United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 1, 2014 No. 64

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

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

Eternal God, through Whom we see who we are and what we can become, thank You for giving us another day.

Send Your spirit upon the Members of this people's House to encourage them in their official tasks. Be with them and with all who labor here to serve this great Nation and its people.

Assure them that, whatever their responsibilities, You provide the grace to enable them to be faithful in their duties and the wisdom to be conscious of their obligations and fulfill them with integrity.

Remind us all of the dignity of work and teach us to use our talents and ability in ways that are honorable and just and are of benefit to those we serve.

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 the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. NORTON 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 five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

GENTRY FIRE DEPARTMENT 100TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in celebration of the Gentry Arkansas Fire Department's 100th birthday.

Gentry, Arkansas, is home to over 3,000 of my constituents; and for the past 100 years, the Gentry Fire Department has been steadfastly committed to their safety and well-being, as well as the safety of thousands more who reside in the surrounding areas of Benton County.

From its humble beginnings in 1914 to the purchase of its first firetruck in the 1940s, the Gentry Fire Department and firefighters have worked tirelessly for its citizens, placing themselves in great danger to protect the lives and property of others.

We rest easy knowing the department will continue to do so for the next century, and I join the residents of Gentry to express my profound gratitude.

Thank you to the Gentry firefighters, past and present, for 100 years of selfless service to the Pioneer community. I wish you a very happy 100th birthday.

FULL EMPLOYMENT

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Madam Speaker, the bottom line is we need bold visions to achieve full employment.

We know only too well that we have had unprecedented periods of high unemployment. We know that we have about 50 million people, 13 million who are children, living below poverty in the greatest country in the world. We know we must expand economic opportunity to have a strong middle class, who are the backbone of this great country. We know that getting every American working will add to not only our tax base, but also reduce the deficit and debt and eliminate poverty.

So the question is, Madam Speaker, why aren't we doing it? Where are the visionaries? Where is the President's American Jobs Act of 2013 or the 21st Century Full Employment and Training Act? Where are they?

Madam Speaker, let's bring them to the floor.

CUBAN JOURNALIST JULIET MICHELENA DIAZ

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the case of Juliet Michelena Diaz, an independent Afro-Cuban journalist who last month was unjustly detained by Castro's thugs simply for photographing the brutality of the state security forces of Fidel Castro in Havana.

The detention of this young journalist is not just an example of the regime's efforts to silence those who are critical of its actions, but it also shows how ruthless the Castro brothers continue to be in their policy of repressing independent voices and violating human rights.

There is no independent press in Cuba and many journalists are afraid to speak out against the dictatorship for fear of incarceration. That is why it is so important to support the free flow of information on the island so that the Cuban people can exchange ideas to promote democratic principles and the rule of law.

DECRIMINALIZING MARIJUANA LAWS

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, 18 States and the District of Columbia have rapidly decriminalized marijuana laws, making them subject only to fines. They did so for various reasons. None of those reasons were more solid or important than the Council's decision to decriminalize D.C.'s marijuana laws.

African Americans in the District of Columbia and Whites use marijuana at the same rate, but Blacks have an arrest record for possession eight times that of Whites. That's discrimination.

It is the same thing when Chairman JOHN MICA of the Government Operations Subcommittee of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee decides to hold a hearing on D.C.'s marijuana decriminalization law but on no others. Two prior hearings have looked at marijuana decriminalization. None has called local public officials.

Be on notice. The District of Columbia insists that it not be treated any differently from the 18 States that have decriminalized marijuana and the States who have legalized it.

VETERANS FAIR ECONOMIC TOWN HALL

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

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, last week, I had the pleasure of holding a veterans fair economic town hall and several general town halls across my district. Throughout the conversations I had with my constituents, I heard a growing concern about the increasing government intrusiveness, whether it is in the doctor's office, the classroom, or the economy.

House Republicans understand that our constituents want government to work efficiently. We have offered real solutions that will grow good-paying jobs and expand opportunity for all.

In fact, we have already passed over 200 bills that will start helping people today but unfortunately are still collecting dust on Senator HARRY REID's desk. This includes bills that would lower health care costs and return choice back to patients, as well as expand domestic energy production to both create jobs and lower costs for consumers.

It is time, Madam Speaker, for the Senate to join us in advancing real solutions. It is time to make life work better for all Americans.

HONORING HAROLD CORBIN

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

Mr. MEADOWS. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor Mr. Harold Corbin and thank him for his service to the 11th Congressional District. This last Saturday marked 50 years of continued service to this great district. It was the first district meeting that he had missed.

Mr. Corbin is a lifelong resident of Franklin, North Carolina, which is a testament to his commitment to our community; and from 1980 to 1989, Mr. Corbin served as the Republican chairman of the 11th Congressional District. As chairman, Mr. Corbin made important contributions that have had a lasting impact on western North Carolina.

In 1981, his activism led to the election of the former Representative Bill Hendon, who was the first Republican Congressman to represent the 11th District in over 100 years.

From 1982 to 2002, Mr. Corbin served as the chairman of the Macon County Board of Commissioners. His leadership and inspiration to his son led his son to get involved in politics. He now holds that same position. It is both of them that have set a tremendous example for our Nation.

I will close with this. All of us in Washington can learn a lesson from Mr. Corbin, who has long said that, once elected, Representatives serving constituents ought to leave their politics at the door and truly serve the citizens.

TVA'S WATTS BAR NUCLEAR FACILITY

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

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to share my findings from last week's tour of TVA's Watts Bar Nuclear facility located in Tennessee's Fourth District in Rhea County.

The Watts Bar facility is constructing a second nuclear unit, which will be completed late next year. It will be the 21st century's first new reactor to go online, doubling the facility's capacity and then creating reliable energy for nearly 1.3 million homes and businesses.

This project has contributed significantly to the local economy by providing more than 3,300 high-paying jobs. TVA makes safety and security its top priority. During the construction of Unit 2, the workers have achieved a milestone of 22.8 million work-hours without a lost-time incident.

I would like to extend a special thanks to TVA's senior vice president of operations and construction, Mike Skaggs, and his team for making my visit so educational and productive.

Madam Speaker, it is imperative that we continue to support the safe, affordable, and reliable energy that nuclear provides in order to attract industry and create jobs.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLE. 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 consideration of H.R. 4487, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 557 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. 4487.

The Chair appoints the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 0912

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. 4487) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, with Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN 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 Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COLE. Madam Chairman, thank you for the recognition, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 4487, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2015, provides $3.3 billion for the operations of the legislative branch, excluding Senate items. The recommendation is the equivalent to the fiscal year 2014 level and a decrease of $122.5 million, or 3.7 percent, from the requested level.

Conforming with the longstanding practice under which each body of Congress determines its own housekeeping requirements and the other concurs without intervention, funds for the Senate are not included in the bill as reported by the committee.

Through seven hearings and meetings with agency heads, the committee listened to all who presented their respective concerns and budget requests. It was necessary to make some critical decisions and prioritize programs, and we did this in a bipartisan and transparent manner.

We are presenting to the House today a bill that is fiscally responsible and maintains current operations for the Legislative Branch agencies.

The bill includes $1.2 billion for the operations of the House. This is equivalent to the fiscal year 2014 enacted

level and $20 million below the request. It is worthy to note that the funding provided for Member's Representational Allowances and Committees provides for the current operations, and I do not anticipate further reductions in the coming year. The bill also includes the Members' pay freeze for fiscal year 2015.

□ 0915

With this bill, total funding for the House of Representatives is 14 percent below fiscal year 2010.

The bill includes $348 million for the Capitol Police. This is $9.5 million above the fiscal year 2014 enacted level and $77 million less than the requested level. This will support 1,775 sworn officers and 370 civilian positions. A slight increase above last year is provided to ensure the Capitol Police maintain current operations and ensure mission-essential training.

Knowing that access to the House office buildings is of critical concern to Members, we directed that the Chief of Police develop an action plan that will make sure public access to our buildings is easily accessible during heightened periods of visitation. The implementation of this plan is in the early stages, and we will continue to monitor the budgetary impacts to the Capitol Police.

The bill includes $45.7 million for the Congressional Budget Office. This is at the fiscal year 2014 enacted level and $378,000 below the requested level.

The bill includes $488.6 million for the Architect of the Capitol, excluding Senate items. This is a decrease of $40.5 million from the fiscal year 2014 enacted level and $79 million below the requested level.

Within the recommended level, the committee continues its prioritization of projects that promote the safety and public health of workers and occupants, decrease the deferred maintenance backlog, and invest to achieve future energy savings.

The committee recognizes the continuing challenge of preserving and maintaining our infrastructure and prioritizing critical projects in the current budgetary environment. It is important to note that $21 million is recommended for the final phase of dome restoration, a very high priority of this committee.

In addition, we are continuing the 5-year practice of including funds for the House Historic Buildings Revitalization Trust Fund, a fund established by Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ when she was chair of this subcommittee in anticipation of the renovation of the historic Cannon House Office Building.

Might I say, it is one of the really tremendous contributions that my friend and colleague has made, and I hope it stays inside of our operating procedure for many years to come. It was a wise decision.

Also included is $16 million for the lease cost of a portion of the Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr. Federal Office Building in preparation of the Cannon renewal project.

The bill includes $595 million for the operations of the Library of Congress. This is an increase of $16 million above the fiscal year 2014 enacted level and $1.9 million above the requested level. The amount will allow the Library to continue at current operations.

Established by Congress in 1800, the Library of Congress is one of the largest libraries in the world, with a collection of more than 130 million print, audio, and video items in 460 languages. It is imperative adequate funding is provided to maintain acquisitions, preservation, the administration of U.S. copyright laws by the U.S. Copyright Office for research and analysis of policy issues for the Congress by the Congressional Research Service, and the administration of a national program to provide reading material to the blind and physically handicapped.

The bill before you accomplishes all of that.

It is important to note $5.5 million of the funding is provided for the Deacidification Program, which is $1 million over the Library's request. And $8.2 million is for the Teaching with Primary Sources Program, at $1 million over the request, to be used for competitive opportunities for developing online interactive and apps for classroom use on Congress and civic participation.

It is $1.2 million above the request for the Copyright Office to reduce the claims and processing time for copyright registrations and to conduct business analyses for the process engineering of the documentation recordation function.

The bill includes $122.6 million for the Government Printing Office. This is an increase of $3.3 million above the fiscal year 2014 enacted level and $6.3 million below the requested level. Funds have been included for continuation of development and infrastructure costs associated with the Federal digital system and the system replacement for upgrading the extensible markup language.

The bill includes $519.6 million for the Government Accountability Office. This is an increase of $14.2 million above the fiscal year 2014 enacted level and $5.5 million below the requested level. Language is included to establish a Center for Audit Excellence to build global institutional auditing capacity and promote good governance. This center is to be operated on a fee-based basis.

Finally, the bill includes $3.42 million for the Open World Leadership Trust Fund. This is $2.58 million below the fiscal year 2014 enacted level and $4.58 million below the requested level.

As a sign of support for Ukraine, the committee has reduced the program by 43 percent. This represents the program's percentage of participants from Russia. It is important to stress that Open World's program does not just focus on work with Russia. Ukraine has the next largest group of participants, closely followed by other nations in the surrounding region. Therefore, we encourage the center to do more in Ukraine and with other participating countries in the surrounding region.

I would like to thank my good friend, the ranking member, DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, for her role throughout the process. We have worked well together in a bipartisan manner. It has truly been a team effort.

