, as a nation, have supported their efforts over the last three and a half decades by providing military assistance and fostering commercial exchange. Today, Taiwan is a close ally and collaborator in global efforts to combat terrorism. Recently, Taiwan was invited for the first time to attend the 38th assembly of the International Civil Aviation Organization, ICAO, as a special guest of Council President Roberto Kobeh Gonzalez. Through their active engagement with ICAO, Taiwan provides a multiplier effect to our own efforts to ensure safe and secure air travel and protect air passengers from the threat of hijackings and terrorist attacks. Such collaboration among partners would not have been possible without the TRA.

Today, 35 years after the passage of the TRA and nearly two decades since the Taiwan Strait Crisis, I would like to reassert our nation's role in maintaining peace and stability abroad. Our ongoing engagement with Taiwan and preservation of the TRA demonstrates our

commitment to all of our allies in the Asia-Pacific region.

While we recognize the TRA, it is also important that we recognize the departure of Ambassador King Pu-tsung who has fostered the U.S.-Taiwan relationship for the last 18 months as their chief envoy to the United States. Ambassador King will soon return to Taiwan to serve as Secretary-General. Under the guidance of Ambassador King, the U.S. and Taiwan have enjoyed a very successful era. I have enjoyed the opportunity to work with Ambassador King and look forward to working with his successor in the future as we continue to strengthen our unique relationship.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF KIDSFIRST

HON. DOUG LaMALFA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 25th Anniversary of KidsFirst, an organization located in Roseville, California, dedicated to ending child abuse and neglect through prevention.

Since 1989, KidsFirst has provided services to parents and children with difficult life circumstances across the Sierra-Sacramento region. In last year alone, KidsFirst served nearly 6,000 children, teens, and adults through direct programs such as counseling, healing therapy, free education programs, and community outreach.

Their commitment and vision has served to strengthen and empower families and communities to provide an ideal environment for children to thrive and experience the benefit of happy, health, and safe childhoods.

Mr. Speaker, I commend KidsFirst for their exceptional work throughout Northern California and join them in the recognition of National Child Abuse Prevention Month during the month of April.

MANUEL FLORES

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Manuel Flores for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Manuel Flores is a 12th grader at Jefferson High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Manuel Flores is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Manuel Flores for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. ANNE TIDWELL

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, one of the great pleaures that I have had as an elected official has been getting to know families like that of Mr. & Mrs. Tidwell, whom I met doing what is called community organizing. Mrs. Annie Tidwell was blessed to possess one of God's greatest gifts, the ability to cook. She of course was an avid churchgoer, a wonderfully engaged Christian and churchgoer, one who looked after her husband and family, and their home was always open for civic and community activities.

Some of my best block club remembrances took place in the Tidwell home because everybody in the neighborhood knew that if you were at the Tidwells' there would be a great environment and some of the best food on this side of heaven.

The Tidwell family is a prime example of what has been the underpinning of Black development in this country, making use of whatever skills, talents, training and hard work they could produce. For many years Mr. Tidwell was my plumber and together, the two of them were stalwarts in the Austin Community and great friends to everyone. It seems as though the poet Sam Walter Foss must have had them in mind when he wrote, the House by the side of the Road.

THE HOUSE BY THE SIDE OF THE ROAD

There are hermit souls that live withdrawn
In the place of their self-content;
There are souls like stars, that dwell apart,
In a fellowless firmament;
There are pioneer souls that blaze the paths
Where highways never ran—
But let me live by the side of the road
And be a friend to man.
Let me live in a house by the side of the road
Where the race of men go by—
The men who are good and the men who are bad,
As good and as bad as I.
I would not sit in the scorner's seat
Nor hurl the cynic's ban—
Let me live in a house by the side of the road
And be a friend to man.
I see from my house by the side of the road
By the side of the highway of life,
The men who press with the ardor of hope,
The men who are faint with the strife,
But I turn not away from their smiles and tears,
Both parts of an infinite plan—
Let me live in a house by the side of the road
And be a friend to man.
I know there are brook-gladdened meadows ahead,
And mountains of wearisome height;
That the road passes on through the long afternoon
And stretches away to the night.
And still I rejoice when the travelers rejoice
And weep with the strangers that moan,
Nor live in my house by the side of the road
Like a man who dwells alone.
Let me live in my house by the side of the road,
Where the race of men go by—
They are good, they are bad, they are weak, they are strong,
Wise, foolish—so am I.
Then why should I sit in the scorner's seat,
Or hurl the cynic's ban?
Let me live in my house by the side of the road
And be a friend to man.

A COMMEMORATION OF NIKA FLEISSIG

HON. ANN KIRKPATRICK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I recognize the life and work of Nika Fleissig. As a young woman, Ms. Fleissig lost her entire family during the Holocaust in Poland, but she survived to tell a heroic and inspiring story.

Ms. Fleissig was born Bronislawa Felicia Kohn in 1920 and was raised by her loving family in Krakow, Poland, until Nazi anti-Jewish laws caused her father to lose his business and forced the family to move from their home. By 1942, both of Ms. Fleissig's parents and her younger brother had been killed by the Nazis. She was left completely alone. Through the goodwill of virtuous and brave friends, and with her own talent for languages, she survived on her own.

After surviving the bombing of Warsaw and near-starvation living in bombed-out buildings, Ms. Fleissig was eventually captured and incarcerated in a prisoner of war camp in Oberlangen, Germany. Throughout 1944 and 1945, Ms. Fleissig survived unthinkable hunger, abuse and deprivation until April 12, 1945, when she was freed from the concentration camp by Polish and Canadian forces.

Ms. Fleissig immediately began working with Allied forces to assist refugees and other victims of the war. As a speaker of English, French, German and Polish, Ms. Fleissig was an unrivaled contributor to this cause. Ms. Fleissig first served the British military by accompanying officers to displaced persons camps to help people rebuild their lives. She then assisted the American Army in a similar capacity. Ms. Fleissig was given an American uniform and the rank of Lieutenant.

On February 14, 1946—Valentine's Day—Ms. Fleissig arrived in New York City and for the first time saw the Statue of Liberty and America. Her new life in her new country had begun.

NEVADA'S BATTLE BORN HISTORY

HON. DINA TITUS

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, every year on March 21st we take a moment to celebrate Nevada's conception and our unique, Battle Born history. From Reno to Las Vegas, from the mountains to the desert, from the sage grouse to the neon lights, 'Home Means Nevada.'

One hundred and fifty years ago, the country was in the middle of the bloodiest war in our history, President Lincoln's re-election was in jeopardy, and the proposed 13th amendment, which would end slavery, lacked the necessary votes to pass.

With little time left in the thirty-eighth Congress, the outlook was bleak; but the Republican-dominated Nevada Territory offered an

opportunity to secure the necessary votes to pass the 13th Amendment and ensure the re-election of President Lincoln.

Anxious to gain the support of the Nevada Territory before the end of the session, Congress rushed to pass an enabling act for Nevada statehood through the legislature. On March 21, 1864, President Lincoln signed the bill to pave the way for Nevada's admission to the Union.

This unique history proves that though Nevadans rarely do things by the book, we always endure. We may be down, but we are never out. Over the past decade we have seen Nevada hit hard by the housing crisis; unemployment soared; and our economy suffered worse than most during the Great Recession. But we are coming back. New businesses are relocating to the state; gaming revenues are up; and we've been chosen as a site for the exciting new FAA Federal UAV testing program. I have no doubt that we will come back stronger than ever, because we are Battle Born.

KRITI DHUNGEL

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Kriti Dhungel for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Kriti Dhungel is a 12th grader at Standley Lake High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Kriti Dhungel is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Kriti Dhungel for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CAROLYN McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent during the week of March 3, 2014. If I were present, I would have voted on the following:"

Rollcall No. 91: H.R. 3370, "yea"; rollcall No. 92: H. Res. 488, "yea"; rollcall No. 93: Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 4118 and H.R. 3826, "nay"; rollcall No. 94: H. Res. 497, "no"; rollcall No. 95: H.R. 938, "yea"; rollcall No. 96: Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 4118, "yea"; rollcall No. 97: H.R. 4118, "nay"; rollcall No. 98: H.R. 2126, "yea"; rollcall No. 99: Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2641 and H.R. 2824, "nay"; rollcall No. 100: H. Res. 501, "nay"; rollcall No. 101: Smith (TX)/Schweikert Amendment, "no"; rollcall No. 102: Capps/McNerney Amendment, "aye."

Rollcall No. 103: Schakowsky/Lowenthal Amendment "aye"; rollcall No. 104: Waxman Amendment, "aye"; rollcall No. 105: Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 3826, "yea"; rollcall No. 106: Final Passage of H.R. 3826, "no"; rollcall No. 107: Motion to Table the Fudge Privileged Resolution, "nay"; rollcall No. 108: Jackson-Lee Amendment, "aye"; rollcall No. 109: McKinley Amendment,"no"; rollcall No. 110: Nadler Amendment, "aye"; rollcall No. 111: Johnson Amendment, "aye"; rollcall No. 112: Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 2641, "aye"; rollcall No. 113: H.R. 2641, "no"; rollcall No. 114: H.R. 4152, "yea."

HONORING SHARON JONES

HON. JASON T. SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Sharon Jones, who has been a valuable asset to Cape Girardeau County for over 28 years through her work with the Cape Girardeau County Sheriffs Office in the Communications Division. Sharon has shown her dedication and commitment to her profession by attending many hours of training on Missouri laws, supervisory training, 9–1–1 communications training and countless hours of continuing education. Sharon worked as a supervisor of the 9–1–1 emergency communications call center, answering emergency calls, as well as serving as the TAC officer for Cape Girardeau County Sheriffs Office for many years. Sharon personally implemented a number of important programs for the community, such as the Sex Offender Registration for Cape Girardeau County and the Carry Conceal Weapon program.

During her years of service, Sharon oversaw and maintained high standards for the 9–1–1 communications division for the protection of our officers and our citizens. Her community recognized her in 2001 with the Timothy J. Ruopp Award. Her dedication in serving Cape Girardeau helped countless residents, and it is my pleasure to recognize her efforts and achievements before the House of Representatives.

RECOGNIZING THE 2014 FLORIDA STRAWBERRY FESTIVAL

HON. DENNIS A. ROSS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize the 2014 Florida Strawberry Festival, which was held from February 27 through March 9, 2014 in the Winter Strawberry Capital of the World—Plant City, Florida. This event, which began in 1930, recognizes and celebrates the historical legacy of the Florida strawberry, and its importance to Hillsborough County.

Hillsborough County produces about 15 percent of our nation's strawberries annually—with virtually all grown during the winter months. More than 10,000 acres of strawberries are grown in Hillsborough County, and 50,000 American jobs are impacted directly by the local strawberry industry. In total, this industry has an economic impact on our community exceeding $700 million per year.

With attendance at the annual Florida Strawberry Festival regularly topping half a million attendees, this is one of the premiere festivals in the country, and I am proud to recognize its success.

LOVIE SCHMITTER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Lovie Schmitter for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Lovie Schmitter is a 12th grader at Jefferson High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Lovie Schmitter is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Lovie Schmitter for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

THE INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PERMIT COMMERCIAL FILMING AND PHOTOGRAPHY ON THE GROUNDS OF THE U.S. CAPITOL

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to introduce a bill to permit commercial filming and photography on the grounds of the U.S. Capitol. Currently, such filming and photography is only authorized on Union Square. The bill would permit commercial photography and filming outside of the Capitol and congressional office buildings by permit. In today's world, where many societies are facing upheavals, our country, with an exemplary model of democracy, should be the first to encourage commercial photography and filming to record various scenes of the legislature, which symbolizes U.S. democracy at work. The time is overdue to allow to commercial filming and photography of the exterior of the historic 19th century Capitol building. There is no good reason filming should be confined to Union Square. Specifically, my bill gives the Capitol Police the discretion, depending on the circumstances in and around the Capitol, to issue a permit authorizing commercial filming activity on any parcel of Federal property under the control of the Capitol Police with

views of the Capitol and congressional office buildings, under the same conditions as those in Union Square. Such areas might include Independence Avenue on the House side, and Constitution Avenue on the Senate side.

No policy or security reason exists to justify the limit of commercial filming and photography of the Capitol complex to only one location, Union Square, particularly considering that permits are necessary. The blanket selection of only one location for such filming raises serious First Amendment issues. People are regularly seen on East Capitol Street (east of 2nd street), where they get a full view of the Capitol building taking pictures, demonstrating how arbitrary it is to limit commercial filming to Union Square.

My bill would allow commercial filming and photography from areas with views of the Capitol and congressional buildings that are under the jurisdiction of the Capitol Police, in addition to Union Square, which is located directly west of the Capitol. In addition, the Capitol Police would have the authority to charge a fee to cover any costs incurred by the Architect of the Capitol as a result of the issuance of the permit, to be deposited into the Capitol Trust Account. The Capitol Trust Account was established to accept proceeds from any fees collected for commercial filming permits for Union Square. Amounts in the Capitol Trust Account would be available without fiscal year limitation for such maintenance, improvements, and projects with respect to the Capitol grounds as the Architect of the Capitol considers appropriate, subject to the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate.

