

Amendments of 1993 (Public Law 103–202) is amended—

- (1) by striking section 203; and
- (2) in the table of contents for such Act, by striking the item relating to section 203.

TITLE XVIII—DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

SEC. 1801. REPORTS ELIMINATED.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT ON ACTIVITIES AND PROPOSALS INVOLVING CONTRACTING FOR PERFORMANCE BY CONTRACTOR PERSONNEL OF WORK PREVIOUSLY PERFORMED BY DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES.—Section 8110 of such title is amended—

- (1) by striking subsection (c); and
- (2) by redesignating subsections (d), (e), and (f) as subsections (c), (d), and (e), respectively.

(b) ANNUAL REPORT ON PROCUREMENT OF HEALTH-CARE ITEMS.—Section 8125 of such title is amended—

- (1) by striking subsection (d); and
- (2) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (d).

(c) ANNUAL REPORT ON STAFFING FOR NURSES AND NURSE ANAESTHETISTS AT DEPARTMENT FACILITIES.—Section 7451(e) of such title is amended—

- (1) by striking paragraph (5); and
- (2) by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (5).

(d) ANNUAL REPORT ON USE OF AUTHORITIES TO ENHANCE RETENTION OF EXPERIENCED NURSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 73 of such title is amended by striking section 7324.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by striking the item relating to section 7324.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4194, the Government Reports Elimination Act of 2014. The Government Reports Elimination Act is part of the committee's efforts to reduce waste and duplication in the Federal Government.

It eliminates 69 unnecessary agency reports to Congress and eliminates or streamlines 10 required GAO, Government Accountability Office, mandates.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that H.R. 4194 will save several million dollars. That doesn't sound like a lot in the Federal budget, but think of the key people who have to prepare those reports. The people that are most knowledgeable of what is going on are often the people taken away for these reports.

These reports were vetted by sending out a questionnaire to every chairman and every ranking member in the House, asking them do they still need these reports. After going through multiple rounds, we determined that these were the reports that no Member of Congress or no committee any longer needed.

This is a modest reform. I would have liked to have done a few more. In fact, I would like to make sure that, in every Congress, every 2 years, a similar bill be brought, asking are those reports still needed and eliminating the ones that are not.

I am assured that if we do so, as we create 69 new reports every year, we can eliminate 69 old reports, saving millions of dollars, but more importantly, freeing up the most valuable people often in the executive branch that must participate in the preparation of these.

The GPRA Modernization Act of 2010 directs agencies and the OMB to work together to identify duplicative and outdated reports to Congress. In January of 2013, the Office of Management and Budget posted that list on their Web site, www.performance.gov, and these reports come from that list.

Madam Speaker, I think enough has been said. The American people want us not to waste their money. Congress is determined that we should eliminate unnecessary reports. The Office of Management and Budget has produced a list. We have culled through that list, worked with all the chairmen, and today give you this list of savings.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As a member of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, I rise in support of this important legislation. I am pleased to join my colleagues and Chairman ISSA today in support of H.R. 4194, the Government Reports Elimination Act, as amended.

Congress often requires reports from executive branch agencies, and these reports can be a valuable tool to scrutinize performance and assess agency goals. However, with the passage of time, reporting requirements can become outdated and unnecessary.

Congress and the executive branch recognized in the Government Performance and Results Modernization Act of 2010 that improved coordination across the Federal Government benefits the taxpayer and government alike.

Pursuant to that act, the Office of Management and Budget publishes a list of plans or reports that are produced by the executive branch pursuant to congressional mandate. The act requires the administration to identify potentially outdated or duplicative plans and reports and provide views for their elimination.

In January 2013, the Office of Management and Budget produced a list that identified over 300 congression-

ally-mandated plans and reports as potentially outdated or duplicative. Majority and minority staffs of our committee worked together to identify specific reports that are currently produced, but should be eliminated.

H.R. 4194 would eliminate the statutory requirements to prepare reports that are produced by 18 Federal agencies. Implementing H.R. 4194 would reduce the administrative costs to these agencies by reducing the number of reports that must be prepared and printed.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that implementing the bill reduces the costs that are subject to appropriation by about \$1 million over the next 5 years. The bill contains no intergovernmental or private sector mandates and would impose no costs on State, local, and tribal governments.