Also, I extend my appreciation to all members of the subcommittee in their efforts in helping bring this measure to the floor. I also want to thank the truly excellent staff that has nursed me through this.

Let me just add, parenthetically, that we had a pretty unusual situation in that, because of some early retirements and the loss of our dear friend, Bill Young, we had a lot of reshuffling to do on our committee. On our side, that meant we only had one carryover member, and that was the vice chairman, Mr. HARRIS from Maryland, who was indispensable and extraordinarily helpful to the rest of us.

Again, without a capable staff and without, frankly, a wonderful working partner in my ranking member, we would have had a much more difficult time. Frankly, I don't think anybody in this institution knows this bill and this process better than Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. She has been my friend. I was once on her committee as a very junior member when she chaired it, and I learned a lot from her then. I learned a lot more from her this time.

I look forward to the debate, and with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL 2015 (H.R. 4487)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - LEGISLATIVE BRANCH					
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES					
Payment to Widows and Heirs of Deceased Members of Congress	174	---	---	-174	---
Salaries and Expenses					
House Leadership Offices					
Office of the Speaker	6,645	6,778	6,645	---	-133
Office of the Majority Floor Leader	2,180	2,224	2,180	---	-44
Office of the Minority Floor Leader	7,114	7,257	7,114	---	-143
Office of the Majority Whip	1,887	1,924	1,887	---	-37
Office of the Minority Whip	1,460	1,489	1,460	---	-29
Republican Conference	1,505	1,536	1,505	---	-31
Democratic Caucus	1,487	1,517	1,487	---	-30
Subtotal, House Leadership Offices	22,278	22,725	22,278	---	-447
Members' Representational Allowances Including Members' Clerk Hire, Official Expenses of Members, and Official Mail					
Expenses	554,318	565,404	554,318	---	-11,086
Committee Employees					
Standing Committees, Special and Select	123,903	126,335	123,903	---	-2,432
Committee on Appropriations (including studies and investigations)	23,271	23,736	23,271	---	-465
Subtotal, Committee employees	147,174	150,071	147,174	---	-2,897
Salaries, Officers and Employees					
Office of the Clerk	24,009	24,639	24,009	---	-630
Office of the Sergeant at Arms	14,777	12,058	11,927	-2,850	-131
Office of the Chief Administrative Officer	113,100	116,163	113,100	---	-3,063
Office of the Inspector General	4,742	4,742	4,742	---	---
Office of General Counsel	1,341	1,353	1,341	---	-12
Office of the Parliamentarian	1,952	1,971	1,952	---	-19
Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the House	3,088	4,114	4,088	+1,000	-26
Office of the Legislative Counsel of the House	8,353	8,893	8,893	+540	---
Office of Interparliamentary Affairs	814	814	814	---	---
Other authorized employees	479	479	479	---	---
Subtotal, Salaries, officers and employees	172,655	175,226	171,345	-1,310	-3,881
Allowances and Expenses					
Supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims	3,503	4,153	4,153	+650	---
Official mail for committees, leadership offices, and administrative offices of the House	190	190	190	---	---
Government contributions	258,081	258,081	256,636	-1,445	-1,445
Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery	16,217	16,217	16,217	---	---
Transition activities	1,631	3,737	3,737	+2,106	---
Wounded Warrior program	2,500	2,500	2,500	---	---
Office of Congressional Ethic	1,467	1,485	1,467	---	-18
Miscellaneous items	720	720	720	---	---
Subtotal, Allowances and expenses	284,309	287,083	285,620	+1,311	-1,463
Total, House of Representatives	1,180,908	1,200,509	1,180,735	-173	-19,774

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL 2015 (H.R. 4487)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
JOINT ITEMS					
Joint Economic Committee	4,203	4,270	4,203	---	-67
Joint Committee on Taxation	10,004	10,149	10,004	---	-145
Office of the Attending Physician					
Medical supplies, equipment, expenses, and allowances	3,400	3,371	3,371	-29	---
Office of Congressional Accessibility Services	1,387	1,405	1,387	---	-18
Total, Joint items	18,994	19,195	18,965	-29	-230
CAPITOL POLICE					
Salaries	279,000	291,403	286,500	+7,500	-4,903
General expenses	59,459	64,260	61,459	+2,000	-2,801
Total, Capitol Police	338,459	355,663	347,959	+9,500	-7,704
OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE					
Salaries and expenses	3,868	4,020	3,959	+91	-61
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE					
Salaries and expenses	45,700	46,078	45,700	---	-378
ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL					
General administration	90,277	96,433	91,555	+1,278	-4,878
Capitol building	61,376	57,545	53,126	-8,250	-4,419
Capitol grounds	13,860	14,366	11,993	-1,867	-2,373
House of Representatives buildings:					
House office buildings	71,622	108,934	71,622	---	-37,312
House Historic buildings revitalization fund	70,000	70,000	70,000	---	---
Capitol Power Plant	125,678	103,990	102,152	-23,526	-1,838
Offsetting collections	-9,000	-9,000	-9,000	---	---
Subtotal, Capitol Power Plant	116,678	94,990	93,152	-23,526	-1,838
Library buildings and grounds	53,391	62,756	41,733	-11,658	-21,023
Capitol police buildings, grounds and security	19,348	25,605	19,486	+138	-6,119
Botanic garden	11,856	15,686	15,023	+3,167	-663
Capitol Visitor Center:					
CVC Operations	20,632	21,095	20,875	+243	-220
Total, Architect of the Capitol	529,040	567,410	488,565	-40,475	-78,845
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS					
Salaries and expenses	412,052	420,852	424,057	+12,005	+3,205
Authority to spend receipts	-6,350	-6,350	-6,350	---	---
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses	405,702	414,502	417,707	+12,005	+3,205
Copyright Office, salaries and expenses	51,624	53,068	54,303	+2,679	+1,235
Authority to spend receipts	-33,444	-33,582	-33,582	-138	---
Subtotal, Copyright Office	18,180	19,486	20,721	+2,541	+1,235
Congressional Research Service, Salaries and expenses	105,350	108,382	106,095	+745	-2,287
Books for the blind and physically handicapped Salaries and expenses	49,750	50,696	50,429	+679	-267
Total, Library of Congress	578,982	593,066	594,952	+15,970	+1,886

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL 2015 (H.R. 4487)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE					
Congressional printing and binding	79,736	85,400	79,736	---	-5,664
Office of Superintendent of Documents, Salaries and expenses	31,500	32,171	31,500	---	-671
Government Printing Office Revolving Fund	8,064	11,348	11,348	+3,284	---
Total, Government Printing Office	119,300	128,919	122,584	+3,284	-6,335
GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE					
Salaries and expenses	537,751	548,866	543,372	+5,621	-5,494
Offsetting collections	-32,368	-23,750	-23,750	+8,618	---
Total, Government Accountability Office	505,383	525,116	519,622	+14,239	-5,494
OPEN WORLD LEADERSHIP CENTER TRUST FUND					
Payment to the Open World Leadership Center Trust Fund	6,000	8,000	3,420	-2,580	-4,580
JOHN C. STENNIS CENTER FOR PUBLIC SERVICE TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT					
Stennis Center for Public Service	430	430	430	---	---
GENERAL PROVISIONS					
Scorekeeping adjustment (CBO estimate)	-1,000	---	-1,000	---	-1,000
Grand total (Discretionary and Mandatory)	3,326,064	3,448,406	3,325,891	-173	-122,515
Discretionary	(3,325,890)	(3,448,406)	(3,325,891)	(+1)	(-122,515)
Mandatory	(174)	---	---	(-174)	---
RECAPITULATION					
House of Representatives	1,180,908	1,200,509	1,180,735	-173	-19,774
Joint Items	18,994	19,195	18,965	-29	-230
Capitol Police	338,459	355,663	347,959	+9,500	-7,704
Office of Compliance	3,868	4,020	3,959	+91	-61
Congressional Budget Office	45,700	46,078	45,700	---	-378
Architect of the Capitol	529,040	567,410	488,565	-40,475	-78,845
Library of Congress	578,982	593,066	594,952	+15,970	+1,886
Government Printing Office	119,300	128,919	122,584	+3,284	-6,335
Government Accountability Office	505,383	525,116	519,622	+14,239	-5,494
Open World Leadership Center	6,000	8,000	3,420	-2,580	-4,580
Stennis Center for Public Service	430	430	430	---	---
Other appropriations	-1,000	---	-1,000	---	-1,000
Grand total (Discretionary and Mandatory)	3,326,064	3,448,406	3,325,891	-173	-122,515
Discretionary	(3,325,890)	(3,448,406)	(3,325,891)	(+1)	(-122,515)
Mandatory	(174)	---	---	(-174)	---

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, I want to thank Chairman ROGERS and my ranking member, NITA LOWEY, for the commitment that they made to regular order, which is why we have our second appropriations bill on the House floor by May 1. It is my hope that we can stay true to this commitment throughout the remainder of this year.

I also want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma, TOM COLE, who I really couldn't say enough good things about what an incredible partner he has been. We really have—and I will say that several times throughout my remarks—worked cooperatively, collaboratively, and I think the finest compliment that I can pay another Member is that they are an institutionalist—someone who has incredible respect for those that came before us and the history and tradition and all that has led to us being the finest democratic institution in the entire world.

We are stewards of the Capitol complex in the Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee, and the chairman really has most definitely recognized that and honored it.

The budget deal struck during the shutdown last year gave us 2 years of discretionary caps so that the Appropriations Committee can now get on with the business of funding important government programs.

There are many opinions about how these resources should be allocated amongst programs, but that is a legitimate debate, rather than the alternative, which we saw during the government shutdown last October.

For my part, I am pleased with and supportive of the bill that my good friend Chairman COLE has put forward today, done within the funding constraints that the Legislative Branch Subcommittee had to operate under. We worked collaboratively, and, as always, it was a pleasure to work with him.

The bill provides level funding, and, unfortunately, the constrained allocation has ensured that there is no increase for Member and committee offices. Personal office budgets have been cut by 16 percent since 2010, while committees have been cut by 14 percent over the same period. When considered through a long lens, those cuts are even more damaging.

The Congressional Research Service reported in August 2010 that House committee staff levels declined 28 percent between 1977 and 2009. The recent cuts have only served to compound the decline in staffing levels highlighted by CRS.

There is no question that these cuts will continue to have a harmful effect on this institution—on our ability to retain the best and brightest and to serve our constituents most effectively. We have gone through some difficult economic times, there is no question, but as we emerge, we need to consider how continuing these stark funding levels affects our ability to compete with the executive branch and the Senate for the best talent. When a Senator can offer to double the salary of a legislative assistant working for a House Member, there is an imbalance that we ignore in the House, at our peril.

I want to thank Chairman COLE also for the focus placed on the Copyright Office in this bill. In the FY 2015 budget hearing with the Library of Congress last month, we heard about the need to bring the copyright system into the 21st century with business practices that provide for more interaction and improvement with the copyright community.

This bill starts that process by investing $1.5 million in much-needed IT improvements for the Copyright Office. The bill also carves out $750,000 to deal with the copyright backlog, which grew larger over the last few years as they lost staff due to tightening budgets.

As the authorizing committees review our Nation's copyright laws, these additional investments will ensure that the Copyright Office can meet immediate needs as well as prepare for new ways to do business.