Vistas of the U.S. Capitol are among America's most iconic. Limiting commercial filming and photography of the Capitol, an important vehicle for telling the nation's story, does not serve the American people. Indeed, most of the world's people know our country and revere our system of government largely through commercial photography and films of the Capitol, which symbolizes our democracy at work. Commercial films and photographs of the Capitol, the seat of our democracy, are perhaps the best modem vehicles for telling the nation's story and showcasing its democratic system of government. My bill would enable appropriate, permitted commercial filming and photography of the Capitol, and would create economic benefits for the nation, the city, and private business.

I urge support of this bill.

EVERY WORLD PROBLEM DOES NOT HAVE AN AMERICAN SOLUTION

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy, in a 1961 speech at the University of Washington, said:

> . . . We must face the fact that the United States is neither omnipotent or omniscient—that we are only six percent of the world's population—that we cannot impose our own will upon the other 94 percent of mankind—that we cannot right every wrong or reverse each adversity—and that therefore there cannot be an American solution to every world problem.

Today we are less than four percent of the world's population and we are over 17.5 trillion dollars in debt.

Many people are trying to prove that they are great world statesmen and are supporting policies that will commit us to spend billions we do not have on Ukraine.

I wish everyone would read a recent book called Ike's Bluff by Evan Thomas. This book is about the foreign policy of President Eisenhower and explains that he stayed out of many situations that were worse than what is going on in Ukraine, because he did not have to prove that he was a great military leader or world statesman.

We should have trade and tourism, and cultural and educational exchanges with other countries, and help to a limited extent during humanitarian crisis.

But we cannot be the policemen of the world. The Ukrainians are going to have to solve their own problems, and we need to start taking better care of our own Country and our own people.

HONORING GLORIA CRUZ

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the contributions and efforts of Ms. Gloria Cruz, a resident of the Bronx and an advocate for reducing gun violence by enacting sensible gun safety laws. Since 2005, she has served as the Bronx President of the Million Mom March, and she has been tireless in her advocacy for the children, and all residents, of the Bronx. After 9 years of incredible effort, she will be stepping back from her volunteer duties.

Ms. Cruz's forceful advocacy over the years has been in honor of her niece, who sadly, was a victim of gun violence. Naiesha Pearson was killed in the Bronx at the age of 10 by a stray bullet—her life cut short in an instant by a senseless act of violence. This tragedy shocked everyone in our community, but for Gloria, it was a call to action.

Since that time, she has been a leading voice in our borough and state for stronger gun laws. Ms. Cruz established Bronx chapter for New Yorkers Against Gun Violence, and organized an annual Bronx Million Mom March. She has tirelessly worked to get illegal guns off our streets, to increase background checks, and to create safe neighborhoods for our children. She has comforted the families of other victims of gun violence, and stood by law enforcement in their efforts to reduce gun crimes. The breadth and depth of her advocacy work has been truly amazing.

Last year, I had the honor to invite Ms. Cruz as my guest to the President's State of the Union address. During the speech, the President eloquently and passionately outlined the need for common sense improvements to our nation's gun control laws. For many years, Gloria Cruz has brought that same message to both the Bronx and to New York City.

Mr. Speaker, through her work, Ms. Cruz has been an inspiration and mentor to many, and a comfort to those who have lost loved ones as a result of gun violence. She has truly honored Naiesha's memory in all of her work. I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring Gloria Cruz for all that she has done to help make the Bronx a safer place for our children.

KAYLEE BOREN

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Kaylee Boren for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Kaylee Boren is a 10th grader at Standley Lake High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Kaylee Boren is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Kaylee Boren for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

CONGRATULATING THE VILLAGE OF SCHILLER PARK ON THEIR CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY

HON. MIKE QUIGLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Village of Schiller Park, Illinois, which is celebrating its 100th Anniversary.

The village just outside the City of Chicago incorporated in 1914 as Kolze was later named Schiller Park in 1926. Although several areas were annexed into the village during the 1920s and 1930s, few homes were built. In 1932, Julia Kolze, daughter-in-law of the founder, became the first woman village president or mayor in Illinois. Her avowed strategy was to employ kitchen table economics, running government on a budget the way she ran her household.

Today, Schiller Park is home to over 11,000 residents, hundreds of businesses, numerous schools and religious institutes, and a variety of parks and recreational facilities. They strive for that small town feeling while located in a great metropolitan area which is incorporated in their motto: ''Small town feel with a world at its touch.''

The Village of Schiller Park is a prime example of what any community should be. They provide services to residents of all ages. For the past six years, Schiller Park has hosted ''Make a Difference Day,'' an initiative to engage members of the community in acts of kindness to benefit seniors and disabled residents of the village. These projects include leaf raking, yard cleaning, or running simple errands for their elderly and disabled neighbors. Schiller Park also hosts a wide range of events such as Family Fun Day, car shows,

village garage sales, blood drives, canned food drives, concerts in the park, and farmers markets.

I am proud to represent the Village of Schiller Park as it prospers today under the leadership of Mayor Barbara Piltaver.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the residents of the Village of Schiller Park on their 100th Anniversary. I am truly honored to have such an outstanding village in my district.

RECOGNIZING THE 35TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TAIWAN RELATIONS ACT AND REPRESENTATIVE KING PU-TSUNG

HON. ALAN S. LOWENTHAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, close cooperation between Taiwan and the United States has been of critical importance since the Taiwan Relations Act was signed on April 10, 1979—35 years ago next month. With the TRA, the United States has been able to forge a strong and mutually beneficial economic, cultural, and security relationship with Taiwan while ensuring peace in the Taiwan Strait.

Taiwan remains a true friend of the United States and a partner in democracy, trade, and human rights. This anniversary is an opportunity to reflect on this successful partnership and to further strengthen the ties between our two governments.

Since the TRA was signed in 1979, Taiwan has grown into a bustling free-market economy and vital trading and investment partner to the United States. But our work is far from over. On the 35th anniversary of the TRA, I urge my fellow colleagues to join me in honoring the deep partnership and friendship between Taiwan and the United States.

It is in this spirit that we should recognize the departure of Representative King Pu-tsung who has fostered greater ties between the U.S. and Taiwan for the last 18 months as Taiwan's chief envoy to the United States. I have enjoyed the opportunity to work with Representative King and wish him all the best as he returns to Taiwan. I also look forward to working with his successor to continue to strengthen our unique relationship with Taiwan.

HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MAPLEWOOD NORTH LIONS CLUB

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the members of the Maplewood North Lions Club, past and present, on the occasion of its 50th anniversary. Since it was founded and chartered on March 23, 1964 in Maplewood, Minnesota, members have focused on serving individuals and organizations throughout the Maplewood community and beyond.

Within seven years after the Village of Maplewood was incorporated, the Maplewood North Lions Club was chartered by dedicated members, including Lion Dick Dean who remains a member today. The Lions and Lionesses originally met at Maplewood Bowl before constructing their own hall in Maplewood, which served as the location for meetings, fundraising events and community gatherings.

Both the Maplewood North Lions and Lionesses have established a legacy of service to local organizations throughout the community. Numerous local organizations have benefitted from the Maplewood North Lions Club's direct volunteer efforts as well as donations, including: schools, food shelves, Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, Special Olympics, Youth Service Bureau, Salvation Army, Union Gospel Mission, Ramsey County Care Center, Wakefield Park, and the East County Line Fire Department. The Maplewood North Lions Club may be best known for its commitment to the "gift of sight." The club has generously donated to the University of Minnesota Lions Eye Bank and currently provides thousands of pairs of eyeglasses each year to people in need around the world.

Mr. Speaker, the valuable contributions of time, talents and generous donations by members of the Maplewood North Lions Club made during the past five decades are commendable and deserve to be celebrated. In honor of the 50th anniversary of the Maplewood North Lions Club, it is a privilege to submit this statement to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

KRISTINA RUSSO

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Kristina Russo for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Kristina Russo is a 7th grader at Oberon Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Kristina Russo is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Kristina Russo for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

IN TRIBUTE TO FRED A. KAHN

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding achievements and remarkable life story of Fred A. Kahn. In addition to his 30 years of distinguished service as a federal employee, Mr. Kahn is credited for his role as an original architect of the modern American Presidential debate and for his work to promote tolerance and understanding through Holocaust education.

Mr. Kahn was born to Jewish parents in Wiesbaden, Germany on December 19, 1932. In January 1933, when Hitler rose to power as Chancellor of Germany, Mr. Kahn's parents fled to Belgium, leaving their infant son behind in Germany in the care of his Uncle Siegfried and Aunt Rosa. On October 1, 1938, six weeks before the terror of Kristallnacht, Siegfried and Rosa arranged for six-year-old Fred's dramatic escape and successful reunification with his parents on the German-Belgian border. Following the occupation of Belgium by the Germans in May 1940, the family went into hiding until Belgium's liberation in September 1944. Sadly, Siegfried and Rosa were both murdered by the Nazis.

Mr. Kahn immigrated to the United States when he was 19, settled in Baltimore, Maryland, and was inducted into the U.S. Army on March 17, 1953. He became a naturalized U.S. citizen on November 24, 1953 at Fort Bragg, North Carolina while serving with the 82nd Airborne Division. After basic training, he was assigned to the 525th Military Intelligence Service where he worked as an intelligence analyst. In March 1954, he returned to Germany, this time as an American soldier.

After his honorable discharge from the Army in 1955, Mr. Kahn enrolled in the University of Maryland. Mr. Kahn devised an idea that would later become a revered tradition in American politics. In 1956, Mr. Kahn approached the University administration with a novel idea—a proposal for an on-campus Presidential debate. The Maryland Board of Regents rejected the proposal. However, former First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt endorsed the idea. When Mr. Kahn attended the 1958 Brussels World's Fair as an employee of the U.S. Department of State, he met with Gov. Adlai Stevenson, the Democratic Party's Presidential candidate in 1952 and 1956. Governor Stevenson endorsed the idea as well. In 1960 the League of Women Voters organized the first Presidential debate between Richard Nixon and John F. Kennedy.

After graduating from the University of Maryland, Mr. Kahn was awarded a Woodrow Wilson Fellowship to the School of Advanced International Studies at Johns Hopkins University. He spent the next 30 years as a political economist for the U.S. government and was instrumental in the creation of the Job Corps for the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity. He later finished his career as an economist for the U.S. Department of Labor. Mr. Kahn served on the Board of the National Council of the American Society of Public Administration (ASPA), the Board of Editors of the Public Administration Review, and the Board of Directors of the Society of Government Economists. He was awarded a Distinguished Career Service Award by the U.S. Secretary of Labor.

After his 1992 retirement from federal service, Mr. Kahn continued to serve his community as a teacher of Holocaust history, promoting tolerance and understanding. In 2005 Maryland Governor Robert Ehrlich appointed Mr. Kahn to his Task Force to Implement Holocaust, Genocide, Human Rights and Tolerance Education. Today, he moderates an online Holocaust remembrance group of over 300 members worldwide and is an active member of the Maryland-Washington, D.C.

chapter of the World Federation of Child Survivors of the Holocaust.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize the extraordinary life and achievements of Fred A. Kahn. Throughout his life, Mr. Kahn has worked tirelessly to make our world more tolerant and compassionate. He has made outstanding contributions to our government, our country, and our community, and I ask my colleagues to join me in expressing our appreciation for his service.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and so I missed rollcall vote No. 120 regarding the ''Conyers Amendment.'' Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and so I missed rollcall vote No. 121 regarding the ''Nadler Amendment.'' Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and so I missed rollcall vote No. 122 regarding the ''Jackson Lee Amendment.'' Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and so I missed rollcall vote No. 123 regarding the ''Motion to Recommit H.R. 4138.'' Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and so I missed rollcall vote No. 124 regarding the ''ENFORCE the Law Act of 2014.'' Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 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 $17,501,576,037,738.02. We've added $6,874,698,988,824.94 to our debt in 5 years. This is over $6.8 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

LILIANA MERAZ

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Liliana Meraz for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Liliana Meraz is a 12th grader at Jefferson High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Liliana Meraz is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Liliana Meraz for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

PATIENT SAFETY AWARENESS WEEK AND THE NATIONAL PATIENT SAFETY FOUNDATION

HON. ANN KIRKPATRICK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, this week is Patient Safety Awareness Week, and today I'd like to recognize the National Patient Safety Foundation and the Organizations in my district that work to promote and improve patient safety.

In Arizona's District One, we have several facilities that are committed to patient safety, including Oro Valley Hospital, Flagstaff Medical Center, and Ventana Medical Systems.

Oro Valley Hospital has been nationally recognized for its efforts, which include daily safety huddles and employee empowerment. At Flagstaff Medical Center, their patient safety program also encourages employee collaboration.

My district is home to Ventana Medical Systems, a world leader in developing solutions for tissue-based diagnoses. Ventana has a new advisory board that brings together experts to review patient safety.