H.R. 4194 provides for greater efficiency for a more effective Federal Government with the elimination of duplicative or unnecessary reports.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill, and I am pleased to yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1700

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 4194, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4194, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BATTLE OF MILL SPRINGS STUDY

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 298) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to evaluate the significance of the Mill Springs Battlefield located in Pulaski and Wayne Counties, Kentucky, and the feasibility of its inclusion in the National Park System, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 298

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

SECTION 1. BATTLE OF MILL SPRINGS STUDY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds as follows:

(1) In 1994, the Mills Springs Battlefield in Pulaski and Wayne Counties in Kentucky was designated as a National Historic Landmark by the Department of the Interior.

(2) The Battle of Mill Springs was the first significant Union victory in the western theater of the Civil War.

(3) The outcome of the Battle of Mill Springs, along with Union victories at Fort Henry and

Fort Donelson paved the way for a major battle at Shiloh, Tennessee.

(4) In 1991, the National Park Service placed the Mill Springs Battlefield on a list of endangered battlefields, noting the impact of this battle to the course of the Civil War.

(5) In 1992, the Mill Springs Battlefield Association formed, and utilizing Federal, State, and local support has managed to preserve important tracts of the battlefield, construct an interactive visitor center, and educate the public about this historic event.

(6) There is strong community interest in incorporating the Mill Springs Battlefield into the National Park Service.

(7) The Mill Springs Battlefield Association has expressed its desire to give the preserved battlefield as a gift to the United States.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this Act:

(1) MILL SPRINGS BATTLEFIELD.—The term “Mill Springs Battlefield” means the area encompassed by the National Historic Landmark designations relating to the 1862 Battle of Mill Springs located in the counties of Pulaski and Wayne in Kentucky.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(c) STUDY.—Not later than 3 years from the date funds are made available, the Secretary shall conduct a special resource study to evaluate the significance of the Mill Springs Battlefield in Kentucky, and the feasibility of its inclusion in the National Park System.

(d) CRITERIA FOR STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct the study authorized by this Act in accordance with 8(b) of Public Law 91-383 (16 U.S.C. 1a-5(b)).

(e) CONTENT OF STUDY.—The study shall include an analysis of the following:

(1) The significance of the Battle of Mill Springs to the outcome of the Civil War.

(2) Opportunities for public education about the Civil War in Kentucky.

(3) Operational issues that should be considered if the National Park System were to incorporate the Mill Springs Battlefield.

(4) The feasibility of administering the Mill Springs Battlefield considering its size, configuration, and other factors, to include an annual cost estimate.

(5) The economic, educational, and other impacts the inclusion of Mill Springs Battlefield into the National Park System would have on the surrounding communities in Pulaski and Wayne Counties.

(6) The effect of the designation of the Mill Springs Battlefield as a unit of the National Park System on—

(A) existing commercial and recreational activities, including by not limited to hunting, fishing, and recreational shooting, and on the authorization, construction, operation, maintenance, or improvement of energy production and transmission infrastructure; and

(B) the authority of State and local governments to manage those activities.

(7) The identification of any authorities, including condemnation, that will compel or permit the Secretary to influence or participate in local land use decisions (such as zoning) or place restrictions on non-Federal lands if the Mill Springs Battlefield is designated a unit of the National Park System.

(f) NOTIFICATION OF PRIVATE PROPERTY OWNERS.—Upon commencement of the study, owners of private property adjacent to the battlefield will be notified of the study's commencement and scope.

(g) SUBMISSION OF REPORT.—Upon completion of the study, the Secretary shall submit a report on the findings of the study to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman

from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) each will control 20 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. At this time, I yield whatever time he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. HAL ROGERS.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, in the Commonwealth of Kentucky, we have dozens of historic sites and landmarks that demonstrate our Nation's proud history to thousands of visitors every year. I am pleased that one of these sites is the Mill Springs Battlefield, which sits in my home county of Pulaski and my birth home county of Wayne, Kentucky. The bill we have before us would give the National Park Service 3 years to complete a study on including this historic battlefield into the National Park System.

The Battle of Mill Springs is a source of great pride and interest to my constituents especially. In late 1861, Confederate forces had advanced into Kentucky on its southern border, and on January 19, 1862, they launched an attack on the Union Army camp that was stationed at Logan's Crossroads, later to be called Mill Springs. After a heavy night of marching, the Confederate troops attacked but were driven back, with their commander, Brigadier General Felix Zollicoffer, being killed in the fighting. In the confusion, the Union troops received reinforcements and were able to repel another Confederate attack, this time driving them back into Tennessee.