During the Capitol Police hearing and during subcommittee markup we heard from Members on both sides of the aisle about the impact door closures have had on our constituents and staff. This is why we included report language requesting a report on how the Capitol Police can accomplish door openings without increasing overtime. We have now received what I can only hope is a draft report from the Capitol Police that details the opening of only two doors for 2½ hours each day.

The committee has been clear that access is one of the Capitol Police's top priorities, and the current plan does not reflect that priority. My expectation, which I know is shared by many Members, is that now that the Capitol Police have been provided essentially full relief from the sequester, multiple doors throughout the House should be staffed and opened for the entire workday.

Reducing overtime costs through door closures is unacceptable. Forcing our constituents, staff, and people trying to do business at the Capitol into long lines is inefficient and stressful for the public and the officers.

I will be asking the Chief to go back to the drawing board on this report.

The bill continues funding for the House Historic Buildings Revitalization Trust Fund at $70 million, for which I thank the chairman. Since the estimate to rehabilitate the Cannon House Office Building, which is 100 years old, has come in at a staggering $753 million, investing a little at a time in the trust fund is the most responsible way to fund this and other major projects.

The bill also includes funding for the final phase of the Capitol dome project at $21.2 million. The funding provided this year will address the interior walls, columns, and coffered ceiling that have sustained significant water damage and paint delamination.

The public will soon see the skyline of our Nation's Capital changed with scaffolding on the Capitol dome that will begin to go up at the end of this month, using funds from previous years. The total pricetag to restore the dome will be around $106 million after this year's funding is provided.

This bill also directs the Library of Congress to continue their 30-year program to deacidify books and provides an additional $1 million to keep that program on track.

Also of note, the bill cuts the Open World Leadership Center by 43 percent to $3.4 million. The Stennis Center Leadership program is funded at $430,000 after finally—and thankfully—providing the committee with a budget justification for the first time, on time.

I congratulate Chairman COLE on writing a balanced bill with a few targeted investments. Even though I wish we could do more—and I know he does too—to invest in our staff, I know that the chairman had many competing priorities, including our vast infrastructure needs.

Chairman COLE, again, I have truly enjoyed working with you in this role, and I appreciate the accommodations made for the minority in this bill. Working with our colleagues on both sides of the aisle has been an absolute pleasure. It was a collaborative and cooperative effort. We are truly, I think, the example for the entire Congress on what collegiality means. The process in putting this bill together was really a team effort.

Chairman COLE understands that this may be the smallest appropriations bill, but one that is essential to his colleagues and the job they do to serve their constituents.

In conclusion, Madam Chairman, I want to thank the committee staff as well who has helped to craft this bill and assisted in a bipartisan manner: Shalanda Young; Liz Dawson, who continues to amaze us every single fiscal year; Chuck Turner; and Jenny Panone.

Also, we could not have done this without our personal staff: Maria Bowie and Sean Murphy, with Chairman COLE's personal office; and Ian Rayder from my office.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend from the great State of Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

□ 0930

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Chairman, I seek the opportunity to have a colloquy with Chairman COLE. I thank them for their work, the chairman and his staff, the work they have put into the legislation they are bringing before us this morning.

As a member of the Congressional Yellow Pages Caucus, I strongly believe that if an activity is available from a private company that can be found in the Yellow Pages, it should either not be a responsibility carried out by the Federal Government or, at the very least, performed by a private firm under contract with the Federal Government.

It is in that spirit that Congress needs to begin the process of leveling the playing field between the Government Printing Office, the GPO, and private industry. Nowhere is the overreach of the GPO and its statutory authority, found in title 44 of the United States Code, more egregious than in the area of secure Federal credentials.

Consider this: title 44 was codified in 1968. Secure credentials, produced by the private sector, first appeared about 30 years later and then became pervasive after 9/11.

I can't imagine that policymakers in the sixties could have ever envisioned title 44 expanding beyond the printing of copies of the Federal Register or the Declaration of Independence to cover credentials, let alone secure credentials, as the kind of printed products the GPO has traditionally produced.

The GPO's statutory monopoly on this issue has been challenged by numerous reports by the GAO and groups such as the National Performance Review.

Secure credentials are a world apart from the products that GPO has traditionally produced and should not be subject to title 44.

I hope that we can take steps to define a clear role for the GPO, create competition, and ensure that the private secure credentials industry and companies like MorphoTrust in Tennessee can perform these functions that the GPO has no business in carrying out.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I yield myself 30 seconds just to note that the Government Printing Office has been in business, doing the work, beyond the scope of printing the Federal Register, for more than 100 years.

It is also important to note that they specifically contract with the private sector to print a myriad of documents, and they are not the only institution that prints documents.

Madam Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chair, I want to thank my good friend from Florida for her leadership on this bill, as well as my very good friend from Oklahoma, who has done a terrific job as chair. Both of you take your responsibilities extremely seriously, as you should.

This is the bill that funds the institution itself, and you have both resisted efforts to demean this institution and to suggest that traditions and resources that have been available to this institution in the past are not necessary.

Both of you understand, because you are institutionalists and revere this institution, there are a lot of things that go on in this institution that play an important role toward serving the American public.

I do regret the fact that there was an amendment that was not made in order. I didn't expect that this amendment would have passed, but it was an issue that needed to be discussed on the House floor because it sets a precedent, what I believe is a very dangerous precedent.

This year, this bill freezes congressional compensation. It is the sixth year in a row that we have frozen our own salaries, but by putting it in this bill, I have been part of this institution long enough to know that, once you do that, there is a very high likelihood that neither political party, no matter who has the majority, is going to be willing to ever take it out; and so it will acquire an aspect of permanence.

So what I suggested is that we have a $25 a day housing stipend, just for those Members that live at least 50 miles from Washington, D.C. I am 10 miles. It wouldn't affect me. None of the other things that are available to Members, small as they might be, affect us either.

Obviously, we can't change our own pay. We can't raise it. So it wouldn't apply till the next term. I am retiring, but I will never lose my love for this institution, and that is why I am doing it.

It just happens that we will be in session 112 days, times 25, that would come, not coincidentally, to exactly what the salary increase would have been had we not frozen it.

The reason for doing this is that, since I was first elected to the Congress, in inflation-adjusted dollars, the compensation to Members has gone down by one-fifth. In the meantime, the cost of rental housing in D.C. has increased substantially.

Rental housing is going up as fast or faster than most other metropolitan areas of the country. In fact, the median cost per month, it is $2,250; per year, it is $27,000.

The problem is that if we continue to freeze the compensation to Members, my fear is—and Mr. COLE, I know, is going to provide a different perspective, but I think the fear is legitimate—that what we will wind up with is a composition of the Congress composed primarily of Members who don't need the pay, who are independently wealthy, who can blithely send the check back and take credit for it because they don't need it. In fact, more than half the Congress today, I understand, are millionaires.

On the other hand, you may have some who figure, well, I will serve one, two, three terms and then go into the private sector and use that experience, albeit limited, to enrich themselves. A lot of people do it. I am not being particularly critical, but I want to raise the issue as to what that means for the Congress itself, for this institution.

I don't think this is the right thing to do, Madam Chairman. We need people who represent those folks who barely make it, who have to pay a mortgage, who have student loans to pay, who have kids to raise. They represent the majority in this country, and it is so difficult for Members to maintain two residences.

I wouldn't have expected us to lose an opportunity for self-flagellation, but I do think we should have raised this issue.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. MORAN. I thank my very good friend.

I think I have made my point. We need to be as representative of the country as possible. For all our failings, for all our deficiencies, for all our needs, our struggles, we need to be able to empathize with people who have the same kind of financial constraints.

I know people think this is a lot of money, but if you are not going to show respect to yourself as an institution, you can't expect the public to show you much respect either.

We are the board of directors of the largest economic entity in the world. We deserve that respect. We ought to stand up for ourselves, defend this Congress—because what we do is defensible—and show that we merit adequate compensation, so we can be wholly representative of this great American public.

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

My friend and I have had a number of opportunities to talk about this issue. We talked about it in committee, we talked about it yesterday in discussion on the rule, and we are talking about it today because I think he wants to make his point, and I think he is using every opportunity to make his point.

Quite frankly, it is a point that needs to be made and a point that deserves to be heard. One of the things I will miss about my friend a lot is his tenacity when he has got something that he thinks is important and his willingness to go through a little heat and a little criticism, which I know he has received over this, to make that point. That is a very valuable characteristic in any Member.

I don't think we are in immediate danger, the kind of future and the kind of House that my friend describes, but I do think, if we were to continue this course indefinitely, we would be.

Now, again, as I mentioned yesterday in our exchange, remember, a lot of people who come here for a short time aren't coming here to cash out on anything. They are coming here because they believe in the limited time of public service, and quite often, that is a pretty popular point of view in their districts. So I cast no aspersions on somebody that comes for 6 or 8 years, and that is their choice.

In my State, that is exactly what Senator TOM COBURN did in this body for 6 years and what he has done in the United States Senate. I know that is a sincere opinion as to what he thinks the appropriate thing is, and quite frankly, he has certainly never cast himself out and hung around Washington, D.C. I think that is true of many, many Members.

As my friend makes a good point about the character of the body and where we may be headed if we do the wrong things over time, I also think we are in a really critical point in our country where we are having to make a lot of difficult decisions.

We have made a lot of difficult decisions on this committee, made a lot of cuts that we didn't want to make because we thought the budget deficit was too high, and we needed to ask people to make some painful reductions.

I think if you are going to ask people to make painful reductions you have got to lead by example, and I think that is actually what both sides have tried to do.

Again, I know when my friends were in the majority, we didn't always get cost of living increases and those sorts of things either. They had inherited a difficult situation. They were making tough choices, and they were trying to lead by example.

I think that is exactly what this majority has continued to do, and so maintaining your personal credibility and your institutional responsibility, while you are arriving at and administering difficult decisions, I think, is a very important characteristic. So that is what we have tried to do in this bill.

Again, I appreciate my friend for making his point because I think, over time, we could change the character of the institution if we are not careful. I don't think that is an immediate concern, but it is one we ought to reflect on as we move forward.

Again, I thank him for his service, and I thank him for his persistence and tenacity.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, at this time, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), our distinguished ranking member of the full Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chair, I want to thank Chairman COLE and Ranking Member DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ for their hard work on this bill. It really was a bipartisan effort, and I do think you have produced a good bill.

Today, we consider the smallest of the appropriations bills which funds the operations of our Nation's legislative branch.

Without Senate items, the bill is $3.326 billion, the same as 2014. While I am pleased with the overall funding level, it was my hope that, after years of cuts to Member Representational Allowances, or the MRAs, we might provide a modest increase this year.

Member offices have sustained $106 million in cuts since 2010. While some reduction was appropriate, those cuts have severely strained the House's ability to serve the American people, due to fewer staff for constituent casework, the inability to effectively communicate with our constituents, and fewer district offices.

Unless we return to sensible funding levels, we cannot stave off the further erosion of expertise, morale, and comity in this great institution.

This bill funds the Open World Leadership program at $3.42 million, a reduction of $2.58 million. Instead of reducing funds equivalent to the amount for exchanges with Russians, we should shift the funds to support a larger presence in Ukraine and other countries fostering democratic principles, as suggested in the committee report.

□ 0945

Madam Chair, with that said, I congratulate, once again, the chairman and the ranking member of the subcommittee for putting forth a balanced bill and urge its support.

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP), our distinguished ranking member of the Military Construction Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I thank the gentlelady for yielding to me.

Madam Chair, I just wanted to say a few words in support of this year's Legislative Branch Appropriations Act. I have been honored to serve on this subcommittee for the last 4 years. I am the only member, in fact, to have served on the subcommittee for the last two Congresses.