I applaud the National Patient Safety Foundation and the hospitals and companies in my district and nationwide who are leading the way to keep patient safety as a top priority.

RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF NUCLEAR ENERGY

HON. MIKE KELLY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to describe the unique opportunity for the United States to meet a number of national goals through the utilization of nuclear energy.

The nuclear industry has played an instrumental role in promoting economic growth and energy security in America. I have witnessed firsthand the benefits of nuclear energy back home in Western Pennsylvania, where the Westinghouse Electric Company employs thousands of hardworking Americans. Founded in 1886 by American entrepreneur and engineer Thomas Westinghouse, the company was initially known for helping to bring electricity to homes throughout our country. Today, nearly 50 percent of the nuclear power plants in operation worldwide, including nearly 60 percent in the United States, are based on Westinghouse technology.

These positive impacts on our domestic economy are only a part of nuclear energy's overall benefits. The U.S. commercial nuclear energy sector yields enormous influence over global nonproliferation policy. The sector is also responsible for assuring international nuclear safety through the exportation of U.S. advanced reactor designs and America's operational expertise. Thus, by exporting U.S. nuclear technology, we ensure the highest levels of plant safety and influence over nonproliferation policies throughout the globe.

Mr. Speaker, a successful nuclear trade and export policy is paramount to international nuclear nonproliferation and power plant safety. I urge my colleagues to recognize the benefits of our nation's participation in the expanding global market for nuclear energy technologies.

NORTHERN IRELAND: INSUFFICIENT ATTEMPTS TO DEAL WITH THE PAST

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, I convened a hearing that inquired into the Northern Ireland peace process, particularly that aspect of it which is called ''dealing with the past.''

Sadly, much of what we heard about amounts to failures to deal with the past, as in the rejection of the recent proposal made by Dr. Richard Haass. Dr. Haass served as Chair of the Panel of Parties in the Northern Ireland Executive—that is, he was asked to assist in brokering an agreement to move the peace process forward. In that capacity Dr. Haass spent months consulting and formulating a proposal. In the end, the proposal was not accepted by all of the parties, though it clarified where progress can be made and where sticking points remain.

One of the most important questions that Dr. Haass and the parties dealt with is what will be done with the Historical Enquiries Team (HET) and the Police Ombudsman of Northern Ireland (PONI)—two key bodies established by the Good Friday agreement to investigate unsolved murders.

We discussed Dr. Haass' proposal to replace the HET and PONI with a Historical Investigations Unit and Baroness O'Loan's suggestion to replace them with a rather different Investigative Commission during the hearing. For now I want to underline this: both agree that the status quo way of dealing with Troubles crimes should be replaced. Likewise the parties in the Northern Ireland executive reportedly agreed with this aspect of Dr. Haass' proposal. So the agreement is broad on this point. It's time to move to a better system.

As Dr. Haass' proposal stated: ''The multiplicity of institutions and vehicles for justice in respect of conflict-related incidents, however, creates confusion and places enormous burdens on the police. The HET, PONI, and inquests also suffer from the perception that they have proceeded too slowly.''

The facts alone tell this story: of the more than 3,000 Troubles-related deaths that occurred between 1968 and 1998, the HET has yet to review some 600 cases, involving 800 deaths.

Dr. Haass' proposed Historical Investigations Unit has much to say for it—by establishing a single unit with full investigative

power it would eliminate the overlaps, contradictions, and waste of resources in the mandates of the HET and PONI.

Likewise the suggestion of Baroness O'Loan—who served very successfully as Police Ombudsman from 2000 to 2007—for an Investigative Commission that would be a ''totally independent investigative fully empowered and fully resourced body with a remit to examine any Troubles related cases involving death up to 2006 . . .'' Lady O'Loan's proposal emphasizes the need for an unimpeachably independent agency in order to win the trust of both communities.

In any case Dr. Haass' proposal remains extremely important on all points—those involved most closely in the peace process have expressed their confidence that it accurately reflects the current divisions and positions of the parties, and will likely serve as an important basis for future discussions.

We also heard about the Finucane case and the British Military Reaction Force. These aspects of 'dealing with the past' were not covered by Dr Haass' proposal to the Northern Ireland political parties—because they deal with matters that are the responsibility of the British Government.

First, the British Government's failure to conduct the promised inquiry into collusion in the 1989 murder of Patrick Finucane. The British Government has a solemn obligation to initiate the full, independent, public, judicial inquiry that was agreed as part of the overall peace settlement in Northern Ireland during the Weston Park negotiations in 2001. This obligation, which was undertaken by both governments as part of the Belfast Agreement—one of the outstanding diplomatic achievements of recent decades—was an extremely serious undertaking. In order for the peace process to move forward, the British Government must honor it.

While Prime Minister Cameron admitted to ''shocking'' levels of collusion between the state and loyalist paramilitaries in the murder of Patrick Finucane, and apologized to the Finucane family for it, this does not substitute for a full exposition of the facts behind the British State's involvement in the murder. Rather the steady increase in the amount of evidence being revealed publicly that the British State colluded with the killers has made honoring that commitment more important than ever.

The British Government committed to implement the recommendation of a judge of international standing on six inquiry cases; in 2004, Judge Peter Cory recommended a public inquiry in the case of Patrick Finucane. To date, it remains the only case investigated where the recommendation has not been honored, a situation that is deeply unsatisfactory for many reasons but not least because it is evidently the one where the British Government is most culpable. Conversely, it is also the case in which—until the Prime Minister's announcement in December 2012—there has been the greatest level of sustained official denial by various state agencies.

The many previous denials and time that has passed have drained public confidence in the peace process and diminished respect for the rule of law in Northern Ireland. It must be said that there are those who oppose the peace process and their opposition is dangerous. The failure to address the case of Patrick Finucane in the manner promised by the British Government provides a readily available propaganda tool for those who would abuse it to further their own ends. In our view, this represents yet another reason why the Finucane case is one of the most important unresolved issues in the peace process.

Second, there is the matter of killings committed by the British Army's Military Reaction Force. From approximately 1971–1973 the British Army ran an undercover unit of approximately 40 soldiers, who operated out-of-uniform and in unmarked cars, mostly around Belfast.

On November 21, 2013, the BBC program Panorama aired a documentary in which former members of MRF broke silence on aspects of the unit's operations, confirming what many had suspected for a long time. The BBC reported that, ''we've investigated the unit and discovered evidence that this branch of the British states sometimes . . . shot unarmed civilians.''

The BBC spoke to seven former members of the MRF, and though the men were careful not to incriminate themselves or each other in specific killings, they made plain that, as The *Independent* fairly characterized the report, ''The unit . . . would carry out drive-by shootings against unarmed people on the street without any independent evidence they were part of the IRA.''

As one of the former members admitted to the BBC, ''We were not there to act like an army unit—we were there to act like a terror group.''

Now the onus is on the British Government to investigate and punish these crimes. The British Ministry of Defense has said that it has referred the matter to the police for investigation. Unfortunately, the BBC reported that ''these soldiers were undercover, and what they did has been airbrushed from the official record.''

LUCERO RIVERA

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Lucero Rivera for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Lucero Rivera is a 12th grader at Jefferson High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Lucero Rivera is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Lucero Rivera for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

TRIBUTE TO ''MAGGIE'' SILVER

HON. JOHN L. MICA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Marjorie P. ''Maggie'' Silver Smith, a female pioneer, entrepreneur and a legend in the American Rail Industry who passed away on March 9, 2014. I was privileged to work with Maggie and was honored to know her both as a good friend and strong advocate for our Nation's railroads.

Maggie was a leader in the American rail business and a most respected member of various railroad infrastructure panels. She came from a railroad family, working with her father at Pinsly Railroad in 1965, and succeeded him as President in 1977 becoming Chairman of the Board in 2000. After her father's death, she was advised to sell the company. However Maggie was determined to run Pinsly holdings because she understood and embraced the changes that were occurring in the railroad industry, especially under the Staggers Act.

Under her leadership, she grew the Pinsly Railroad companies to eight short line railroads and railroad distribution companies serving 200 customers. She was a member and officer on the Board of the American Short Line Railroad Association and also played a leadership role at the Massachusetts Railroad Association and the American Short Line and Regional Railroad Association.

Maggie was recognized by all as a knowledgeable, vocal and effective spokesman for the rail industry. Her innovation and good business sense made her one of the most important and significant leaders in the short line industry. She was renowned for being tough but fair, thoughtful and forward thinking, continually encouraging women to enter and succeed in the railroad industry. Her wonderful wit, enthusiasm, energy and presence always had a positive impact, and she will be truly missed.

My deepest sympathy is extended to her husband, Robert; daughters, Anne, Leslie and Lindsey; and sons, John, Marc and James.

I ask all Members of the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in recognizing the distinguished life and service of Marjorie P. ''Maggie'' Silver Smith.

HONORING CLAN ''BUD'' PROFFER

HON. JASON T. SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Clan ''Bud'' Proffer who has been a valuable asset to Cape Girardeau County for over 32 years through his dedication and work with the Sheriff's Office in the Patrol Division, as Captain of Field Operations. Bud has shown his commitment to law enforcement by attending many hours of training on Missouri laws, crime investigations, supervisory training, reporting crimes, and countless hours of continuing education. He was appointed to the Cape Girardeau/Bollinger County Major Case Squad in 1983. Bud has served the community and his fellow employees as the Captain of the Field Operations Division for over 27 years.

Bud has shown dedication and commitment to his profession by leading the Sheriff's Office in their endeavor to automate the operations of the Sheriff's Office by obtaining, installing and maintaining computer programs, software and equipment to keep the Sheriff's Office automated for over 25 years. Over the years, Bud has received numerous awards such as the Timothy J. Ruopp Award for Outstanding Law Enforcement Officer in 1987 and again in 2012.

It is with the utmost respect and deepest gratitude that I recognize and thank Bud Proffer for his many years of service to the Cape Girardeau County Sheriff's Office. I wish him health and happiness in his future endeavors and in his retirement. I am grateful that we have such caring members of the Cape Girardeau community; it is my pleasure to recognize his achievements before the House of Representatives.

CELEBRATING THE GIRL SCOUTS OF AMERICA

HON. LEONARD LANCE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Girl Scouts of America as the organization celebrates its 102nd anniversary. More than 60 million Americans, and thousands of young women in my district, have been part of the premier leadership organization for girls.

The mission of the Girl Scouts has been to introduce girls to positive role models and experiences. Activities in science and technology, business and economic literacy, outdoor awareness and team building make them women of courage, confidence and character.

I applaud the Girl Scouts for more than a century of distinguished public service and the girls in my community for their achievements.

MAKENZIE MATTHEWS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Makenzie Matthews for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Makenzie Matthews is a 10th grader at Pomona High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Makenzie Matthews is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Makenzie Matthews for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

USS BATTLESHIP ''TEXAS'' CELEBRATES 100 YEAR ANNIVERSARY

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, fittingly titled after the Lone Star State, the USS *Texas* was the most powerful warship the world had seen. Commissioned on March 12, 1914, she participated in the most important battles of the first half of the Twentieth Century, spanning both World Wars and including the invasion of North Africa, Normandy, Iwo Jima and Okinawa. This year marks the 100th anniversary of the commissioning of this important Battleship named after our great state.

To commemorate her 100th anniversary, the Battleship *Texas* Foundation along with the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department are throwing a Texas-sized celebration for the Battleship on March 15, 2014 in La Porte at the San Jacinto Battleground Park. The all day festival will feature live music, food, fireworks, and activities for children as well as tours of the battleship. This month, don't pass up a great opportunity to go aboard and get a firsthand look of the last of the great Dreadnought battleships.

As a kid growing up in Spring Branch, I always looked forward to the long days of the hot Houston summers. Long days meant more time to play outside. I didn't know that summers in the other parts of the world were not steamy like here in Houston. (I now those from up north that Houston has two seasons: Summer and August.) Like most kids in the neighborhood, my sister and I played outdoors a good portion of the day and didn't come in til dark. We knew when the porch light came on, we had to be home within five minutes of seeing the ''beacon'' or there would be consequences. Occasionally, we got to take summer excursions with the family to the battlegrounds, the Monument and of course the Battleship *Texas*. That is where my love for the USS *Texas* began.

As kids, we thought it was ''cool'' that Texas had its own Battleship. We would pretend to shoot the guns on the ship, run through the countless corridors, nooks and crannies, climb the ladders as far as was allowed and reenact battles on the great battlewagon. My best friend Pete Cliburn and I would climb from top to bottom of the ''Mighty T,'' firing every gun and squeezing down every port hole along the way. We explored and climbed the ladders to the upper decks as high as we could go. When you reached the top of the ladder of the highest point, you better remember that the metal deck you were about to lay your forearms on was as hot as a cast iron skillet! But, as kids we couldn't care less; we were fighting on the greatest battleship to have ever sailed.

As I grew older, my fondness for the USS *Texas* remained, and I learned more about the amazing legacy of BB 35. Her most notable contributions came in WWII, firing at Nazi defenses during the D-Day invasion at Normandy. Called the ''smartest man o'war afloat,'' the *Texas* was an integral part of many US victories.