Although this battle did not generate the number of casualties seen at such battles as Antietam or Gettysburg, it was a critically important battle and one of the first major Union victories in the Civil War. As a border State in the conflict between the North and South, Kentucky sat at a dangerous and strategically critical crossroads, with both sides vying for control of its territory. In fact, President Lincoln has been quoted as saying, “I hope to have God on my side, but I must have Kentucky.” Victory in the Battle of Mill Springs held off the Confederate advance into Kentucky and laid the groundwork for later Union successes at Fort Donelson, in now Nashville, Tennessee, in February 1862, and at Shiloh, in April, under General Ulysses S. Grant.

Despite the importance of this battle, like many battlefields throughout the country, the site of the Battle of Mill Springs became threatened over the years by disrepair and development. In

the early 1990s, the U.S. Department of the Interior classified the site of the Battle of Mill Springs as one of the most endangered battlefields in Kentucky. It might have slipped into the pages of history with no living monument to it had it not been for a group of concerned citizens in the community who came together in 1992 out of concern that the site would be lost forever.

Today, thanks to the Mill Springs Battlefield Association, along with determination from State and local officials and the Civil War Trust and the National Parks Conservation Association, hundreds of acres of battlefield land have been diligently preserved. Through a partnership of public and private funds, the association has constructed a fantastic 10,000-square-foot Mill Springs Battlefield Visitor Center and Museum, established interpretive signage, and led driving and walking tours of the battle. Above all, they have created a vibrant tourist attraction which hosts thousands of visitors and students each year, preserving the memory of this historic battle for generations to come. Periodically, Madam Speaker, there is a reenactment of the Battle of Mill Springs with thousands of participants from all across the country.

After years of work preserving this precious historic site, the Mill Springs Battlefield Association has expressed its desire to turn the site over to the National Park Service and the people of the United States so that the joy of learning and history will be enjoyed by many more people through the years. This bill, H.R. 298, will start this process by evaluating the feasibility of adopting this important site into the Park Service. I am proud to associate myself with this effort and to have this battlefield and generous group of citizens in my district.

Madam Speaker, our Nation has been truly blessed. We have a remarkable array of natural beauty which people from all over this country and the world flock to see. Additionally, we have a great number of historical sites which have been dutifully and faithfully preserved so that new generations can appreciate what this country has been through and what their forefathers cared for. The Mill Springs Battlefield is a jewel of this group and will be an excellent addition to the National Park Service.

I am proud of the work that they have done, and I look forward to many years of this site being an inspiring and educational attraction for our Nation. So I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill, and I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

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

I would congratulate the gentleman from Kentucky on his eloquent description of Mill Springs and its significance in our history in the Civil War. It was declared a National Historic Landmark in 1993, but the gentleman

makes an eloquent case that it should be upgraded from a National Historic Landmark to look at as a part of the National Park System.

This bill would allow the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study in anticipation of making this a part of the National Park System. And I want to congratulate the gentleman on his advocacy and thank him for his dedication to protecting and promoting this resource.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, and I would like to thank the gentleman from my home State, Mr. ROGERS, for his advocacy of this important issue, and I appreciate Mr. YOUNG yielding me some time to talk about this legislation that I am proud to cosponsor, which would study the feasibility of including the historic Mill Springs Battlefield within the National Park System.

Perhaps nowhere more than the Commonwealth of Kentucky does the maxim that the Civil War “pit brother against brother” ring truer. While it never seceded, a slaveholding Kentucky had rival Union and Confederate governments and was represented by the central star of the Stars and Bars. It is no exaggeration to say that Kentucky families and communities were often split along blue and gray lines.

A border State at the nexus of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, Kentucky was of vital strategic importance to both the Union and Confederate causes. As Chairman ROGERS pointed out, President Abraham Lincoln noted, “I hope to have God on my side, but I must have Kentucky.” The loss of the Commonwealth would have been a significant blow to the cause of keeping the Union intact.