It may have the smallest budget of the 12 appropriations bills, but it is vital to the work we do here in Congress and our ability to serve our constituents. From paying our staffs, to maintaining a digital and printed record of our work, to getting cost estimates of our legislative proposals, the legislative branch is so important to the proper functioning of our system of government.

It is especially gratifying that this year's bill reverses some of the draconian cuts from the legislative branch which have occurred over the last few years. I said last year that including these cuts would have been like cutting off our nose to spite our face. After all, agencies under the bill's jurisdiction, like the Congressional Budget Office and the Government Accountability Office, help Congress to identify potential savings and efficiencies throughout the government.

Or consider the Architect of the Capitol, which is responsible for the maintenance, operation, development, and preservation of the United States Capitol. Two years ago, the House couldn't find the necessary funds to complete the restoration of one of the most vital symbols of our democracy, the Capitol dome. I am pleased this year that the legislation includes $21.2 million for the last phase of the Capitol dome restoration.

Other agencies in the bill receive much-needed investments, including the Library of Congress, the United States Capitol Police, and the Government Printing Office.

I would like to commend the outstanding bipartisan work of Chairman COLE and Ranking Member WASSERMAN SCHULTZ in crafting this year's bill. Chairman COLE has done a yeoman's job stepping in at the last moment following the retirement of our colleague Rodney Alexander and shepherding this measure for the full House Appropriations Committee this morning.

I am also greatly appreciative of Ranking Member WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, whose institutional knowledge of the agencies in this measure is really unmatched.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I yield the gentleman from Georgia an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Both Chairman COLE and Ranking Member WASSERMAN SCHULTZ were greatly aided by their excellent staff: Liz Dawson, Chuck Turner, Jenny Panone, and Shalanda Young.

I look forward to supporting the bill and doing all that I can to ensure its swift passage by the full House of Representatives.

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

I was tempted to actually yield my friend from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP) additional time, he was being so kind to all of us on both sides of the aisle. But I genuinely want to thank my friend who is a very valuable member of our committee and, again, someone who is always thoughtful, always helpful, and always works in a bipartisan manner. You saw it on this floor yesterday when he and Chairman CULBERSON delivered their bill in a very bipartisan and a very professional manner. He does the same thing on our committee. So I just wanted to thank my friend.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, at this time, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I just wanted to once again thank my friend, my working partner in this, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. She, in this area, is an absolute expert without peer in this House, which has been enormously helpful to me.

Again, I want to thank the members of the committee. I want to thank all of the staff, frankly, from both sides of the aisle, all of the personnel offices. They have just been absolutely first-rate.

As I observed, I think, in one of our committee meetings, if the current chairman of the Democratic National Committee and the former chief of staff of the Republican National Committee can work this well together, then surely all things are possible in this universe.

It has been a pleasure to work with my friend. I look forward to continuing that collaboration as we go forward.

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

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 4487—the Fiscal Year 2015 Legislative Branch Appropriations Act.

For our government to truly remain ''of the people, and by the people'' the House of Representatives must be a place that is open and transparent to all. From ensuring constituents can meet with their elected representatives to guaranteeing open access to the legislative business of Congress, the Legislative Branch must be accessible to the public. We also have a responsibility to ensure the safety and security of the U.S. Capitol complex for all who work here and all who visit.

Therefore, as a Member of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee, one of my priorities has been to provide appropriate oversight regarding the security of the U.S. Capitol complex, including Members, staff, and visitors. I have met personally with House Sergeant of Arms Paul Irving and will continue to follow closely any developments relating to security concerns. I greatly appreciate Mr. Irving and our professional team of Capitol Police officers for the tireless work they put in to protect us and all who visit these hallowed halls.

Madam Chair, this bill adequately provides for the needs of the House Sergeant of Arms and the Capitol Police to ensure the necessary steps can be taken to maintain and strengthen security procedures for the entire Capitol complex.

Recent events have shown that even the most secure buildings in our country are still susceptible to security lapses. That is why it is more important than ever to remain vigilant in our efforts to ensure we are secure.

As I continue to serve on this Subcommittee, it is my responsibility to ask questions, find solutions, and help enact policies to keep members, staff, and guests as safe as reasonably possible.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Chair, I rise today to highlight what I believe are anticompetitive practices at the Government Printing Office, or GPO.

As its name implies, the GPO was set up to do government printing. Title 44 of the United States Code states that ''all printing, binding, and blank-book work for Congress, the Executive Office, the Judiciary, other than the Supreme Court of the United States . . . shall be done at the Government Printing Office.'' GPO's mission statement is to ''produce, protect, preserve, and distribute the official publications and information products of the Federal Government.'' Somehow, GPO has interpreted this to mean that ''printing'' includes the creation of secure federal credentials.

Madam Chair, the production of secure federal credentials cannot be reasonably classified as printing. The production of these credentials involves electronic storage capability, anti-counterfeiting technologies, and specialized manufacturing techniques. Furthermore, Title 44 was codified in 1968—secure credentials were not created until 30 years later. It is hard to believe that lawmakers in the 1960's could have envisioned the technical know-how that goes into making these credentials, much less classified the production as printing.

The real problem, however, lies with GPO asserting its authority to make these products while crowding out private sector competition. The federal government has successfully contracted out production of secure credentials to the private sector for years. The private sector competes for these contracts, ensuring that we end up with the best product for the best price. More disturbingly, I have heard reports indicating that GPO has a dedicated sales staff, and sends other staffers on sales calls to promote its secure credentials capabilities to federal agencies. GPO's attempt to fill this space inhibits competition by encouraging the federal government to insource at the expense of innovations in the private sector. I believe we need to level the playing field.

By highlighting this issue, I hope to trigger a discussion that will define a clear role for the GPO today, but also to ensure that the private secure credentials industry, the acknowledged leaders in this field, will have a chance to compete for government contracts.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4487

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the House of Representatives, $1,180,736,000, as follows:

HOUSE LEADERSHIP OFFICES

For salaries and expenses, as authorized by law, $22,278,891, including: Office of the Speaker, $6,645,417, including $25,000 for official expenses of the Speaker; Office of the Majority Floor Leader, $2,180,048, including $10,000 for official expenses of the Majority Leader; Office of the Minority Floor Leader, $7,114,471, including $10,000 for official expenses of the Minority Leader; Office of the Majority Whip, including the Chief Deputy Majority Whip, $1,886,632, including $5,000 for official expenses of the Majority Whip; Office of the Minority Whip, including the Chief Deputy Minority Whip, $1,459,639, including $5,000 for official expenses of the Minority Whip; Republican Conference, $1,505,426; Democratic Caucus, $1,487,258: *Provided*, That such amount for salaries and expenses shall remain available from January 3, 2015 until January 2, 2016.

MEMBERS' REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCES

INCLUDING MEMBERS' CLERK HIRE, OFFICIAL EXPENSES OF MEMBERS, AND OFFICIAL MAIL

For Members' representational allowances, including Members' clerk hire, official expenses, and official mail, $554,317,732.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

STANDING COMMITTEES, SPECIAL AND SELECT

For salaries and expenses of standing committees, special and select, authorized by House resolutions, $123,903,173: *Provided*, That such amount shall remain available for such salaries and expenses until December 31, 2016, except that $2,300,000 of such amount shall remain available until expended for committee room upgrading.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

For salaries and expenses of the Committee on Appropriations, $23,271,004, including studies and examinations of executive agencies and temporary personal services for such committee, to be expended in accordance with section 202(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and to be available for reimbursement to agencies for services performed: *Provided*, That such amount shall remain available for such salaries and expenses until December 31, 2016.

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

For compensation and expenses of officers and employees, as authorized by law, $171,344,864, including: for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Clerk, including the positions of the Chaplain and the Historian, and including not more than $25,000 for official representative and reception expenses, of which not more than $20,000 is for the Family Room and not more than $2,000 is for the Office of the Chaplain, $24,009,473; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Sergeant at Arms, including the position of Superintendent of Garages and the Office of Emergency Management, and including not more than $3,000 for official representation and reception expenses, $11,926,729 of which $4,344,000 shall remain available until expended; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer including not more than $3,000 for official representation and reception expenses, $113,100,000, of which $4,000,000 shall remain available until expended; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Inspector General, $4,741,809; for salaries and expenses of the Office of General Counsel, $1,340,987; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Parliamentarian, including the Parliamentarian, $2,000 for preparing the Digest of Rules, and not more than $1,000 for official representation and reception expenses, $1,952,249; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the House, $4,087,587, of which $1,000,000 shall remain available until expended for the completion of the House Modernization Initiative; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the House, $8,892,975, of which $540,000 shall remain available until expended for the completion of the House Modernization Initiative; for salaries and expenses of the Office of Interparliamentary Affairs, $814,069; for other authorized employees, $478,986.

ALLOWANCES AND EXPENSES

For allowances and expenses as authorized by House resolution or law, $285,620,336, including: supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims, $4,152,789; official mail for committees, leadership offices, and administrative offices of the House, $190,486; Government contributions for health, retirement, Social Security, and other applicable employee benefits, $256,635,776, to remain available until March 31, 2016; Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery, $16,217,008 of which $5,000,000 shall remain available until expended; transition activities for new members and staff, $3,737,000, to remain available until expended; Wounded Warrior Program $2,500,000, to remain available until expended; Office of Congressional Ethics, $1,467,030; and miscellaneous items including purchase, exchange, maintenance, repair and operation of

House motor vehicles, interparliamentary receptions, and gratuities to heirs of deceased employees of the House, $720,247.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. (a) REQUIRING AMOUNTS REMAINING IN MEMBERS' REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCES TO BE USED FOR DEFICIT REDUCTION OR TO REDUCE THE FEDERAL DEBT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any amounts appropriated under this Act for ''HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—SALARIES AND EXPENSES—MEMBERS' REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCES'' shall be available only for fiscal year 2015. Any amount remaining after all payments are made under such allowances for fiscal year 2015 shall be deposited in the Treasury and used for deficit reduction (or, if there is no Federal budget deficit after all such payments have been made, for reducing the Federal debt, in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury considers appropriate).

(b) REGULATIONS.—The Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives shall have authority to prescribe regulations to carry out this section.

(c) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term ''Member of the House of Representatives'' means a Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress.

DELIVERY OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

SEC. 102. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to deliver a printed copy of a bill, joint resolution, or resolution to the office of a Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress) unless the Member requests a copy.

DELIVERY OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

SEC. 103. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to deliver a printed copy of any version of the Congressional Record to the office of a Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress).

LIMITATION ON AMOUNT AVAILABLE TO LEASE VEHICLES

SEC. 104. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives to make any payments from any Members' Representational Allowance for the leasing of a vehicle, excluding mobile district offices, in an aggregate amount that exceeds $1,000 for the vehicle in any month.

LIMITATION ON PRINTED COPIES OF U.S. CODE TO HOUSE

SEC. 105. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide an aggregate number of more than 50 printed copies of any edition of the United States Code to all offices of the House of Representatives.

JOINT ITEMS

For Joint Committees, as follows:

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Economic Committee, $4,203,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Taxation, $10,004,000, to be disbursed by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives.