As the flagship of the US fleet, the *Texas* was the first of her kind to mount anti-aircraft guns, to use the first commercial radar, to launch an aircraft and to lay claim to the First Marine Division in 1941. At the end of the War, she made three trips bringing American servicemen home.

On April 21, 1948, the *Texas* was decommissioned and her place in history took root right here in our backyard. School children across Texas saved their nickels to help pay to dry dock the Battleship at the site of the Battlegrounds on the San Jacinto River. As a kid, it was obvious to me why General Sam routed Santa Anna—we had a battleship! It took me awhile to figure out that the Texas Revolution was in the 1800s, and the Battleship *Texas* was used in the 1900s. After all they retired her on San Jacinto Day. While that all made perfectly good sense back then, my love for Texas history in the years to come taught me that they were not one in the same, and General Sam's accomplishments became far more impressive.

Texas still has an ''Honorary'' Texas Navy. In the 1980s, the Governor of Texas appointed me as an Admiral in the Texas Navy. (Everyone in the Navy is an Admiral.) During my tenure as a judge, the ''Mighty T'' found its way back into my life, and the lives of offenders I ordered to be ''enlisted'' into the ''Texas Navy.'' I ordered probationers who were skilled welders, painters, plumbers and electricians to help in the restoration efforts of the Battleship. As one of many creative sentences, this became another effective tool that both served the public and the probationer—a few even went on to be hired by the Parks and Wildlife Department.

During the '80s, the ship needed repairs so it could be taken to Galveston for refurbishing. Several groups helped with the entire operation spearheaded by the Texas Parks Service. The First Texas Volunteers provide major restoration projects and have kept this old ship alive for thousands of visitors each year. The volunteers are working extra hard to prepare the ship for her 100th birthday bash.

Today, the Battleship *Texas* serves as a museum and a reminder of wars long past. In 1948, she was designated a National Historic Landmark. The *Texas* has an onboard museum that details her efforts in our fight for freedom and a history of the sailors that called her their own. The San Jacinto State Historical Park is just a short drive—tour the ship, enjoy the festivities, and relive some history aboard the magnificent USS *Texas*. And that's just the way it is.

IN RECOGNITION OF INTEL SCIENCE TALENT SEARCH FINALISTS KATHY CAMENZIND, ESHA MAITI, AND EMILY PANG

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize three finalists for the Intel Science Talent Search: Kathy Camenzind and Esha Maiti from California High School, and Emily Pang from Dougherty Valley High School, all from San Ramon, California in my congressional district.

These bright high school students are among the forty finalists selected from over 1,800 entrants in the Intel Science Talent Search, which is a competition that challenges students to tackle difficult scientific questions.

Entrants are judged on the originality and creativity of their science research projects.

I am inspired by the passion Kathy, Esha, and Emily have shown for their science projects, which highlight not only their intellect, but also their drive and determination to help solve today's most difficult problems. Kathy researched and build inexpensive optical tweezers using a low power laser and generic microscope; Esha developed a mathematical simulator to predict the distribution of secondary tumors in cancer patients; and Emily researched immune protein receptors critical to the growth and suppression of tumors for cancer therapies.

Kathy, Esha, and Emily's exceptional work show that we have the best and brightest among us in the East Bay.

Congratualtions again to Kathy, Esha, and Emily. I hope you will continue your efforts, and I look forward to hearing about your future successes.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

RECOGNIZING THE LEADERSHIP AND SERVICE OF SARA SHAW

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, in honor of Women's History Month, to recognize Sara Shaw. Sara is a City Commissioner and the owner of a small flooring business in her hometown of Kissimmee, Florida. She is also a lifelong resident of Osceola County where she began volunteering in her youth with Civil Air Patrol specializing in search and rescue.

Sara Shaw currently serves as the Director of several boards: the Tr-County League of Cities, the Education Foundation, the Transition House, and ESAH 360. Her memberships include the Osceola County Bar Association, Tr-County League of Cities Legislative Advocacy Team, and Florida League of Cities Environmental, Energy and Natural Resources Committee.

Prior to being elected, Sara served as a volunteer board member for Kissimmee's Parks and Recreation Advisory Board. She is very proud of Kissimmee's state of the art Lakefront Park. Her volunteer activities include Kissimmee Relay for Life, Kissimmee 5K, and serving as a Guardian Ad Litem to protect the rights of foster children. She has advocated to change Kissimmee Utility Authority (KUA) policies and to change the KUA Board of Directors appointment process.

Sara engages the community on a personal basis. She actively seeks out the concerns and opinions of the citizens and business owners and encourages everyone to get involved civically. She has even been known to help push a disabled vehicle out of the street or give rides to citizens in need.

Growing up in poverty, Sara feels that she must give back to the community that helped her so much. She is a hard worker and a fierce defender of those who cannot defend themselves. She tries to lead by example and serve her city, ever mindful of the Athenian Oath:

> We will never bring disgrace to this our city, by any act of dishonesty or cowardice; nor ever desert our suffering comrades in the ranks, we will fight for the ideal and sacred things of the city, both alone and with many; we will revere and obey the city's laws and do our best to incite a like respect in those above us who are prone to annul or set them at naught; we will strive unceasingly to quicken the public's sense of civic duty. Thus, in all these ways we will transmit this city not only, not less, but greater and more beautiful than it was transmitted to us.

I am happy to honor Sara Shaw, during Women's History Month, for her service to her hometown of Kissimmee, Florida.

RECOGNIZING THE LEADERSHIP OF COMMISSIONER DAISY WILLIAMS LYNUM

Mr. Speaker, I rise today, in honor of Women's History Month, to recognize Commissioner Daisy Williams Lynum. Commissioner Lynum was elected to the Orlando City Council on April 14, 1998. Born and raised in Leesburg, Florida, Ms. Lynum earned an undergraduate degree in Sociology at Bethune-Cookman College and a graduate degree in clinical Social Work from Florida State University.

As a Rockefeller Foundation Scholar recipient, she completed her post-baccalaureate studies at Haverford and Bryn Mawr colleges in Pennsylvania. She then completed her teaching certification at the University of Central Florida. Following her election, Commissioner Lynum completed the John F. Kennedy School of Government Program for Executives at Harvard University in 2000. In 2005, Florida Metropolitan University awarded Commissioner Lynum an Honorary Doctorate of Humane Letters. Commissioner Lynum joined the Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc., in 1966 and Gamma Phi Delta Sorority, Inc. in December 2008.

After more than 30 years of employment, Commissioner Lynum retired in 2002. She began her career as a fifth grade teacher then became a social worker and administrator for the Department of Health & Rehabilitative Services and a Special Services Social Worker for Orange County Public Schools.

Commissioner Lynum's primary focus has been increasing quality of life through sustainable neighborhoods for residents in District 5 and the City of Orlando. Her community and civic involvement has included numerous organizations, boards, committees, and taskforces: Florida League of Cities Board of Directors; Board of Directors for the National League of Cities; Vice Chair BBIF Board of Directors; President of the National League of Cities Women In Municipal Government; President of the National Black Caucus of Local Elected Officials; President of the National Black Caucus of Local Elected Officials Foundation Board; President of the Florida Black Caucus of Local Elected Officials; African American Women's Technology Caucus; Chairman of MetroPlan Orlando Transportation Board; Secretary of the Central Florida Metropolitan Planning Organization Alliance; Orange County Voter's League; Life Member of the NAACP; and Member of the Nemours Advisory Council.

For two years, Commissioner Lynum worked on constructing the Blueprint, adopted by Orlando City Council, which created over 1,000 jobs for the homeless, ex-felons and residents in the Parramore community. Commissioner Lynum also created the Orlando Medical Careers Partnership. The partnership takes a comprehensive approach to engage at-risk residents from elementary school through adulthood, with a four-tier system focusing on breaking barriers, youth engagement, advancing adults, and careers in science and healthcare related fields. The program launched on September 6, 2013.

Commissioner Lynum has also represented Orlando and the U.S. in Japan, Africa, and China through her participation in business exchanges like the US-China Exchange Association's US Business Matchmaking Conference. In addition, she has visited many Caribbean and European countries as a visitor. She enjoys reading, traveling, and gardening and is a member of the New Covenant Baptist Church of Orlando.

I am happy to honor Commissioner Daisy Lynum, during Women's History Month, for her contributions to the Central Florida community.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF JOSEPHINE MERCADO

Mr. Speaker, I rise today, in honor of Women's History Month, to recognize Josephine Mercado. A native New Yorker, of Puerto Rican descent, she was raised in Spanish Harlem. After 18 years as a homemaker, she enrolled in college, as an urban legal scholar. Six years later, she graduated from law school, with a Juris Doctor. She practiced law for 17 years, devoting much of her time to Latino health issues, among other volunteer and community involvement.

Throughout her career, Josephine has formed and directed nonprofits which implement programs that have provided access to health care, education, and wellness services to tens of thousands of people, first in New York City and now in Central Florida.

Josephine is the Founder and Executive Director of Hispanic Health Initiatives, Inc. (HHI), a private, non-profit, health education, prevention, and referral organization focused on chronic diseases impacting the medically underserved. HHI serves the communities of Orange, Osceola, Seminole and Volusia Counties.

Ms. Mercado was one of the first in her field to launch language-specific, culturally-competent health campaigns on early detection, preventive medicine, and screening. HHI's programs provide access (Abriendo Caminos) to existing health care services and medical "homes."

HHI's work includes: disproving myths preventing people from seeking care; reducing barriers and disparities; and enhancing health literacy among low-income, uninsured, and underserved populations.

Josephine is a staunch advocate of the community involvement. She is a member of a variety of entities serving the medically underserved in Central Florida, the state, and the nation. She has won local and national recognition for her innovative "Take It to the Community" health and wellness initiatives. These initiatives offer welcoming, informal settings for risk assessments, wellness, and prevention education.

Both Josephine and HHI have received numerous recognitions, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation "Community Health Leader" award, the FamiliesUSA "Consumer Health Advocate" award, and the Intercultural Cancer Council "National HOPE" award. Josephine has also been profiled many times, in both English and Spanish media, as HHI is considered the "Voice" of Hispanic health in Central Florida.

I am happy to honor Josephine Mercado, during Women's History Month, for her contributions to the health and wellness of the community.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF STATE REPRESENTATIVE LINDA STEWART

Mr. Speaker, I rise today, in honor of Women's History Month, to recognize State Representative Linda Stewart. Elected in 2012, Linda currently serves in the Florida House of Representatives representing District 47. She sits on the Regulatory Affairs Committee, Select Committee on Claims Bills, State Affairs Committee, Agriculture & Natural Resources Appropriations Subcommittee, and Transportation & Highway Safety Subcommittee.

Prior to her election to the Florida Legislature, Linda served as Orange County Commissioner for District 4 from 2002 to 2010. Her other public service includes serving on the City of Orlando Parks Board, the Library Governance Board, and the Orange County Canvassing Board.

An active member of her community, Linda has served as Chairwoman and Member of Metroplan Orlando, Orange County Vice Mayor, a Member of the Saint Johns River Restoration Group, and Vice Chairman for Phase II Housing Component for Mentally Ill.

Linda is an advocate for women and for equality. She is a member of the Harvey Milk Foundation Advisory Board and the Rainbow Democrats. In 2010, Equality Florida honored her with the ''Voice of Equality Award'' and in 2004 she was Women's Executive Council's ''Downtown Woman of the Year.'' She also received the ''Commissioner Leadership Award'' (FLERA) from the Sierra Club in 2011.

I am happy to honor State Representative Linda Stewart, during Women's History Month, for her leadership and service to the Central Florida community.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF MARTHA OGDEN HAYNIE

Mr. Speaker, I rise today, in honor of Women's History Month, to recognize Martha Ogden Haynie, CPA. Haynie graduated with honors from the University of West Florida in 1973 with a degree in accounting. She worked at Walt Disney World, Ernst and Young (previously Ernst and Whinney), her own accounting practice, and the Florida Symphony Orchestra before being elected as the Orange County Comptroller in 1988.

In her capacity as Comptroller, Haynie made improving citizens' trust in local government her top priority. Using her experience in the public, private and non-profit sectors, she emphasized providing quality service and accountability. By presenting audit reports directly to citizens through public presentations and the media, Haynie emphasized her role as a watchdog and the value of her independence as an elected official who answers to the public, not to other County officers.

In 1992, Haynie undertook an initiative to gain authority to collect and audit Orange County's resort tax. Her proactive measure has since produced more than $20 million in added revenues for the County. In 1996, Haynie's auditing authority was expanded by a Charter amendment, allowing her to audit other offices in the County in addition to the Board of County Commissioners and the Comptroller's Office.

The Florida Institute of CPAs named Haynie the 1998 Outstanding CPA in Government for her efforts to promote the CPA designation as the premier professional credential for government accounting, auditing, and finance professionals.

Between 2007 and 2011, Haynie saved Orange County nearly $77 million. She took action to prevent a $57 million loss in county funds that were invested with the state investment pool, and saved $20 million after identifying errors made in the state of Florida's Medicaid billing process.