Both sides recognized this, and so in the first 2 years of the war, some of the bloodiest fighting occurred in the Commonwealth. Major hostilities in the Bluegrass State were bookended by the Union victories at Mill Springs in January 1862, which largely ended the Confederacy’s eastern Kentucky offensive, and the Battle of Perryville in October of that year, which ended the Confederacy’s hope of victory in the Kentucky Campaign.

The Battle of Mill Springs is notable not only as the first major battle and Union victory in Kentucky, but also the first battle of the Western Theater in which a Confederate general—Brigadier General Felix Kirk Zollicoffer—would be killed in action.

Inclement weather the night before the battle had slowed the Confederate infiltration of the area costing them the benefit of a surprise attack. Despite early success by Confederate troops, a Union rally in the fog and gun smoke that clouded the dense woods sowed confusion and disarray among the rebels.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLINS of New York). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. BARR. I thank the gentleman.

As the Confederate lines fell back, Brigadier General Zollicoffer was separated and mistakenly approached the 4th Kentucky Infantry and, believing them to be his own troops, was cut down.

The result of the battle of Mill Springs was a hasty retreat by Confederate forces across the Cumberland River back into Tennessee. In hindsight, it was the last opportunity for the Confederacy to gain a foothold in eastern Kentucky. For the Union Army, which had been humiliated at the Battle of First Manassas in the summer of 1861, the battle was its first major victory of the war and a needed boost to morale.

In 1991, the National Park System placed Mill Springs Battlefield on its list of the Most Endangered Battlefields. Today, thanks to the coordinated efforts of the Mill Springs Battlefield Association and several other public and private organizations, the battlefield has been largely restored and now offers walking and driving tours, as well as a 10,000-square-foot visitor center and museum.

H.R. 298 is an important step to recognize and build upon the good work of these organizations and passionate Civil War history enthusiasts from eastern Kentucky and throughout the country. While the feasibility study would only be a first step in the process, inclusion in the National Park System would help ensure that the story of Mill Springs and the battlefield itself are preserved and maintained for future generations and that the memories and sacrifices of the fallen are never forgotten.

Again, I commend Chairman ROGERS on his efforts to preserve this piece of American and Kentucky history, and I am a proud cosponsor of H.R. 298.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I have no requests for further speakers, so I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 298, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1715

NEW PHILADELPHIA, ILLINOIS, STUDY ACT

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 930) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a spe-

cial resource study of the archeological site and surrounding land of the New Philadelphia town site in the State of Illinois, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 930

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 “New Philadelphia, Illinois, Study Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) Frank McWorter, an enslaved man, bought his freedom and the freedom of 15 family members by mining for crude niter in Kentucky caves and processing the mined material into saltpeter;

(2) New Philadelphia, founded in 1836 by Frank McWorter, was the first town planned and legally registered by a free African-American before the Civil War;

(3) the first railroad constructed in the area of New Philadelphia bypassed New Philadelphia, which led to the decline of New Philadelphia; and

(4) the New Philadelphia site—

(A) is a registered National Historic Landmark;

(B) is covered by farmland; and

(C) does not contain any original buildings of the town or the McWorter farm and home that are visible above ground.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) STUDY AREA.—The term “Study Area” means the New Philadelphia archeological site and the surrounding land in the State of Illinois.

SEC. 4. SPECIAL RESOURCE STUDY.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a special resource study of the Study Area.

(b) CONTENTS.—In conducting the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) evaluate the national significance of the Study Area;

(2) determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the Study Area as a unit of the National Park System;

(3) consider other alternatives for preservation, protection, and interpretation of the Study Area by—

(A) Federal, State, or local governmental entities; or

(B) private and nonprofit organizations;

(4) consult with—

(A) interested Federal, State, or local governmental entities;

(B) private and nonprofit organizations; or

(C) any other interested individuals;

(5) identify cost estimates for any Federal acquisition, development, interpretation, operation, and maintenance associated with the alternatives considered under paragraph (3); and

(6) determine the effect of the designation of the Study Area as a unit of the National Park System on—

(A) existing commercial and recreational activities, including but not limited to hunting, fishing, recreational shooting, and on the authorization, construction, operation, maintenance or improvement of energy production and transmission infrastructure; and

(B) the effect of the authority of State and local governments to manage those activities; and

(7) identify any authorities, including condemnation, that will compel or permit the Secretary to influence or participate in local land use decisions (such as zoning) or place restrictions on nonfederal land if the Study Area is designated a unit of the National Park System.