For other joint items, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTENDING PHYSICIAN

For medical supplies, equipment, and contingent expenses of the emergency rooms, and for the Attending Physician and his assistants, including:

(1) an allowance of $2,175 per month to the Attending Physician;

(2) an allowance of $1,300 per month to the Senior Medical Officer;

(3) an allowance of $725 per month each to three medical officers while on duty in the Office of the Attending Physician;

(4) an allowance of $725 per month to 2 assistants and $580 per month each not to exceed 11 assistants on the basis heretofore provided for such assistants; and

(5) $2,486,000 for reimbursement to the Department of the Navy for expenses incurred for staff and equipment assigned to the Office of the Attending Physician, which shall be advanced and credited to the applicable appropriation or appropriations from which such salaries, allowances, and other expenses are payable and shall be available for all the purposes thereof, $3,371,000, to be disbursed by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives.

OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL ACCESSIBILITY SERVICES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the Office of Congressional Accessibility Services, $1,387,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

CAPITOL POLICE

SALARIES

For salaries of employees of the Capitol Police, including overtime, hazardous duty pay, and Government contributions for health, retirement, social security, professional liability insurance, and other applicable employee benefits, $286,500,000 of which overtime shall not exceed $23,425,000 unless the Committee on Appropriations of the House and Senate are notified, to be disbursed by the Chief of the Capitol Police or his designee.

GENERAL EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Capitol Police, including motor vehicles, communications and other equipment, security equipment and installation, uniforms, weapons, supplies, materials, training, medical services, forensic services, stenographic services, personal and professional services, the employee assistance program, the awards program, postage, communication services, travel advances, relocation of instructor and liaison personnel for the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, and not more than $5,000 to be expended on the certification of the Chief of the Capitol Police in connection with official representation and reception expenses, $61,459,000, to be disbursed by the Chief of the Capitol Police or his designee: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the cost of basic training for the Capitol Police at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center for fiscal year 2015 shall be paid by the Secretary of Homeland Security from funds available to the Department of Homeland Security.

OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the Office of Compliance, as authorized by section 305 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1385), $3,959,000, of which $450,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That not more than $500 may be expended on the certification of the Executive Director of the Office of Compliance in connection with official representation and reception expenses.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses necessary for operation of the Congressional Budget Office, including not more than $6,000 to be expended on the certification of the Director of the Congressional Budget Office in connection with official representation and reception expenses, $45,700,000.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

For salaries for the Architect of the Capitol, and other personal services, at rates of pay provided by law; for surveys and studies in connection with activities under the care of the Architect of the Capitol; for all necessary expenses for the general and administrative support of the operations under the Architect of the Capitol including the Botanic Garden; electrical substations of the Capitol, Senate and House office buildings, and other facilities under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol; including furnishings and office equipment; including not more than $5,000 for official reception and representation expenses, to be expended as the Architect of the Capitol may approve; for purchase or exchange, maintenance, and operation of a passenger motor vehicle, $91,555,000.

CAPITOL BUILDING

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Capitol, $53,126,000, of which $28,817,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2019.

CAPITOL GROUNDS

For all necessary expenses for care and improvement of grounds surrounding the Capitol, the Senate and House office buildings, and the Capitol Power Plant, $11,993,000, of which $2,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2019.

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the House office buildings, $71,622,000, of which $7,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2019.

In addition, for a payment to the House Historic Buildings Revitalization Trust Fund, $70,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CAPITOL POWER PLANT

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Capitol Power Plant; lighting, heating, power (including the purchase of electrical energy) and water and sewer services for the Capitol, Senate and House office buildings, Library of Congress buildings, and the grounds about the same, Botanic Garden, Senate garage, and air conditioning refrigeration not supplied from plants in any of such buildings; heating the Government Printing Office and Washington City Post Office, and heating and chilled water for air conditioning for the Supreme Court Building, the Union Station complex, the Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building and the Folger Shakespeare Library, expenses for which shall be advanced or reimbursed upon request of the Architect of the Capitol and amounts so received shall be deposited into the Treasury to the credit of this appropriation, $93,152,000, of which $8,686,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2019: *Provided*, That not more than $9,000,000 of the funds credited or to be reimbursed to this appropriation as herein provided shall be available for obligation during fiscal year 2015.

LIBRARY BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

For all necessary expenses for the mechanical and structural maintenance, care and operation of the Library buildings and grounds, $41,733,000, of which $16,542,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2019.

CAPITOL POLICE BUILDINGS, GROUNDS, AND SECURITY

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of buildings, grounds and security enhancements of the

United States Capitol Police, wherever located, the Alternate Computer Facility, and AOC security operations, $19,486,000, of which $1,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2019.

BOTANIC GARDEN

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Botanic Garden and the nurseries, buildings, grounds, and collections; and purchase and exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of a passenger motor vehicle; all under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library, $15,022,946, of which $5,122,946 shall remain available until September 30, 2019: *Provided*, That of the amount made available under this heading, the Architect of the Capitol may obligate and expend such sums as may be necessary for the maintenance, care and operation of the National Garden established under section 307E of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1989 (2 U.S.C. 2146), upon vouchers approved by the Architect of the Capitol or a duly authorized designee.

CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER

For all necessary expenses for the operation of the Capitol Visitor Center, $20,875,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

SCRIMS

SEC. 1001. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for scrims containing photographs of building facades during restoration or construction projects performed by the Architect of the Capitol.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Library of Congress not otherwise provided for, including development and maintenance of the Library's catalogs; custody and custodial care of the Library buildings; special clothing; cleaning, laundering and repair of uniforms; preservation of motion pictures in the custody of the Library; operation and maintenance of the American Folklife Center in the Library; activities under the Civil Rights History Project Act of 2009; preparation and distribution of catalog records and other publications of the Library; hire or purchase of one passenger motor vehicle; and expenses of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board not properly chargeable to the income of any trust fund held by the Board, $424,057,000, of which not more than $6,000,000 shall be derived from collections credited to this appropriation during fiscal year 2015, and shall remain available until expended, under the Act of June 28, 1902 (chapter 1301; 32 Stat. 480; 2 U.S.C. 150) and not more than $350,000 shall be derived from collections during fiscal year 2015 and shall remain available until expended for the development and maintenance of an international legal information database and activities related thereto: *Provided*, That the Library of Congress may not obligate or expend any funds derived from collections under the Act of June 28, 1902, in excess of the amount authorized for obligation or expenditure in appropriations Acts: *Provided further*, That the total amount available for obligation shall be reduced by the amount by which collections are less than $6,350,000: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, not more than $12,000 may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for the Overseas Field Offices: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, $8,231,000 shall remain available until expended for the digital collections and educational curricula program.

COPYRIGHT OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For all necessary expenses of the Copyright Office, $54,303,000, of which not more than $27,971,000, to remain available until expended, shall be derived from collections credited to this appropriation during fiscal year 2015 under section 708(d) of title 17, United States Code: *Provided*, That the Copyright Office may not obligate or expend any funds derived from collections under such section, in excess of the amount authorized for obligation or expenditure in appropriations Acts: *Provided further*, That not more than $5,611,000 shall be derived from collections during fiscal year 2015 under sections 111(d)(2), 119(b)(2), 803(e), 1005, and 1316 of such title: *Provided further*, That the total amount available for obligation shall be reduced by the amount by which collections are less than $33,582,000: *Provided further*, That not more than $100,000 of the amount appropriated is available for the maintenance of an ''International Copyright Institute'' in the Copyright Office of the Library of Congress for the purpose of training nationals of developing countries in intellectual property laws and policies: *Provided further*, That not more than $6,500 may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for activities of the International Copyright Institute and for copyright delegations, visitors, and seminars: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any provision of chapter 8 of title 17, United States Code, any amounts made available under this heading which are attributable to royalty fees and payments received by the Copyright Office pursuant to sections 111, 119, and chapter 10 of such title may be used for the costs incurred in the administration of the Copyright Royalty Judges program, with the exception of the costs of salaries and benefits for the Copyright Royalty Judges and staff under section 802(e).

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 203 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 166) and to revise and extend the Annotated Constitution of the United States of America, $106,095,000: *Provided*, That no part of such amount may be used to pay any salary or expense in connection with any publication, or preparation of material therefor (except the Digest of Public General Bills), to be issued by the Library of Congress unless such publication has obtained prior approval of either the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate.

BOOKS FOR THE BLIND AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses to carry out the Act of March 3, 1931 (chapter 400; 46 Stat. 1487; 2 U.S.C. 135a), $50,429,000: *Provided*, That of the total amount appropriated, $650,000 shall be available to contract to provide newspapers to blind and physically handicapped residents at no cost to the individual.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

REIMBURSABLE AND REVOLVING FUND ACTIVITIES

SEC. 1101. (a) IN GENERAL.—For fiscal year 2015, the obligational authority of the Library of Congress for the activities described in subsection (b) may not exceed $203,058,000.

(b) ACTIVITIES.—The activities referred to in subsection (a) are reimbursable and revolving fund activities that are funded from sources other than appropriations to the Library in appropriations Acts for the legislative branch.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

CONGRESSIONAL PRINTING AND BINDING

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For authorized printing and binding for the Congress and the distribution of Congressional information in any format; expenses necessary for preparing the semimonthly and session index to the Congressional Record, as authorized by law (section 902 of title 44, United States Code); printing and binding of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed to Members of Congress; and printing, binding, and distribution of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed without charge to the recipient, $79,736,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for paper copies of the permanent edition of the Congressional Record for individual Representatives, Resident Commissioners or Delegates authorized under section 906 of title 44, United States Code: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred under the appropriations for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the 2-year limitation under section 718 of title 44, United States Code, none of the funds appropriated or made available under this Act or any other Act for printing and binding and related services provided to Congress under chapter 7 of title 44, United States Code, may be expended to print a document, report, or publication after the 27-month period beginning on the date that such document, report, or publication is authorized by Congress to be printed, unless Congress reauthorizes such printing in accordance with section 718 of title 44, United States Code: *Provided further*, That any unobligated or unexpended balances in this account or accounts for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years may be transferred to the Government Printing Office revolving fund for carrying out the purposes of this heading, subject to the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding sections 901, 902, and 906 of title 44, United States Code, this appropriation may be used to prepare indexes to the Congressional Record on only a monthly and session basis.

OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses of the Office of Superintendent of Documents necessary to provide for the cataloging and indexing of Government publications and their distribution to the public, Members of Congress, other Government agencies, and designated depository and international exchange libraries as authorized by law, $31,500,000: *Provided*, That amounts of not more than $2,000,000 from current year appropriations are authorized for producing and disseminating Congressional serial sets and other related publications for fiscal years 2013 and 2014 to depository and other designated libraries: *Provided further*, That any unobligated or unexpended balances in this account or accounts for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years may be transferred to the Government Printing Office revolving fund for carrying out the purposes of this heading, subject to the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE REVOLVING FUND

For payment to the Government Printing Office Revolving Fund, $11,348,000, to remain available until expended, for information technology development and facilities repair: *Provided*, That the Government Printing Office is hereby authorized to make such

expenditures, within the limits of funds available and in accordance with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 9104 of title 31, United States Code, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs and purposes set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for the Government Printing Office Revolving Fund: *Provided further*, That not more than $7,500 may be expended on the certification of the Public Printer in connection with official representation and reception expenses: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund shall be available for the hire or purchase of not more than 12 passenger motor vehicles: *Provided further*, That expenditures in connection with travel expenses of the advisory councils to the Public Printer shall be deemed necessary to carry out the provisions of title 44, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund shall be available for temporary or intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not more than the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title: *Provided further*, That activities financed through the revolving fund may provide information in any format: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund and the funds provided under the headings ''Office of Superintendent of Documents'' and ''Salaries and Expenses'' may not be used for contracted security services at the Government Printing Office's passport facility in the District of Columbia.