Haynie is professionally affiliated with the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, the Florida Court Clerks and Comptroller Association, Florida Executive Women, Florida Institute of Certified Public Accountants, the Florida Government Finance Officers Association, and the National Association of Local Government Auditors.

Always civically engaged, Haynie has been a board member to several community institutions such as the Women's Resource Center, Planned Parenthood of Greater Orlando, Hamilton Holt School of Rollins College, the Mental Health Association of Central Florida, the Florida Symphony Orchestra, and WEEKENDS of Greater Orlando.

Haynie's public engagement helped facilitate the passage of the Orange County Domestic Partner Registry in 2012, earning her Equality Florida's ''Voice for Equality'' award. In addition, the Orlando Business Journal named Haynie the 2013 ''Executive of the Year.''

I am happy to honor Martha Haynie, during Women's History Month, for her service to Orange County and the Central Florida community.

KOHLTON PRIBBLE

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Kohlton Pribble for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Kohlton Pribble is an 8th grader at Oberon Middle School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Kohlton Pribble is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Kohlton Pribble for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY PREPARATORY SCHOOL FOR WINNING FIRST PLACE IN THE 2014 REGIONAL SCIENCE BOWL COMPETITION

HON. DOUG LaMALFA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the University Preparatory School from Redding for winning first place in the 2014 Regional Science Bowl competition.

The National Science Bowl is an annual competition sponsored by the U.S. Department of Energy that brings together some of the best and brightest students from across our country. Teams compete in a face-off competition featuring questions on a range of science disciplines including biology, chemistry, earth science, physics, energy, and math. The event, while very competitive, also promotes and encourages discovery, innovation, and teamwork and a commitment to bettering our Nation's future.

We are very proud of all the north State teams that competed against dozens of California high schools for a chance to represent California at the National Science Bowl. Their interest and diligent studies in math and science are a testament to the outstanding work from our students, educators, and parents across our region.

Best of luck to Joban, Christian, Leo, Logan, and Melia who will be traveling to Washington, DC, next month to compete against teams from across the country in the National Science Bowl. I know you will make us proud. Good luck.

HONORING RICK ALLEN JAUERT

HON. KEITH ELLISON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to today to honor the life of Ricky ''Rick'' Allen Jauert. Mr. Jauert passed away before his time at the age of 59 on June 2, 2013, after a brave battle with Multiple Systems Atrophy. Tuesday, March 18, 2014, would have been his 60th birthday.

Mr. Jauert was born on March 18, 1954, to Russell and Norma (Olson) Jauert in Luverne, Minnesota. The fourth of seven children, he was raised on a dairy farm outside of Luverne. He lost his father at age twelve. Mr. Jauert was active in 4-H and began his political career while still in high school. After graduating from Luverne High School in 1972, Mr. Jauert was a foreign exchange student in the Philippines. He returned and became the first person in his family to attend college.

While at the University of Minnesota-Morris, he served in a wide variety of leadership capacities including as resident assistant, dorm director and serving as Chairman of the Budget Advisory Committee. He was a vociferous lobbyist for students' rights and student involvement in the decision making of the campus. He graduated with honors from the university in 1976. Soon after, Mr. Jauert moved to Washington, DC to intern in Rep. Rick Nolan's congressional office.

Over the next three decades, Mr. Jauert worked for ten members of Congress in various capacities including chief of staff, legislative director and communications director. He is part of an elite group of people to have worked in so many congressional offices and the only person from Minnesota to have done so. In addition to being a savvy political operative, Mr. Jauert was a great story teller. He always had a witty, wise, and anecdotal story to tell of his childhood or early years on the Hill.

Rick lived on Capitol Hill during his time in Washington, maintaining a three-story townhouse just blocks from the U.S. Capitol. Rick's

welcoming and generous spirit, as well as hundreds of pieces of political memorabilia, drew roommates ranging from members of Congress to college interns from Luverne and Morris, and everyone in between. Rick had no children, but referred to many of his renters as ''his kids.''

I had the honor of working with Mr. Jauert for the last three years of his career. He served as my communications director, senior advisor and dear friend. Mr. Jauert practiced the idea that politics is about improving people's lives—he would always go the extra mile to help someone. He ended every e-mail with this quote from Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. ''Not only will we have to repent for the sins of bad people; but we also will have to repent for the appalling silence of good people.'' I have fond memories of Mr. Jauert pushing everyone around him to do whatever they could to make the world a better place, or to at least put a smile on someone's face.

Mr. Jauert moved to back Luverne in 2012 after his diagnosis, but continued to be deeply involved with politics. He was proud to be able to travel to Washington one last time on January 3, 2013, for Rep. Nolan's swearing in ceremony. We are all better off because of his life of service. Mr. Jauert, thank you for your service and the wonderful legacy you left for us to continue fulfilling.

RECOGNIZING THE NOMINEES FOR THE AGNES MEYER OUTSTANDING TEACHER AWARD FOR PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the nominees for the Agnes Meyer Outstanding Teacher Award for Prince William County Public Schools.

The Agnes Meyer Outstanding Teacher Award program was established by The Washington Post to ''recognize excellence in teaching, to encourage creative and quality instruction, and to contribute in a substantive way to the improvement of education in the Washington metropolitan area.''

The annual recipients include one representative from each of the nineteen metropolitan public school systems and a single representative from the area private schools. The winner selected from Prince William County Public Schools will also be named the Prince William County Teacher of the Year. Teachers who meet the criteria for the award are those who instill in students a desire to learn and achieve, understand the individual needs of students, and demonstrate a thorough knowledge of subject matter and have the ability to share it effectively with students.

I would like to extend my personal congratulations to the 2013–2014 Prince William County nominees for the Agnes Meyer Outstanding Teacher Award:

Peter Alouise—Battlefield High School, Barbara Babauta—Graham Park Middle School, Kimberly Black—Henderson Elementary School, Janine Byers—Patriot High School, Matthew Carbo—Brentsville District High School, Carlos Castro—Woodbridge High School, Dina DaSilva—Stonewall Jackson High School, Robert Donaldson—Stonewall Jackson High School, Frank Dunn—Potomac High School, Gerald Fowkes—Gar-Field High School, Frances Gabor—New Dominion Alternative Center, Sara Gill—Osbourn Park High School, Scott Howard—Hylton High School, Lynn Maletick—Bristow Run Elementary School.

Ashley Meyer—King Elementary School, Jeanine Mitchell—Buckland Mills Elementary School, Donna Notarantonio—Pennington Traditional School, Matthew Piette—Ronald Wilson Reagan Middle School, Kristen Putman—T. Clay Wood Elementary School, Jennifer Ramsey—T. Clay Wood Elementary School, Ramona Richardson—Coles Elementary School, Paul Rischard—Hylton High School, Bethany Robbins—Battlefield High School, Amanda Taylor—Gainesville Middle School, Alyssa Tice—Bel Air Elementary School, William Watts—PACE West School, Nancy Weaver—T. Clay Wood Elementary School, Dorothy Wright—Bel Air Elementary School.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in commending the nominees for the Agnes Meyer Outstanding Teacher Award in Prince William County and in thanking them for their dedication to our children. Their continued service will ensure that Prince William County students are provided with a world class education in a more vibrant learning community.

CONGRESSWOMAN CELEBRATES AVISTA'S 125TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Avista Corporation of Spokane, Washington as it celebrates its 125th anniversary. I take great pride in representing this company which has diligently sought to capture the character of Eastern Washington and the entire Pacific Northwest.

Avista is a company that seeks to reflect the community in which it does business. In fact, during its 125 years, Avista has not only been enriched by the people and landscape that surround it but it has enriched all of Eastern Washington. In 1889, faced with increasing demand for electricity in the booming young city of Spokane Falls, Washington, trustees of the Edison Electric Illuminating Company sought funding from their backers in New York to build a power station on the Spokane Falls. Their request was denied because, as they were told, water power held little or no value. Not so easily dissuaded, ten stakeholders founded The Washington Water Power Company, now known as Avista, who opted to proceed with the project themselves. Since The Washington Water Power Company forged ahead in proving the value of what today we called ''hydropower'', hydropower has become the most prominent form of electricity generation in Washington State. The decision of few investors in Spokane began a long tradition of a company and community joining forces to advance the economy, care for the Eastern Washington's natural resources, and promote a lifestyle that we enjoin in the Pacific Northwest. Avista has repeatedly been honored for its environmental stewardship. The company also contributes more than $1 million per year to non-profit organizations throughout its service territory, and it has been named in the top 25 in the Puget Sound Business Journal's list of top Washington philanthropists for the past four years.

In its early years, The Washington Water Power Company built six hydroelectric facilities, contributing to an era of growth for the company. Fast forward 125 years, hydropower continues to bring countless opportunities to the Pacific Northwest with Washington State getting over 70% of its power from this clean and renewable energy source. Seeking to further diversify and expand, in 1983, Avista's Kettle Falls generating station commenced operation as the first utility-owned electric generating station of its kind in the United States constructed for the sole purpose of producing electricity from wood waste, or biomass. The award-winning plant, combined with Avista's legacy hydroelectric power projects, has contributed to Avista being listed among the greenest investor-owned utilities in the country. That facility produces up to 52 megawatts of electricity—enough to power 46,000 homes. Supporting over 100 jobs in the region where I grew-up, the Kettle Falls is generating station also greatly contributes to the economy in Northeastern Washington and continues to add to a vibrant community.

Avista currently serves their 680,000 customers in a service territory of more than 30,000 square miles with a mix of hydro, natural gas, wind, biomass, and coal generation delivered over 2,200 miles of transmission line, 18,000 miles of distribution line, and 7,600 miles of natural gas distribution mains. While a Spokane-based company, Avista's electric and natural gas services support community's in Washington, Idaho, Oregon, Montana and, soon, we expect, Alaska.

I am also proud of the Avista's close ties with the Spokane community which have remained steadfast for the last 125 years. Avista is the City of Spokane's eighth largest non-government employer, employing more than 1,600 people. So today, I recognize Avista for achieving this historic 125-year milestone and applaud the entire community for the contributions they have made to Eastern Washington throughout the years.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. LUCILLE ROBINSON FAULKNER

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Lucille Robinson Faulkner was born in August of 1930 in Portland, Arkansas in the Mississippi Delta, eight miles from Parkdale, Arkansas where I was born and lived until I was nineteen years old. Mrs. Faulkner moved with her grandmother and family to Chicago where she attended Waller High School and graduated in 1948, which made her one of the more educated Black persons in her community at that time.

Mrs. Faulkner married her husband Mr. Derrell Faulkner in 1949, and to this union, thirteen children were born. Mrs. Faulkner worked as a seamstress, took care of her children and eventually was hired by Samuel

Adams Sr., an outstanding, colorful and very successful attorney who is known far and wide. This was a position which she held until she retired. Mrs. Faulkner was a great cook and actively involved with church and the community in which she lived.

I am indeed proud of the fact that I was able to know and represent individuals and groups of people like the Faulkner family whose heritage is so closely aligned with mine that I feel a great sense of personal kinship.

Bless you Mrs. Lucille Faulkner and may your soul rest in peace.

RECOGNIZING THE TEACHERS OF PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS RECEIVING CERTIFICATION FROM THE NATIONAL BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL TEACHING STANDARDS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Prince William County Public Schools teachers who recently received certification from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. The National Board is an independent nonprofit organization governed by classroom teachers, school administrators, school board leaders, governors, state legislators, higher education officials, teacher union leaders, and business and community leaders.

The teachers have met the standards established by the National Board and have undergone a rigorous application process that required they demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and accomplishments that comprise teaching excellence. A Board Certified teacher supports a vision of teaching based on the following five core principles:

1. Teachers are committed to students and their learning;
2. Teachers know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to students;
3. Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning;
4. Teachers think systematically about their practice and learn from experience; and
5. Teachers are members of learning communities.

I would like to extend my personal congratulations to the following National Board Certified Teachers for receiving their respective certifications.

Salome Atkins—Battlefield High School (Renewal), Kellie Bernal—Gravely Elementary School, Nicole Boissiere—Rosa Parks Elementary School, Sara Bosse—Pennington Traditional, Frantzie Cadet—Vaughan Elementary School, Carla Drew—Osbourn Park High School, Kristina Ferrell—Osbourn Park High School, Donna Garzione—Loch Lomond Elementary School, Erin Hart—Nokesville Elementary School, Mya Hatfield—Marumsco Hills Elementary School, Kelly Haynes—Ashland Elementary School, Anne Hicock—Woodbridge Middle School, Shana Higginbotham—Triangle Elementary School, Marjorie Lathers—Triangle Elementary School.