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Government Accountability Office, including not more than $12,500 to be expended on the certification of the Comptroller General of the United States in connection with official representation and reception expenses; temporary or intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not more than the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of such title; hire of one passenger motor vehicle; advance payments in foreign countries in accordance with section 3324 of title 31, United States Code; benefits comparable to those payable under sections 901(5), (6), and (8) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4081(5), (6), and (8)); and under regulations prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States, rental of living quarters in foreign countries, $519,622,000: *Provided*, That, in addition, $23,750,000 of payments received under sections 782, 3521, and 9105 of title 31, United States Code, shall be available without fiscal year limitation: *Provided further*, That this appropriation and appropriations for administrative expenses of any other department or agency which is a member of the National Intergovernmental Audit Forum or a Regional Intergovernmental Audit Forum shall be available to finance an appropriate share of either Forum's costs as determined by the respective Forum, including necessary travel expenses of non-Federal participants: *Provided further*, That payments hereunder to the Forum may be credited as reimbursements to any appropriation from which costs involved are initially financed.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

CENTER FOR AUDIT EXCELLENCE

SEC. 1201. (a) CENTER FOR AUDIT EXCELLENCE.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Chapter 7 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subchapter:

''SUBCHAPTER VII—CENTER FOR AUDIT EXCELLENCE

''§ 791. Center for audit excellence

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Comptroller General shall establish, maintain, and operate a center within the Government Accountability Office to be known as the 'Center for Audit Excellence' (hereafter in this subchapter referred to as the 'Center').

''(b) PURPOSE AND ACTIVITIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Center shall build institutional auditing capacity and promote good governance by providing affordable, relevant, and high-quality training, technical assistance, and products and services to qualified personnel and entities of governments (including the Federal government, State and local governments, tribal governments, and governments of foreign nations), international organizations, and other private organizations.

''(2) DETERMINATION OF QUALIFIED PERSONNEL AND ENTITIES.—Personnel and entities shall be considered qualified for purposes of receiving training, technical assistance, and products or services from the Center under paragraph (1) in accordance with such criteria as the Comptroller General may establish and publish.

''(c) FEES.—

''(1) PERMITTING CHARGING OF FEES.—The Comptroller General may establish, charge, and collect fees (on a reimbursable or advance basis) for the training, technical assistance, and products and services provided by the Center under this subchapter.

''(2) DEPOSIT INTO SEPARATE ACCOUNT.—The Comptroller General shall deposit all fees collected under paragraph (1) into the Center for Audit Excellence Account established under section 792.

''(d) GIFTS OF PROPERTY AND SERVICES.—The Comptroller General may accept and use conditional or non-conditional gifts of property (both real and personal) and services (including services of guest lecturers) to support the operation of the Center, except that the Comptroller General may not accept or use such a gift if the Comptroller General determines that the acceptance or use of the gift would compromise or appear to compromise the integrity of the Government Accountability Office.

''(e) SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING PERSONNEL.—It is the sense of Congress that the Center should be staffed primarily by personnel of the Government Accountability Office who are not otherwise engaged in carrying out other duties of the Office under this chapter, so as to ensure that the operation of the Center will not have a negative impact on the ability of the Office to maintain a consistently high level of service to Congress.

''§ 792. Account

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF SEPARATE ACCOUNT.—There is established in the Treasury as a separate account for the Government Accountability Office the 'Center for Audit Excellence Account', which shall consist of the fees deposited by the Comptroller General under section 791(c) and such other amounts as may be appropriated under law.

''(b) USE OF ACCOUNT.—Amounts in the Center for Audit Excellence Account shall be available to the Comptroller General, in amounts specified in appropriations Acts and without fiscal year limitation, to carry out this subchapter.

''§ 793. Authorization of Appropriations

''There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subchapter.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 7 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SUBCHAPTER VII—CENTER FOR AUDIT EXCELLENCE

''791. Center for Audit Excellence.
''792. Account.
''793. Authorization of appropriations.''.

(b) APPROVAL OF BUSINESS PLAN.—The Comptroller General may not begin operating the Center for Audit Excellence under subchapter VII of chapter 7 of title 31, United States Code (as added by subsection (a)) until—

(1) the Comptroller General submits a business plan for the Center to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate; and

(2) each such Committee approves the plan.

OPEN WORLD LEADERSHIP CENTER TRUST FUND

For a payment to the Open World Leadership Center Trust Fund for financing activities of the Open World Leadership Center under section 313 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2001 (2 U.S.C. 1151), $3,420,000.

JOHN C. STENNIS CENTER FOR PUBLIC SERVICE TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT

For payment to the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Development Trust Fund established under section 116 of the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Training and Development Act (2 U.S.C. 1105), $430,000.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used for the maintenance or care of private vehicles, except for emergency assistance and cleaning as may be provided under regulations relating to parking facilities for the House of Representatives issued by the Committee on House Administration and for the Senate issued by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SEC. 202. No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond fiscal year 2015 unless expressly so provided in this Act.

SEC. 203. Whenever in this Act any office or position not specifically established by the Legislative Pay Act of 1929 (46 Stat. 32 et seq.) is appropriated for or the rate of compensation or designation of any office or position appropriated for is different from that specifically established by such Act, the rate of compensation and the designation in this Act shall be the permanent law with respect thereto: *Provided*, That the provisions in this Act for the various items of official expenses of Members, officers, and committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and clerk hire for Senators and Members of the House of Representatives shall be the permanent law with respect thereto.

SEC. 204. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, under section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued under existing law.

SEC. 205. Amounts available for administrative expenses of any legislative branch entity which participates in the Legislative Branch Financial Managers Council (LBFMC) established by charter on March 26, 1996, shall be available to finance an appropriate share of LBFMC costs as determined by the LBFMC, except that the total LBFMC costs to be shared among all participating legislative branch entities (in such allocations among the entities as the entities may determine) may not exceed $2,000.

SEC. 206. The Architect of the Capitol, in consultation with the District of Columbia, is authorized to maintain and improve the

landscape features, excluding streets, in the irregular shaped grassy areas bounded by Washington Avenue, SW on the northeast, Second Street, SW on the west, Square 582 on the south, and the beginning of the I–395 tunnel on the southeast.

SEC. 207. None of the funds made available in this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government, except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in, this Act or any other appropriation Act.

SEC. 208. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), none of the funds made available to the Architect of the Capitol in this Act may be used to eliminate or restrict guided tours of the United States Capitol which are led by employees and interns of offices of Members of Congress and other offices of the House of Representatives and Senate.

(b) At the direction of the Capitol Police Board, or at the direction of the Architect of the Capitol with the approval of the Capitol Police Board, guided tours of the United States Capitol which are led by employees and interns described in subsection (a) may be suspended temporarily or otherwise subject to restriction for security or related reasons to the same extent as guided tours of the United States Capitol which are led by the Architect of the Capitol.

SEC. 209. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no adjustment shall be made under section 610(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 31) (relating to cost of living adjustments for Members of Congress) during fiscal year 2015.

SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 210. The amount by which the applicable allocation of new budget authority made by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, excluding Senate items, exceeds the amount of proposed new budget authority is $0.

This Act may be cited as the ''Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2015''.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in House Report 113–426. 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. NUGENT

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 113–426.

Mr. NUGENT. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, beginning line 23, strike ''in an aggregate amount that exceeds $1,000 for the vehicle in any month'' and insert ''and excluding short-term vehicle rentals in an aggregate amount that does not exceed $1,000 for the vehicle in any month''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 557, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. NUGENT. Madam Chairman, my amendment is simple. It would end the practice of Members leasing vehicles on the taxpayers' dime. I am just not convinced that this is a necessary use of taxpayer money, and neither are the constituents that I represent.

We are asking agencies throughout the Federal Government to use their funding carefully and to cut out unnecessary, nice-to-have things. We ought to apply the same standard to ourselves, and in many ways we have done an excellent job of doing that.

Funding for the House of Representatives has been cut since the Republicans took the majority by over 14 percent. We have cut our own MRAs and committee funds. We have frozen our own pay.

Unfortunately, the vehicle lease program isn't consistent in that effort. That is not to say that some Members who lease vehicles aren't doing it responsibly. They are, and they have good reason. Unfortunately, I think the line of what is appropriate in terms of leasing vehicles has been blurred by others. Members of Congress driving around the Capitol in luxury vehicles financed by the taxpayers that they represent isn't exactly the image we want to portray to the American people, especially when many Americans are struggling just to get by.

The vehicle lease program in its current form is simply out of touch with the economic reality of what our American brothers and sisters face. Therefore, until we can ensure that all Members of Congress are using this program responsibly, I believe we ought to halt it entirely.

The Senate, to their credit, in one of the few times that I agree with the Senate—and I don't say that often—already has barred its Members from leasing vehicles with public money; and, frankly, I think it is time that we do the same.

To be clear, my amendment is straightforward. It says that the CAO may not make any payments from any Member's Representational Allowance for the leasing of a vehicle. My amendment excludes short-term vehicle rentals and mobile district offices, as those are often necessary resources used in serving our constituents. But having basically a personal car entirely paid for by taxpayers should no longer be allowed.

I urge adoption of my amendment and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLE. I want to begin by thanking my friend. We serve together on the Rules Committee. It is very seldom that I would disagree with my friend, who not only has a distinguished record here, but a distinguished record in law enforcement.

And let me make it clear. I am quite content to let the body work its will on this matter. I appreciate my friend actually bringing it forward. I think it is important to discuss.

I had not really thought about this a great deal until I saw my friend's amendment. I don't lease a vehicle through my office at all. Although we have discussed it and looked at it, it just never seemed to be appropriate or make sense for us. We do have 63 Members, however, who do do this practice. The average cost of the vehicle is $589.

Now, I can't tell you that I have taken a survey of all 63, but I have talked to a few—just sort of tell me what your reasoning is—and the responses are pretty diverse. But you could break it into two or three categories.

First, some of them cover exceptionally large districts, and they find this the most cost-effective way to actually cover it, I mean, even to the point of saying, as one Member said:

> I go through rough terrain to reach remote areas. I need a vehicle that, frankly, is quite a bit more robust than members of my staff have or that I even have personally, sometimes, to reach some of my constituents.

I thought that was a pretty impressive reason.

Second, others, again, just find it much more cost-effective than actually paying and reimbursing for mileage. But I think the core thing here is to trust—actually trust—the Member to make the decision.

I think an important point here is to note that we are not going to save any money, really. This comes out of the Member's Representational Allowance as it is, so there is not a real savings here. And it is all publicly disclosed, so Members take some considerable risk if they do this. They have to be able to explain it to their constituents.

At the end of the day, I just simply don't want to micromanage individual Members in how they spend the money which we allot them through this bill.

And with that, I understand my good friend would like to say some things, so I will yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), the ranking member.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, I also rise in opposition to my Florida colleague's amendment, which seeks to dictate to other Members how to spend their office budgets. It is important to note that I also do not lease a vehicle.

The bill already sets a limit on what Members can spend on vehicle leases to ensure that costs are appropriately controlled. The Nugent amendment would go further and prevent long-term vehicle leases unless they are classified as mobile district offices.

The problem with the gentleman from Florida's amendment is the same as we have had with other similar amendments in the past that have sought to restrict or eliminate Members' use of funds for their office budgets.

We have Members that represent entire States or very large geographic

areas. Removing transportation options for Members trying to effectively represent their constituents forces a one-size-fits-all approach to serving our congressional districts, and we know that is not reasonable nor does it make sense.

The House makes statements of disbursements available to the public so that our constituents can judge us on the purchases that we make. Each Member has to answer to his or her constituents if they spend inappropriately or if they make purchases that are at odds with the sensibilities of those that sent the Member to office. We don't need to dictate to each other how we can most effectively do our jobs.

With that, Madam Chair, I urge the defeat of this well-intentioned but misguided amendment.

Mr. COLE. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUGENT. Madam Chair, I do appreciate the comments of more senior Members of this House. I, obviously, have been here 3 years, and I do appreciate their comments.

But I will go back to this. Think about this. The Senate, each Senator represents their whole State. They gave up that privilege a while back because it didn't make sense. But think about this. Today, Members of Congress can lease Lexuses, BMWs, Infinities, Acuras, Mercedes, which all fall within the guidelines, and not all do that. But does that send a message to our folks back home that this is the right way to do it? Because that MRA that was discussed, this also covers all of the wear and tear on the car, it covers the fuel. There is no expense that is spared with regards to covering that, versus the mileage reimbursement, if I used my own car, which I do.

That is not to try to diminish or hurt any Member. It really is, though, bringing us into compliance with the same thing that the Senate has done. It is about reasonable usage of the dollars the taxpayers give us.

Once again I will tell you that I agree with most of what my good friends have said, but I disagree on this one. I truly believe it is time for this House to move forward and limit itself in regards to these types of acquisitions and purchases.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT).

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

Mr. NUGENT. 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 Florida will be postponed.

□ 1000

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 113–426.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Chairwoman, I have an amendment desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 11, line 10, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $500,000)''.

Page 12, line 16, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $500,000)''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 557, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Chair, I rise today because many Americans think Congress has unchecked power. They think we know how to make laws but don't know how to follow them. They think of us not as the House of Representatives but as the House of Hypocrites. I have spent a lot of time here on the floor speaking about sexual harassment and the epidemic of rape in the military and on college campuses. It is just as important that we bring the same scrutiny to our own House.

The American people expect us to conduct ourselves in a manner befitting the responsibilities and duties that we hold as Members of Congress—not as if we are freshmen in a frat house. While they are the exception, not the rule, it is an embarrassment to this institution that some Members have ''sexted'' teenage pages on the floor. It is unacceptable that others have groped and inappropriately touched their staff members. This behavior is illegal and unacceptable in the private sector, and it is illegal and unacceptable here.

This is not a Democratic issue, and this is not a Republican issue. This is a House issue. Just recall former Congressman Bob Filner. He pled guilty to charges of felony false imprisonment for sexually harassing a former aide in the San Diego's mayor's office. When Mr. Filner was ranking member on the Veterans' Affairs Committee in the House, he allegedly sexually harassed several female members of the Armed Forces who were rape survivors. But none of the women ever said a word while Mr. Filner was still here—not one.

If you work for a private company in my home State in California, it is likely you have had several hours of sexual harassment training to identify and prevent sexual harassment in the workplace because it is the law. It is also the law in California that State legislators and their staff participate in a mandatory sexual harassment training every year. But that is not the case here in the House.

In fact, congressional Office of Compliance staff say that when new Members go through their 3-day training, they are mostly counseling empty seats by the end of day 3.

Sexual harassment training is already mandatory for the executive branch agencies, and it has proven to result in a significant reduction in the number of discrimination, harassment, and retaliation claims. But this training for Congress is only voluntary. The congressional Office of Compliance provides sexual harassment training to offices, but it is not typically requested until after an office reports an incident.

It is time we take advantage of the valuable training the office provides. My staff and I actually have taken this 1½ hour training, and as much as I know about sexual harassment, I learned additional things during that training.

Madam Chairwoman, my amendment is simple. It appropriates $500,000 in additional funds to the Office of Compliance to be used to enhance sexual harassment training programs by implementing a Web-based platform. These funds will also be used for outreach to inform House office employees what their rights are, the various forms sexual harassment takes, and where to go if they experience sexual harassment. It is time to send a new message: that we are here to serve and that we are not above the law.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition; although, I am not opposed.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the gentlelady from California's amendment, which would provide an additional $500,000 to the Office of Compliance. The funding is intended for the office to provide mandatory sexual harassment training for all congressional offices in the House of Representatives.

Surveys find that anywhere from 25 to 31 percent of women in the United States have experienced sexual harassment at work, with the majority of women reporting that the harasser was a direct supervisor or senior to them. Sexual harassment creates counterproductive, hostile, and potentially dangerous working environments, not only threatening the emotional and physical well-being of women, but also women's job performance and security.

There is no reason to think the House of Representatives is immune to this problem. The House of Representatives should not be exempt from providing proper training to identify, prevent, and report sexual harassment, as many private institutions undertake.

Additionally, this type of training is already mandatory for all executive branch agencies. It is time that we follow suit to ensure that the entire Federal Government is setting a model example for safety and respect in the workplace.

To that end, I have cosponsored Representative SPEIER's resolution, which

amends the rules of the House to require that the mandatory annual ethics training offered to Members, officers, and employees of the House include the specific program of training in the prevention and deterrence of sexual harassment in employment.

I urge support of this amendment and thank the gentlelady for her leadership on this issue, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SPEIER. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment. When I came to Congress, I was outraged by the behavior of some of my colleagues. In one incident, a woman Member was told to share a seat with a male colleague when there weren't enough chairs at a committee meeting.

While there have certainly been improvements, recent events embarrassing this institution highlight the continued need for training. We cannot allow ''Mad Men''-style antics to occur in our offices.

Sexual harassment training will help victims, improve awareness of what is not allowed, and is necessary if we want to be serious about stopping inappropriate acts.

I thank the gentlelady for offering this amendment, and I encourage your support.

Ms. SPEIER. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. At this time, I would like to yield 30 seconds to Chairman COLE.

Mr. COLE. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Chairman, I just want to thank my friend from California for bringing this amendment. I think it is a truly important amendment and something that we are more than happy to accept, and appreciate her raising the issue very, very much.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. We thank the gentleman and appreciate his support.

At this time, I would like to yield the balance of our time in opposition, even though no one is speaking in opposition to this very important amendment, to the gentlelady from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER), the chair of the Committee on House Administration.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlelady for yielding me time, and I certainly want to thank my colleague from California for offering this very, very important amendment which we are all very supportive of.

This amendment, as has been explained, provides additional funds to the congressional Office of Compliance. This is the agency that really is tasked with making sure that Members of Congress and—very importantly, most importantly—their staff are aware of what their individual rights are and how to protect themselves against sexual harassment in the workplace.

Unfortunately, sometimes it seems like the Members might be protected, but perhaps their staffs are not as well aware and protected as they need to be. This is certainly not a partisan issue. We have seen incidents over the years of Republicans and of Democrats, both sides of the aisle here.

Actually, Madam Chair, this week I met with senior staff at the OOC. I met with all the board members there. We talked about what kind of additional training might be helpful when we put together our new Members orientation program in the fall, various kinds of things that we can do, and, of course, they needed a little bit more cash to be able to really step up, particularly on the Internet and various things, and do awareness training. So this amendment, I think, is very important.

Certainly, Madam Chair, Congress needs to be held to the highest standards, and, at a minimum, we ought to be held to the same standards that we hold private businesses to out in the marketplace and the workplace.

Every employee that works on this Hill needs to work in an environment that they feel is free from sexual harassment, and if they feel threatened in any way, they need to be able to be sure that they understand their rights and what recourse they have to protect themselves without any fear of retribution. I think Congress needs to be a leader on this issue—a leader—and I certainly feel that by conducting awareness training, that will help stop any unfortunate situation, and if we don't stop it, certainly, then, allowing an individual to protect themselves. That, I think, is an important thing for all of us.

So, again, I thank the gentlelady from California for offering the amendment, and I would urge all my colleagues to support this amendment.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chairman, I also yield back the balance of my time and thank the gentlelady from California for her amendment.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 113–426.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chairwoman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 15, line 2, after the first dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $3,166,946)''.

Page 32, line 21, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $3,166,946)''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 557, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chairwoman, I rise today to speak in favor of my simple and straightforward amendment. My amendment would reduce funding to the United States Botanic Garden to the levels appropriated in fiscal year 2014. That money would then be transferred to the Spending Reduction Account so that we could take one more step towards reining in Federal spending.

I would be the first to say that I appreciate the Botanic Garden and its beauty. I believe it is a good program, and I am personally interested in botany. But Members of Congress are often faced with difficult choices, especially given our current fiscal crisis. There are programs that are constitutionally mandated, and other programs that are nice but are not constitutionally mandated. This is one program that is nice but cannot be immune from the fiscal pressures facing our government.

While the Botanic Garden is a wonderful attraction, Congress must seek to limit excessive spending in the name of getting our fiscal house in order. No line item can be overlooked in making these assessments and decisions, including our own office budgets, as we have demonstrated.

Madam Chairwoman, so many families are tightening their belts during these trying economic times. Congress must do the same and make cuts where it can.

I am concerned that the Architect of the Capitol has proposed over $5.1 million in new capital projects at the Botanic Garden this year. Rather than making minor repairs to a few small leaks in the roof, the Architect of the Capitol is proposing to tear down the entire roof and replace it with something called a new vegetative roofing system. At a time of soaring deficits and with the Federal debt in excess of $17 trillion, such expenditures are especially wasteful, and we shouldn't be wasting precious taxpayer money on a new, state-of-the-art vegetative roofing system.

My proposed amendment is a fair cut. It does not gut the program but merely rolls back the appropriations back to 2014 levels. My amendment still allows for almost $2 million in new capital projects and repairs to take place in fiscal year 2015.

A note about vegetative roofs. They are usually at least twice the cost to install and require a much higher maintenance cost, and in some cases have unintended consequences by attracting wildlife into urban areas, as an example, geese. I ask each Member to vote in favor of the Gosar amendment.

Madam Chairwoman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment which

seeks to cut over $3 million from the Architect of the Capitol's Botanic Garden—the people's Botanic Garden.

Now, I understand the gentleman from Arizona is trying to generate headlines by attempting to cut much-needed funding to one of the most beloved destinations in Washington, D.C., our Nation's Capital, but this is not the way to fix our Nation's deficit.

Over 200 years ago, George Washington had a vision for our Capital City to include a botanic garden that would demonstrate and promote the important role plant life plays in our Nation. It may seem trivial, but the Botanic Garden, established in 1820, is one of the oldest botanic gardens in the United States. It is also one of the most visited destinations on the Capitol complex. In fact, I know it is my own children's favorite place to visit when they come to Washington, D.C., and often our first stop.

Our constituents sent us here to do real work and look for real solutions to the deficit, not to try to score cheap political points by attacking important institutions that have already taken a fiscal hit, like the Botanic Garden.

The gentleman says that no line-item or opportunity can be looked over when it comes to reducing our deficit. Yet, I urge the gentleman if he is looking for ways to significantly reduce our deficit, to urge the House Republican leadership to address comprehensive immigration reform, which would result in a $900 million reduction in the deficit over the next 20 years. Going after a garden isn't the answer.

In fact, I think it is important to note that since President Obama took office, our deficit has been cut by more than 50 percent as a percentage of our GDP.