Nicholas Maneno—Old Bridge Elementary School (Renewal), Bridget Mathwin—Coles Elementary School, Courtney McDonald—Bull Run Middle School, Melissa Miller—Ashland Elementary School, Janell Mills—Featherstone Elementary School, Stephanie Richards—Tyler Elementary School, Melanie Riley—Signal Hill Elementary School, Teresa Shaffstall—Loch Lomond Elementary School, Carla Shaw—Glenkirk Elementary School, Katherine Sherman—Rosa Parks Elementary School, Jayne Sherman—Occoquan Elementary School, Margaret Stout—Antietam Elementary School, Kelle Stroud—Buckland Mills Elementary School, Tammy Vice—River Oaks Elementary School.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in commending these teachers for their commitment to education and professional development. Prince William County Public Schools delivers a world class education thanks to the tireless efforts of teachers who make excellence the standard.

HONORING STANLEY ''SCOTT'' ANDERSON

HON. JASON T. SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Stanley ''Scott'' Anderson, who has been a valuable asset to the Cape Girardeau County for over 29 years through his work with the Sheriff's Office as the Maintenance Supervisor. Scott has shown his commitment to the Sheriff's Office by working 29 years on the day-to-day maintenance operations such as vehicle maintenance, equipment maintenance and by learning new advanced information systems to secure the continued operations of the heating/cooling systems of the two-building complex of the Sheriff's Office and Jail. By taking care of inventory, ordering, stocking and securing the most economical solutions for supplies, he enabled the day-to-day operations of the Sheriff's Office. Scott has always upheld a professional standard when working with the public, fellow employees, outside agencies and office holders. Scott always provided jokes and stories to anyone that would listen and kept the work day lively.

It is with sincere respect and deep appreciation that I recognize and thank Scott for his loyalty and many years of dedicated commitment to Cape Girardeau County and the Sheriff's Office. I wish him health and happiness in his future endeavors and in his retirement. He will be truly missed. I am grateful that we have such caring, hardworking members of the Cape Girardeau community; it is my pleasure to recognize his achievements before the House of Representatives.

A COMMEMORATION OF U.S. MARINE SGT. LANCE DAVISON

HON. ANN KIRKPATRICK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, Lance Clinton Davison was born on January 8, 1979, the first son of John and Desbah Davison.

In Navajo tradition, Lance is of the Hashtl'ishnii Clan and born for Bilagaana. Lance was raised in Flagstaff, Arizona, and graduated from Flagstaff High School in 1997. Upon graduation, Lance joined the U.S. Marine Corps, where he excelled and became an especially accomplished marksman and scout/sniper.

Immediately following the tragedy of Sept. 11, 2001, Lance was deployed to Afghanistan for duty in the 3rd Battalion 23rd Marines 1st Marine Division, for which he received several medals and commendations, including the Bronze Star and Purple Heart.

Like so many veterans, Lance not only served his country but he came home and helped strengthen his own community. He became a police officer with the Flagstaff Police Department and founded Raven2 O.D.G, a disabled veteran-owned business that provides enhanced training for SOCOM Operatives and agency professionals with precision marksmanship skills.

Lance's dedication to his country and community was surpassed only by his dedication to and love for his son, Korben. Lance was a true hero.

American poet Thomas William Parsons once wrote about the men and women who sacrificed for our country: ''On thy grave, the rain shall fall from the eyes of a mighty nation.''

Sgt. Lance Davison, a valiant Marine and devoted father, is one of the reasons our nation is mighty.

We remember, honor and mourn him—Lance left us far too soon.

Lance and all of our veterans deserve a community and a country that stand up for our soldiers when they come home. These men and women have served honorably, but they may also struggle mightily.

For years, I've kept a quote on my desk—it was given to me by a veteran, and it says: ''Because they have already paid the price, fight for veterans with all of your might.''

Fight for veterans with all of your might. This is how we will honor Lance.

MAC HOPPER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Mac Hopper for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Mac Hopper is a 7th grader at Mandalay Middle School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Mac Hopper is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Mac Hopper for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

HONORING THE 35TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ENACTMENT OF THE TAIWAN RELATIONS ACT

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment today to recognize the 35th anniversary of the Taiwan Relations Act, TRA, enacted April 10, 1979. While our friendship with Taiwan spans longer than 35 years, the TRA has been vital in strengthening this mutually-beneficial partnership.

Since the enactment of the TRA, Taiwan has emerged as a model democracy and an economic powerhouse in the Asia-Pacific region and the world. The People of Taiwan enjoy self-governance with a democratic system and direct elections. They also enjoy a booming economy with an innovative tech community.

The success of the TRA cannot be understated. Because of the TRA, the U.S. has been able to enjoy mutually beneficial trade with Taiwan, greater national and international security, and a rich cultural relationship. Our trade relationship with Taiwan is stronger than ever. Time and time again, Taiwan has proven its willingness to engage in substantive trade negotiations. We have enjoyed a positive relationship with them, and it is my hope that Taiwan will soon be admitted to the Trans-Pacific Partnership, TPP.

Over the last 35 years, we have watched Taiwan's contributions to international development and security. Continually, they have come to our aid to assist our antiterrorism efforts. These contributions, and more, have made it clear that, as we strengthen our relationship with Taiwan, we succeed in advancing U.S. interests.

RECOGNIZING THE PRINCIPAL OF THE YEAR AWARD NOMINEES FOR PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Principal of the Year Award nominees for Prince William County Public Schools.

The Principal of the Year for Prince William County will receive the Distinguished Educational Leadership Award from The Washington Post. Among other skills, nominees must demonstrate the ability to manage effectively, demonstrate and encourage creativity and innovation, and foster a cooperative relationship with students, parents, faculty, staff, and the community.

I would like to extend my personal congratulations to the 2013–2014 nominees for Prince William County Schools, Principal of the year award.

Skyles Calhoun—Woodbridge Middle School, Robert Eichorn—New Directions, Anita Flemons—Old Bridge Elementary School, David Huckestein—Woodbridge High School, Kathy Notyce—Mullen Elementary School, Amy Schott—Rockledge Elementary School.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in commending Principal of the Year Award nominees for Prince William County Public Schools and in thanking them for their dedication to leadership in our school system. Their continued service will ensure that Prince William County students are provided with a world class education in a more vibrant learning community.

HONORING SIMON URBANIC

HON. RANDY K. WEBER, SR.

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the birthday of my friend and treasured member of the gulf coast community, Mr. Simon Urbanic, who will turn seventy years old on March 15, 2014. Simon is a resident of League City, Texas along with his lovely wife, Pamela.

Born on Galveston Island in 1944, Simon has committed himself to being a successful business owner, principled conservative and devoted follower of Christ. He also served our country honorably in the United States Navy as an Opticalman 3rd Class. Simon continues to be a devoted servant in Galveston County, serving on several boards in the area.

As an area realtor, Simon has worked tirelessly to help many—including my family—find a house to call home. Not only has he served others through his work and church, he has also worked tirelessly to promote the Republican Party and conservative ideals. Simon is a dedicated and passionate volunteer for the Republican Party, the Galveston County Republican Network and other conservative political causes. A passionate learner of conservative thought, Simon is dedicated to organizing conservative ideology in Texas.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating Simon Urbanic on this milestone. I thank him for his many contributions to Galveston Island, Texas District 14, and the United States. I am proud to join his friends and family in celebrating his 70th year. Simon is a friend of mine and a friend of Galveston County and I wish him continued health and happiness.

IN SUPPORT OF WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2014

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Women's History Month and H.R. 863, the National Women's History Commission Act. I would like to recognize a few of the many important women from Texas.

While there have been many women leaders in Dallas, one that stands out in my mind is former mayor Annette Strauss, the second female mayor and also the second Jewish mayor. Before her election to the Dallas City Council, Strauss worked tirelessly as a fundraiser for many organizations, poignantly for the arts in Dallas. During her tenure as Mayor-Pro Tern and as mayor, Strauss successfully provided a refuge for the many Texas families that fell into homelessness during the economic crisis. Today, the Annette G. Strauss Family Gateway remains a facility that provides empowerment for homeless people and families to break the cycle of homelessness and poverty. Strauss served as Ambassador-at-large for the city of Dallas until her death from cancer in 1998.

In the world of education, Yvonne Ewell is a Texas legend. Ewell began her teaching career at Phyllis Wheatley Elementary School in Dallas. Ewell was the first African American woman appointed as the district-wide elementary school consultant and subsequently was named associate superintendant of the Dallas Independent School District (DISD). During her time as the court-appointed school desegregation monitor for DISD, Ewell began planning for a magnet school with her fellow committee members. From her vision, the Yvonne A. Ewell Townview Magnet Center was born and is extremely successful in educating students in its six semi-independent subject-based high schools. Ewell maintained a strong, controversial stance on education in Dallas schools until her death in 1998 of pancreatic cancer.

When recognizing Dallas leaders, it is impossible to not highlight Margaret McDermott. At the age of 102, McDermott will lend her name to the second signature bridge which connects downtown Dallas to west Dallas over the Trinity River. McDermott and her late husband Eugene McDermott have been philanthropists and friends to civic, cultural, and educational organizations nationwide. Some recipients of the McDermotts' generosity include the University of Texas at Dallas, the Dallas Museum of Art, the Hockaday School, the AT&T Performing Arts Center, the Meyerson Symphony Center, and even the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. While McDermott takes little credit for her philanthropic activities, she continues to do more civic good in her hometown of Dallas.

While there are many women that we should recognize for their historic leadership in Dallas, we must recognize the young leaders in our community as well. Ariel Atkins, a senior basketball player at Duncanville High School, currently has her eye on a third state championship. The fourth-ranked prospect in the espnW HoopGurlz Top 100 for the class of 2014, Atkins has already made the decision to play basketball at the University of Texas next year. Despite her hard work and talent on the court, Atkins is committed to helping others, which she says she feels is her sole purpose in life. Young women like Atkins need encouragement from parents, coaches, and teachers so that they can reach their goals and beyond.

The women I have recognized are true visionaries. I urge my colleagues to support Women's History Month so that we can empower women at every age to be leaders in their fields and in their communities.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed S. 1086, Child Care and Development Block Grant Act, as amended.

Senate passed H.R. 3370, Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act.

Senate passed S. 2137, National Flood Insurance Program Act.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1597–S1670

Measures Introduced: Twenty-four bills and eleven resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2125–2148, S.J. Res. 34, and S. Res. 383–392.

Pages S1652–53

Measures Passed:

Child Care and Development Block Grant Act: By 96 yeas to 2 nays (Vote No. 77), Senate passed S. 1086, to reauthorize and improve the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, and taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto:

Pages S1602, S1611–12, S1613–27

Adopted:

By a unanimous vote of 100 yeas (Vote No. 75), Coburn Modified Amendment No. 2830, to establish a $1,000,000 asset limit for eligibility for child care assistance. **Pages S1608–09, S1610**

Harkin (for Portman) Amendment No. 2827, to provide for evidence-based training that promotes early language and literacy development.

Pages S1609, S1611

Harkin (for Tester/Murkowski) Amendment No. 2834, to permit the Secretary of Health and Human Services to waive the prohibition on the use of amounts by Indian tribes and tribal organizations for construction or renovation of facilities for child care programs if the use will result in an increase of the level of child care services. **Pages S1609–10**

Harkin (for Thune) Amendment No. 2838, to specify that child care certificates may be included in State strategies to increase the supply of child care. **Pages S1609–10**

Harkin (for Warren) Amendment No. 2842, to allow funds reserved under section 658G(a) of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 to be used to connect child care staff members with Federal and State financial aid, or other resources, in order to assist the staff members in pursuing relevant training. **Pages S1609–10**

Harkin (for Bennet/Murkowski) Modified Amendment No. 2839, to expand the requirement that space allotted to child care providers in Federal buildings will be used to provide child care services to children of whom at least 50 percent have 1 parent or guardian employed by the Federal Government. **Page S1610**

Vitter Modified Amendment No. 2845, to require the Secretary (acting through the Assistant Secretary for Children and Families) to prepare an annual report that contains a determination about whether States have complied with a priority requirement, and to require the Secretary to withhold funds from States that fail to comply with such priority requirement. **Pages S1613–14**

Harkin (for Portman) Amendment No. 2847, to provide that a child care staff member who has been convicted of a violent misdemeanor against a child or a misdemeanor involving child pornography is ineligible for employment by certain child care providers. **Page S1616**

Harkin (for Sanders) Amendment No. 2846, to express the sense of the Senate on significantly reducing child poverty by calendar year 2019.

Page S1616

Withdrawn:

Harkin Amendment No. 2811, to include rural and remote areas as underserved areas identified in the State plan. **Pages S1602, S1617**

Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act: By 72 yeas to 22 nays (Vote No. 78), Senate passed

H.R. 3370, to delay the implementation of certain provisions of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the bill, having achieved 60 affirmatives votes, pass.) **Pages S1627–32**

National Flood Insurance Program Act: Senate passed S. 2137, to ensure that holders of flood insurance policies under the National Flood Insurance Program do not receive premium refunds for coverage of second homes. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the requirement of a 60 affirmative vote threshold, be vitiated.) **Pages S1629, S1632**

Congressional Gold Medal to Shimon Peres: Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs was discharged from further consideration of S. 1456, to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Shimon Peres, and the bill was then passed, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S1666–67**

Reid (for Bennet) Amendment No. 2851, to make a technical correction. **Page S1667**

Congressional Gold Medal to Montford Point Marines: Senate passed S. 2147, to amend Public Law 112–59 to provide for the display of the congressional gold medal awarded to the Montford Point Marines, Unites States Marine Corps, by the Smithsonian Institution and at other appropriate locations. **Page S1667**

HHEATT Act: Senate passed H.R. 4076, to address shortages and interruptions in the availability of propane and other home heating fuels in the United States. **Pages S1667–68**

Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Non-Intercourse Act: Committee on Indian Affairs was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2650, to allow the Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa in the State of Minnesota to lease or transfer certain land, and the bill was then passed. **Page S1668**

Crisis in the Central African Republic: Senate agreed to S. Res. 375, concerning the crisis in the Central African Republic and supporting United States and international efforts to end the violence, protect civilians, and address root causes of the conflict, after agreeing to the committee amendment, and the amendment to the preamble. **Pages S1668–69**

International Women's Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 376, supporting the goals of International Women's Day, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Page S1669**

Reid (for Shaheen) Amendment No. 2852, to strike the quotation from the United States Agency for International Development regarding educated women. **Page S1669**

193rd Anniversary of the Independence of Greece: Senate agreed to S. Res. 377, recognizing the 193rd anniversary of the independence of Greece and celebrating democracy in Greece and the United States. **Page S1669**

National Rehabilitation Counselors Appreciation Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 388, designating March 22, 2014, as "National Rehabilitation Counselors Appreciation Day". **Page S1669**

National Youth Synthetic Drug Awareness Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 389, designating the week of March 9, 2014, through March 15, 2014, as "National Youth Synthetic Drug Awareness Week". **Page S1669**

World Plumbing Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 390, designating March 11, 2014, as "World Plumbing Day". **Page S1669**

Chief Counsel for Employment Emeritus of the United States Senate: Senate agreed to S. Res. 391, designating Jean M. Manning as Chief Counsel for Employment Emeritus of the United States Senate. **Page S1669**

Authorize Document Production and Representation: Senate agreed to S. Res. 392, to authorize document production and representation in *Care One Management LLC, et al. v. United Healthcare Workers East, SEIU 1199, et al.* **Page S1669**

Technical Corrections: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 93, directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make technical corrections in the enrollment of H.R. 3370. **Page S1669**

Measures Considered:

Sovereignty and Democracy in Ukraine Act—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 2124, to support sovereignty and democracy in Ukraine. **Pages S1627, S1633–42**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of Thursday, March 13, 2014, a vote on cloture will occur at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, March 24, 2014. **Page S1642**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 2 p.m. on Monday, March 24, 2014, Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Page S1670**

Authorizing Leadership To Make Appointments—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding the upcoming recess or adjournment of the Senate, the President of the Senate, the President Pro Tempore, and the Majority and Minority Leaders be authorized to make appointments to commissions, committees, boards, conferences, or interparliamentary conferences authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses, or by order of the Senate. **Page S1670**

Signing Authority—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that during the adjournment or recess of the Senate from Thursday, March 13, 2014 through Monday, March 24, 2014, Senators King, Reed, Rockefeller, and Casey be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions. **Page S1670**

Pro Forma—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that Senate adjourn and convene for pro forma sessions only with no business conducted on the following dates and times, and that following each pro forma session, Senate adjourn until the next pro forma session: Friday, March 14, 2014 at 10:30 a.m.; Tuesday, March 18, 2014 at 10:30 a.m.; and Friday, March 21, 2014 at 9 a.m.; and that the Senate adjourn on Friday, March 21, 2014 until 2 p.m., on Monday, March 24, 2014. **Page S1670**

Executive Reports of Committees: Senate received the following executive reports of a committee:

Report to accompany Agreement on Port State Measures to Prevent, Deter, and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported, and Unregulated Fishing (Treaty Doc. 112–4) (Ex. Rept. 113–1);

Report to accompany Convention on the Conservation and Management of High Seas Fishery Resources in the South Pacific Ocean (Treaty Doc. 113–1) (Ex. Rept. 113–2);

Report to accompany Convention on the Conservation and Management of High Seas Fisheries Resources in the North Pacific Ocean (Treaty Doc. 113–2) (Ex. Rept. 113–3); and

Report to accompany Amendment to the Convention on Future Multilateral Cooperation in the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries (Treaty Doc. 113–3) (Ex. Rept. 113–4). **Pages S1651–52**

Cooper Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Christopher Reid Cooper, of the District of Columbia, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia. **Page S1643**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of S. 2124, to support sovereignty and democracy in Ukraine. **Page S1643**

Harpool Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of M. Douglas Harpool, of Missouri, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Missouri. **Page S1643**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Christopher Reid Cooper, of the District of Columbia, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia. **Page S1643**

McHugh Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Gerald Austin McHugh, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. **Page S1643**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of M. Douglas Harpool, of Missouri, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Missouri. **Page S1643**

Smith Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Edward G. Smith, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. **Page S1643**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Gerald Austin McHugh, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. **Page S1643**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

Puneet Talwar, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Political-Military Affairs). **Pages S1610, S1670**

Joseph Pius Pietrzyk, of Ohio, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation for a term expiring July 13, 2014. **Pages S1610–11, S1670**

Dwight L. Bush, Sr., of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Morocco. **Pages S1611, S1670**

By 95 yeas to 4 nays (Vote No. EX. 76), Caroline Diane Krass, of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel of the Central Intelligence Agency. **Pages S1612–13, S1670**

Arun Madhavan Kumar, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Director General

of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service. **Pages S1632–33, S1670**

Timothy M. Broas, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of the Netherlands. **Pages S1632–33, S1670**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

John W. deGravelles, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Louisiana.

Deirdre M. Daly, of Connecticut, to be United States Attorney for the District of Connecticut for the term of four years.

James Walter Frazer Green, of Louisiana, to be United States Attorney for the Middle District of Louisiana for the term of four years.

Ronald Lee Miller, of Kansas, to be United States Marshal for the District of Kansas for the term of four years.

Judith M. Davenport, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2020.

Bradford Raymond Huther, of Virginia, to be Chief Financial Officer, Department of Housing and Urban Development.

2 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

1 Army nomination in the rank of general.

1 Coast Guard nomination in the rank of admiral.

4 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Army. **Page S1670**

Messages from the House: **Page S1650**

Measures Referred: **Page S1650**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Pages S1650, S1669**

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S1650, S1669–70**

Executive Communications: **Pages S1650–51**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S1651**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S1653–55**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S1655–64**

Additional Statements: **Pages S1646–49**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S1664–66**

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: **Page S1666**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S1666**

Record Votes: Four record votes were taken today. (Total—78) **Pages S1610, S1613, S1617, S1630**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 8:15 p.m., until 10:30 a.m. on Friday, March 14, 2014. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S1670.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2015 for the Department of Transportation, after receiving testimony from Anthony Foxx, Secretary of Transportation.

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND FOREIGN OPERATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2015 for the Department of State and Foreign Operations, after receiving testimony from John F. Kerry, Secretary of State.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine United States Northern Command and United States Southern Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2015 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from General Charles H. Jacoby, Jr., United States Army, Commander, United States Northern Command, and North American Aerospace Defense Command, and General John F. Kelly, United States Marine Corps, Commander, United States Southern Command, both of the Department of Defense.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Stanley Fischer, of New York, to be a Member and Vice Chairman, Jerome H. Powell, of Maryland, and Lael Brainard, of the District of Columbia, both to be a Member, all of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Gustavo Velasquez Aguilar, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and J. Mark McWatters, of Texas, to be a Member of the National Credit Union Administration, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

U.S. AVIATION INDUSTRY AND JOBS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Aviation Operations, Safety, and Security concluded a hearing to examine the United

States aviation industry and jobs, focusing on keeping American manufacturing competitive, after receiving testimony from Dennis Muilenburg, Boeing, Seattle, Washington; Marion C. Blakey, Aerospace Industries Association of America, Arlington, Virginia; and Nicholas E. Calio, Airlines for America, and Edward Wytkind, AFL–CIO Transportation Trades Department, both of Washington, D.C.

IDEAS TO STRENGTHEN AND EXPAND THE MIDDLE CLASS

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine innovative ideas to strengthen and expand the middle class, after receiving testimony from George Packer, *The Unwinding: An Inner History of the New America*, New York, New York; William C. Dunkelberg, National Federation of Independent Business, and Leonard E. Burman, Urban-Brookings Tax Policy Center, both of Washington, D.C.; Diane C. Swonk, Mesirow Financial, Chicago, Illinois; and Lawrence Lindsey, The Lindsey Group, Fairfax, Virginia.

KEYSTONE XL AND THE NATIONAL INTEREST DETERMINATION

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Keystone XL and the National Interest Determination, after receiving testimony from Karen A. Harbert, U.S. Chamber of Commerce Institute for 21st Century Energy, and General James L. Jones, USMC (ret.), Jones Group International, both of Washington, D.C.; James Hansen, Columbia University Earth Institute Climate Science, Awareness and Solutions Program, New York, New York; and Michael Brune, Sierra Club, San Francisco, California.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY BUDGET

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2015 for the Department of Homeland Security, after receiving testimony from Jeh Johnson, Secretary of Homeland Security.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of L. Reginald Brothers, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of Homeland Security for Science and Technology.

FEMA BUDGET

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Emergency Management, Intergovernmental Relations, and the District of Columbia concluded a hearing to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2015 for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, after receiving testimony from Craig Fugate, Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security.

FDA INITIATIVES AND PRIORITIES

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Food and Drug Administration's initiatives and priorities, focusing on protecting the public health, after receiving testimony from Margaret A. Hamburg, Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services.

TRIBAL TRANSPORTATION

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine tribal transportation, focusing on pathways to infrastructure and economic development in Indian country, after receiving testimony from Michael Black, Director, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior; Robert W. Sparrow, Director, Tribal Transportation Program, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation; Dana Buckles, Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes of the Fort Peck Reservation, Poplar, Montana; Wes Martel, and John Smith, both of the Eastern Shoshone and Northern Arapaho Tribes, Fort Washakie, Wyoming, on behalf of the Joint Business Council; and Edward K. Thomas, Central Council of Tlingit and Haida Indian Tribes of Alaska, Juneau.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee began consideration of the nominations of Gregg Jeffrey Costa, of Texas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit, Tanya S. Chutkan, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia, M. Hannah Lauck, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia, Leo T. Sorokin, to be United States District Judge for the District of Massachusetts, and John Charles Cruden, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, but did not complete action thereon, and will met again on Thursday, March 27, 2014.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 26 public bills, H.R. 4225–4250; and 4 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 93; and H. Res. 517–519 were introduced. **Pages H2432–34**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H2434–35**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H.R. 1786, to reauthorize the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 113–380, Pt. 1). **Page H2432**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Ros-Lehtinen to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H2363**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:07 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H2370**

Providing for the reappointment of John W. McCarter as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution: The House agreed to discharge from committee and agree to S.J. Res. 32, to provide for the reappointment of John W. McCarter as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. **Page H2374**

Oath of Office—Thirteenth Congressional District of Florida: Representative-elect David W. Jolly presented himself in the well of the House and was administered the Oath of Office by the Speaker. Earlier, the Clerk of the House transmitted a facsimile copy of a letter received from Mr. Gary J. Holland, Assistant Director of Elections, Office of the Secretary of State of Florida, indicating that, according to the preliminary returns of the Special Election held March 11, 2014, the Honorable David W. Jolly was elected Representative to Congress for the Thirteenth Congressional District, State of Florida. **Pages H2384, H2431**

Whole Number of the House: The Speaker announced to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentleman from Florida, Mr. Jolly, the whole number of the House is 432. **Pages H2384–85**

Water Rights Protection Act: The House passed H.R. 3189, to prohibit the conditioning of any permit, lease, or other use agreement on the transfer, relinquishment, or other impairment of any water right to the United States by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture, by a recorded vote of 238 ayes to 174 noes, Roll No. 132. **Pages H2374–83, H2385–H2408**

Rejected the Kirkpatrick motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 183 ayes to 227 noes, Roll No. 131. **Pages H2406–07**

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule. **Page H2395**

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: ''To prohibit the conditioning of any permit, lease, or other use agreement on the transfer of any water right to the United States by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture.''. **Page H2408**

Agreed to:

Tipton manager's amendment (No. 1 printed in part A of H. Rept. 113–379) that makes several clarifying technical changes to the bill, and clarifies that the Act will have no effect on Bureau of Reclamation contracts, implementation of the Endangered Species Act, certain existing Federal reserved water rights, and certain authorities under the Federal Power Act and **Pages H2396–97**

Mullin amendment (No. 2 printed in part A of H. Rept. 113–379) that ensures that the Federal government cannot make Native American tribes apply for or acquire water rights under state law or the Federal government rather than acquiring the rights for themselves. Prohibits the Federal government from using permits, approvals, and other land management agreements to take the water rights of Native American tribes without just compensation. Ensures that nothing in the Act limits or expands the reserved water rights or treaty rights of Federally recognized Native American tribes. **Pages H2397–98**

Rejected:

Polis amendment in the nature of a substitute (No. 3 printed in part A of H. Rept. 113–379) that sought to mandate that the U.S. Forest Service may not condition ski area permits on the transfer of title of any water right or require any ski area permittee to acquire a water right in the name of the United States (by a recorded vote of 175 ayes to 236 noes, Roll No. 130). **Pages H2398–H2401, H2405–06**

H. Res. 515, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 3189) and (H.R. 4015), was agreed to by a recorded vote of 228 ayes to 184 noes, Roll No. 126, after the previous question was

ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 227 yeas to 193 nays, Roll No. 125. **Pages H2383, H2385**

Directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make technical corrections in the enrollment of H.R. 3370: The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 93, to direct the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make technical corrections in the enrollment of H.R. 3370. **Page H2401**

Faithful Execution of the Law Act of 2014: The House passed H.R. 3973, to amend section 530D of title 28, United States Code, by a recorded vote of 244 ayes to 171 noes, Roll No. 129. Consideration of the measure began yesterday, March 12th. **Pages H2401–05**

Rejected the Lujan Grisham (NM) motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 192 ayes to 225 noes, Roll No. 128. **Page H2404**

Rejected:

Ellison amendment (No. 1 printed in part B of H. Rept. 113–378) that was debated on March 12th that sought to waive reporting requirements provided in the bill if sufficient funds are not available to generate the increased volume of reports (by a yea-and-nay vote of 191 yeas to 227 nays, Roll No. 127). **Page H2402**

H. Res. 511, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 4138) and (H.R. 3973), was agreed to yesterday, March 12th.

Privileged Resolution—Intent to Offer: Representative Kildee announced his intent to offer a privileged resolution. **Pages H2408–10**

Privileged Resolution: Representative Kildee rose to a question of the privileges of the House and submitted a privileged resolution. Upon examination of the resolution, the Chair determined that the resolution qualified. Subsequently, the House agreed to the Cantor motion to table H. Res. 517, raising a question of the privileges of the House, by a recorded vote of 217 ayes to 173 noes with 10 answering "present", Roll No. 133. **Pages H2408–10**

Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Member on the part of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy: Representative Rooney. **Page H2410**

Senate Messages: A message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House and a message received from the Senate today appear on pages H2374, H2410–11.

Senate Referrals: S. 611 was held at the desk; S. 2137 was referred to the Committee on Financial Services. **Pages H2374, H2410–11, H2431**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes and seven recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H2383, H2385, H2402, H2404, H2404–05, H2405–06, H2407, H2407–08 and H2409–10. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 9:22 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Agriculture: Full Committee held a markup to consider Budget Views and Estimates Letter of the Committee on Agriculture for the agencies and programs under jurisdiction of the Committee for FY 2015; H.R. 935, the "Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2013"; and H. Con. Res. 86, Celebrating the 100th anniversary of the enactment of the Smith-Lever Act, which established the nationwide Cooperative Extension Service. The Committee approved the Budget Views and Estimates letter; and H.R. 935 and H. Con. Res. 86 were ordered reported, without amendment.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FY 2015 BUDGET

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a hearing on Department of Defense FY 2015 Budget. Testimony was heard from Chuck Hagel, Secretary, Department of Defense; General Martin Dempsey, USA, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff; and Robert Hale, Undersecretary of Defense, Comptroller.

APPROPRIATIONS—U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT FY 2015 BUDGET

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Homeland Security held a hearing on U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement FY 2015 Budget. Testimony was heard from Daniel Ragsdale, Deputy Director, Immigration and Customs Enforcement; Peter Edge, Deputy Associate Director, Homeland Security Investigations, Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and Thomas Homan, Executive Associate Director Enforcement and Removal Operations, Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES FY 2015 BUDGET

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education and related Agencies held a hearing on Department of Health and Human Services FY 2015 Budget. Testimony was heard from Kathleen Sebelius, Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN AFGHANISTAN

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Recent Developments in Afghanistan''. Testimony was heard from General Joseph Dunford, USMC, Commander, International Security and Assistance Force.

THE FISCAL YEAR 2015 NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BUDGET REQUEST FROM THE U.S. SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND AND THE POSTURE OF U.S. SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities held a hearing on The Fiscal Year 2015 National Defense Authorization Budget Request from the U.S. Special Operations Command and the Posture of U.S. Special Operations Forces. Testimony was heard from Michael D. Lumpkin, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict, Office of the Secretary of Defense; and Admiral William McRaven, USN, Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on Workforce Protections held a hearing on H.R. 3633, the ''Protecting Health Care Providers from Increased Administrative Burdens Act''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

KEEPING THE PROMISE: ALLOWING SENIORS TO KEEP THEIR MEDICARE ADVANTAGE PLANS IF THEY LIKE THEM

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled ''Keeping the Promise: Allowing Seniors to Keep Their Medicare Advantage Plans If They Like Them''. Testimony was heard from the following Representatives: Ross; Paulsen; Denham; Walorski; and Rothfus; and public witnesses.

IMPROVING SPORTS SAFETY: A MULTIFACETED APPROACH

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade held a hearing entitled ''Improving Sports Safety: A Multifaceted Approach''. Testimony was heard from Richard Cleland, Assistant Director, Advertising Practices, Federal Trade Commission; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee began a markup on the following legislation: H.R. 3623, the ''Improving Access to Capital for Emerging Growth Companies Act''; H.R. 4164, the ''Small Company Disclosure Simplification Act''; H.R. 4167, the ''Restoring Proven Financing for American Employers Act''; H.R. 2672, the ''CFPB Rural Designation Petition and Correction Act''; H.R. 3584, the ''Capital Access for Small Community Financial Institutions Act of 2013''; and Committee Views and Estimates on the President's FY 2015 Budget Submission.

ADVANCING U.S. INTERESTS ABROAD: THE FY 2015 FOREIGN AFFAIRS BUDGET

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Advancing U.S. Interests Abroad: The FY 2015 Foreign Affairs Budget''. Testimony was heard from John F. Kerry, Secretary, Department of State.

THE PRESIDENT'S FY 2015 BUDGET REQUEST FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''The President's FY 2015 Budget Request for the Department of Homeland Security''. Testimony was heard from Jeh C. Johnson, Secretary, Department of Homeland Security.

SECTION 512 OF TITLE 17

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property and the Internet held a hearing on Section 512 of Title 17. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a markup on the following legislation: H.R. 1192, to redesignate Mammoth Peak in Yosemite National Park as ''Mount Jessie Benton Frémont'; H.R. 1501, the ''Prison Ship Martyrs' Monument Preservation Act; H.R. 3222, the ''Flushing Remonstrance Study Act; H.R. 3366, to provide for the release of the property interests retained by the United States in certain land conveyed in 1954 by the United States, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land

Management, to the State of Oregon for the establishment of the Hermiston Agriculture Research and Extension Center of Oregon State University in Hermiston, Oregon; and H.R. 4032, the ''North Texas Invasive Species Barrier Act of 2014''. The following bills were ordered reported, without amendment: H.R. 1192; and H.R. 4032. The following bills were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 1501; H.R. 3222; and H.R. 3366.

STATUS OF U.S. FOREIGN ASSISTANCE TO AFGHANISTAN IN ANTICIPATION OF THE U.S. TROOP WITHDRAWAL

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on National Security held a hearing entitled ''Status of U.S. Foreign Assistance to Afghanistan in Anticipation of the U.S. Troop Withdrawal''. Testimony was heard from Donald Sampler, Assistant to the Administrator, Office of Afghanistan and Pakistan Affairs, U.S. Agency for International Development; and Charles M. Johnson, Director, International Affairs and Trade, Government Accountability Office.

AT A CROSSROADS: THE POSTAL SERVICE'S $100 BILLION IN UNFUNDED LIABILITIES

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, U.S. Postal Service, and the Census held a hearing entitled ''At a Crossroads: the Postal Service's $100 Billion in Unfunded Liabilities''. Testimony was heard from Frank Todisco, Chief Actuary, Government Accountability Office; Jeffrey Williamson, Chief Human Resources Officer and Executive Vice President, U.S. Postal Service; Robert Moss, Chief, Budget and Resource Management, Defense Health Agency; and Joel Sitrin, Chief Actuary, Office of the Actuary, Department of Defense.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Research and Technology held a markup on H.R. 4186, the ''Frontiers in Innovation, Research, Science, and Technology Act of 2014''. H.R. 4186 was ordered reported, as amended, to the full committee.

MADE IN THE U.S.A.: SMALL BUSINESS AND A NEW DOMESTIC MANUFACTURING RENAISSANCE

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Tax and Capital Access held a hearing entitled ''Made in the U.S.A.: Small Business and a New Domestic Manufacturing Renaissance''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Full Committee held a markup on the following legislation: Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Views and Estimates of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; H.R. 3678, to redesignate the lock and dam located in Modoc, Illinois, commonly known as the Kaskaskia Lock and Dam, as the ''Jerry F. Costello Lock and Dam'', and for other purposes; H.R. 3786, to direct the Administrator of General Services, on behalf of the Archivist of the United States, to convey certain Federal property located in the State of Alaska to the Municipality of Anchorage, Alaska; H.R. 3998, the ''Albuquerque, New Mexico, Federal Land Conveyance Act of 2014''; H. Con. Res. 88, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby; H. Con. Res. 92, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers Memorial Service and the National Honor Guard and Pipe Band Exhibition; and General Services Administration Capital Investment and Leasing Program resolutions. H.R. 3786 and H.R. 3998 were ordered reported, as amended. H.R. 3678; H. Con. Res. 88 and H. Con. Res. 92 were ordered reported, without amendment. The General Services Administration Capital Investment and Leasing Program resolutions were approved. The Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Views and Estimates were approved.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS BUDGET REQUEST FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs Budget Request for Fiscal Year 2015''. Testimony was heard from Eric K. Shinseki, Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs.

ONGOING INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Ongoing Intelligence Activities; and meeting on Committee Views and Estimates on the President's Budget for FY 2015; and member access requests. The Views and Estimates letter on the President's Budget for FY 2015 was adopted; and three member access requests were approved. A portion of this hearing was closed.

Joint Meetings

ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

Joint Economic Committee: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Economic Report of the President 2014, after receiving testimony from Jason Furman, Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, MARCH 14, 2014

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA and Related Agencies, hearing on FY 2015 Department of Agriculture Budget, 10 a.m., 2362–A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Defense, hearing on U.S. Central Command and ISAF Oversight Hearing, 10 a.m., H–140 Capitol. This is a closed hearing.

Committee on Armed Services, Full Committee, hearing on Fiscal Year 2015 National Defense Authorization Budget Request from the Department of the Air Force, 9 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee continued markup on the following legislation: H.R. 3623, the ''Improving Access to Capital for Emerging Growth Companies Act''; H.R. 4164, the ''Small Company Disclosure Simplification Act''; H.R. 4167, the ''Restoring Proven Financing for American Employers Act''; H.R. 2672, the ''CFPB Rural Designation Petition and Correction Act''; H.R. 3584, the ''Capital Access for Small Community Financial Institutions Act of 2013''; and Committee Views and Estimates on the President's FY 2015 Budget Submission, 9 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''The Promise of the Taiwan Relations Act'', 9:30 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Indian and Alaska Native Affairs, hearing on discussion draft of ''The Alaska Native Subsistence Co-Management Demonstration Act of 2014'', 11 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10:30 a.m., Friday, March 14

Senate Chamber

Program for Friday: Senate will meet in a pro forma session.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Friday, March 14

House Chamber

Program for Friday: Consideration of H.R. 4015—SGR Repeal and Medicare Provider Payment Modernization Act of 2014 (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Coffman, Mike, Colo., E376
Connolly, Gerald E., Va., E371, E381, E382, E383
Davis, Danny K., Ill., E372, E381
Delaney, John K., Md., E371
DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E376
Duncan, John J., Tenn., E374
Ellison, Keith, Minn., E380
Grayson, Alan, Fla., E379
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E383
Kelly, Mike, Pa., E376
Kirkpatrick, Ann, Ariz., E372, E376, E382
LaMalfa, Doug, Calif., E372, E380
Lance, Leonard, N.J., E378
Lipinski, Daniel, Ill., E371
Lowenthal, Alan S., Calif., E375
McCarthy, Carolyn, N.Y., E373
McCollum, Betty, Minn., E375
McMorris Rodgers, Cathy, Wash., E381
Mica, John L., Fla., E377
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E373
Payne, Donald M., Jr., N.J. , E371
Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E372, E373, E373, E374, E375, E376, E377, E378, E380, E382
Poe, Ted, Tex., E378
Quigley, Mike, Ill., E374
Ross, Dennis A., Fla., E373
Serrano, José E., N.Y., E374
Shimkus, John, Ill., E383
Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E376
Smith, Jason T., Mo., E373, E377, E382
Swalwell, Eric, Calif., E378
Titus, Dina, Nev., E372
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E375
Weber, Randy K. Jr., Tex., E383

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.