With that, I urge the Members to defeat this ill-advised amendment.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. Madam Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding. I want to thank my friend too because I know the spirit in which this is brought is to save money and to make some tough decisions, and I share that. It is worth pointing out that we did reduce the Architect's request by $79 million.

□ 1015

Frankly, we are spending about $40 million less than we did last year, so it is not as if we have not been serious about this. We did look at this particular area. My friend from Florida made the point that not only is it a well-traveled destination point and very desirable place, but it is a pretty old building, and we really do have serious problems here that we think are potentially health hazards.

We have chunks of the building, 5–15 pounds, that have fallen off from the height of 40 feet, and that is a health hazard; so given the traffic there, given the fact that we have been pretty tough across the board, we thought this was one of those urgent priorities that needed to be taken care of.

Again, I have no qualms with my friend's motives. I know he is trying to save money. I share that belief. We have made a lot of tough decisions across the board, and it is certainly appropriate for this body to look, and if people can find areas, we are happy with that.

In this case, our judgment as a committee—and certainly my judgment—is that we need to make certain that a facility that is this well used is kept safe and in good repair, so we don't risk liability and risk injury and, frankly, that we do keep open and functioning one of the most beloved institutions of the Capitol complex.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

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

Mr. GOSAR. 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 Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 113–426.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. 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 15, line 13, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $243,000)''.

Page 32, line 21, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $243,000)''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 557, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, the bill under consideration today is probably the smallest appropriations bill that we see each year, at least in terms of the number of dollars involved.

It funds the operations of the legislative branch—both the operational expenses of the congressional offices and the expenses which occur in protecting and maintaining Capitol grounds.

This bill decreases in several places, and it holds the line on a number of accounts as well. In total, the bill provides funding which is in line with the amount provided just last year. I commend the Appropriations Committee for this. However, there are also a number of increases found within the bill.

Earlier this week, I submitted amendments to the Rules Committee, all of which were meant to target accounts which received seemingly inexplicable increases. I have been allowed one amendment today, only one, which would decrease funding for the Capitol Visitor Center by $243,000 and move the same amount to the spending reduction account.

This move would result in the Visitor Center funding being equal to the amount which was appropriated last year, just keeping it at the same level.

The Capitol Visitor Center opened to the public in December of 2008, and according to the Congressional Research Service, it cost more than $600 million to complete. While the Visitor Center received about $65 million in private donations, the rest of its cost was borne by taxpayers.

Madam Chairman, it has been less than 10 years since the Visitor Center has opened, at considerable public expense. I think, given our current fiscal state, we can certainly afford to level fund the Visitor Center, hold the line, and use this increase, while just a small one, to help reduce our Federal deficit. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, this amendment cuts the small inflationary increase of $243,000 provided to the Capitol Visitor Center in this bill. This small increase is needed for the Capitol Visitor Center to keep up with inflation in order to provide the same level of service to our constituents next year as they are providing this year. When is enough enough?

My colleague must not be aware that the Capitol Visitor Center is 7 percent below the funding level that they were in fiscal year 2010. They have already contributed their fair share to deficit reduction.

If my colleague is serious about reducing the national debt and the deficit, then I would suggest that he stop voting to repeal the Affordable Care Act because the recent CBO estimate is that there would be a net increase of $109 billion to the deficit between 2013 and 2022 if the Affordable Care Act is repealed.

Perhaps he can call on his own leadership to reduce the deficit by $900 million by taking up and passing comprehensive immigration reform.

When I was chair of this subcommittee, I inherited a fiscal disaster in cost overruns during the construction of the Capitol Visitor Center. We were collaboratively and in a bipartisan way able to bring that project in for a soft landing and slow the hemorrhaging of Federal funds for a project that a Republican majority began.

Now, we recognized that the responsible thing was to ensure that this facility had the tools necessary to succeed, so that our visitors could have an

informative and welcoming space to visit their government and to understand our democracy, so it baffles me that we would see an amendment that goes after the very organization that interacts with our constituents nearly every day.

I want those working in the Capitol Visitor Center to know that we appreciate the work they do. They are essential to the experience our constituents have when visiting our Nation's Capitol. With that, I urge defeat of the amendment.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. Madam Chair, first, I thank the gentlelady for yielding, and I want to thank my friend too because I know he is very serious about looking for places to cut costs. Indeed, later on, there are a number of items that Members have brought to our attention that we will accept. In this case, we don't think it is appropriate.

I do want to thank my friend from Florida. I happened to be on this committee as a junior Member when she did do, I think, an unbelievably good job in working us through what had been a bad process and cost overruns in the Center.

At the end of the day, this is where millions of Americans—this is their portal to the Capitol. It is well run, and it is well managed. I think maintaining access and keeping it safe and keeping it welcoming, if you will, is very important.

So while this is a legitimate question to raise, I agree with my friend and would oppose the amendment.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, I didn't realize with this amendment that we were going to get into debate about the unaffordable, uncaring act, so-called ObamaCare. Actually, I have the solution.

We have been promised that if you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. We have been promised that if you like your insurance, you can keep your insurance. We know both of those are not factual.

We know both of those were known by the President when he made those claims to America, that he knew that they were not factual also. I am just waiting for the President to come out with this claim: if you like your gun, you can keep your gun.

Before getting back to the appropriations process, let me, to just finish up—and that is, I have the solution. It is called the Patient Option Act. It will actually make everybody's health insurance in this country less expense.

It will provide access to good quality health care for all Americans, and it will save Medicare from going broke. It has been endorsed by the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, as well as FreedomWorks, and it will solve the problems that we all face of an out-of-control health care cost system burden that has been placed on us by a government that has intruded into the health care system itself.

Madam Chairman, this country expects us to make cuts. We are spending money we don't have. We are borrowing 40 cents on every dollar that we spend, and we just have to stop spending money we don't have. We have to restore fiscal sanity to the government. That is what I will continue to do as a Member of Congress, as long as I am here.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, as a breast cancer survivor and one of the 129 million Americans who live in this country with a preexisting condition, I am thankful for the Affordable Care Act and the peace of mind it established on January 1 when, never again, an insurance company in this country could drop us or deny us coverage, the coverage that the gentleman from Georgia has repeatedly voted to take away from millions of Americans.

This amendment would cut the Capitol Visitor Center by $243,000, when we need to make sure that they have the cost of inflation increase, so they can continue to provide the good service that they provide to our constituents, so we can continue to educate Americans and everyone around the world about the finest democracy in the world.

Madam Chair, I urge Members to vote against this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. 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 Georgia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. DUFFY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 113–426.

Mr. DUFFY. 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 29, line 7, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $3,420,000)''.

Page 32, line 21, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $3,420,000)''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 557, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DUFFY. Madam Chair, first, I want to commend the work of both Mr. COLE and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ in producing a spending bill that doesn't actually increase spending. It doesn't actually reduce it, but it actually maintains it; and for this institution, I think that is a positive, and I commend you both for doing that.

I think it is important, when we talk a lot about our debt at $17 trillion—we have deficits at $1.5 trillion today, down to a little over $600 billion, I think it is important that this institution lead by example and look to places that we can cut, places that we can be more efficient, when we look at spending on operations here in the House.

When we do that, I think it is important to look at duplicative programs, programs that accomplish the same mission through multiple agencies.

I would submit to this Chamber that one of those is the Open World Leadership Center. This program—its purpose is to engage emerging leaders from post-Soviet countries by exposing them to American cultural institutions. I would argue it has outlived its usefulness.

Listen, it is great that we should engage others from around the world. We should engage their leaders. I think that can help bridge the gap.

The problem with this program is that, since 2000, it has cost the American taxpayer $150 million; but not only that, we have nearly 90 programs that try to accomplish this very same mission, just to name a few in the State Department: the National Endowment for Democracy, the International Republican Institute, the National Democratic Institute, and USAID, all with this same mission.

So I think this is a space where we can eliminate this program. The mission can still be accomplished with other agencies, and we can move over $3 million to deficit reduction.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLE. Madam Chair, I want to thank my friend. Again, I appreciate the spirit in which he approaches this. This is an interesting point of discussion because we actually have Members of both parties who really like this program and think it is very important, and we have Members of both parties that share your point of view. It is not a partisan debate in the least.

I would say that there are a number of both contemporary points and a number of longer-term points that ought to be taken into account.

□ 1030

First, this was originally a $6 million item. We have cut it by 43 percent aimed at Russia. All the other participants in this program are the very countries that Russia threatens right now; particularly Ukraine, which is the second largest participant. I think it would be a really bad signal for this country to actually cut programs that are supportive of democracy in the areas immediately around Russia and, frankly, I think more or less plays into Mr. Putin's hand.

Beyond that, we have a unique institution, a unique arrangement, and a unique person heading it at the Library

of Congress, Mr. Billington, who is probably the world's most expert on Russian history, culture, and literature. This has been well placed, as long as he has been the librarian, and well used.

So, again, I appreciate my friend's motives, but I would urge the rejection of his amendment.

With that, I would like to yield the remainder of the time that I have to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), my good friend.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chairman, I could not agree more with my good friend from Oklahoma, the chairman of this subcommittee, the idea that my colleague from Wisconsin would suggest that this program has outlived its usefulness when the Russian bear is hungrier than it has been in decades, when Putin seized Crimea and now he is trying to take parts of eastern Ukraine.

Let me explain what this program does. It takes emerging leaders in Russia and Russia's satellite countries, former members of the Soviet Union, who show exceptional talent and interest in speaking for themselves and it brings them over to the United States and puts them in homes and communities where they will learn how our rule of law works, what equal justice under the law means in a truly democratic country. It shows them how to participate in the democratic process. It shows them how we have taken the works of Tolstoy and Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn and we have implemented them in a country that respects individualism and puts individualism higher than statism. It is a direct threat to communism. It is a direct threat to Mr. Putin. Because if you do this, Mr. Putin can't keep his $60 billion he has taken from corruption. He can't continue to make his people dependent upon the state. This is disruptive to him. It is a direct threat to him. That is why it is important.

Haven't we done enough for Mr. Putin's interests to cut this program by 43 percent by preventing these young emerging leaders from being able to come over to this country? Do we now have to deny Ukrainian leaders the ability to gain an understanding of what a country that is not corrupt, of what a country that respects individualism, respects democracy, respects equal justice under the law is all about?

That is what this program is all about. We spend half a trillion dollars on our military, and yet programs like this will accomplish more for sustainability of peace among nations by giving an opportunity for people to speak for themselves, to speak out for the rule of law, to speak against corruption. That is what we as a nation want. We don't want to dominate anybody else. We want to be an instrument of our values and our vision. We want to be that beacon of light and hope for other nations. This is one of the ways in which we achieve that objective. A small amount of money, but an enormously valuable contribution to world peace.

Mr. COLE. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DUFFY. Madam Chairman, with all due respect, to those who may disagree with this amendment—I am seeing some bipartisan agreement; I know I have some bipartisan disagreement with this amendment—but to my colleagues, there are 90 programs that are aimed at accomplishing the very same mission. When do we come forward and say: Listen, let's cut this back; let's cut it back a little bit? The bridge isn't cut off, but we have other programs that are doing the same thing.

Listen, we want to talk about what is going on in Ukraine and want to talk about what is going on in Russia. This program didn't exist in the 1980s. Ronald Reagan didn't have this program to tear down the Soviet Union. He did it with strong leadership. So to come to this institution and say: Listen, the $3.4 million in this program is going to stop the aggression of Putin, no. Strong leadership will, though. This is about when do we come together as an institution and find programs that are duplicative, programs that we can look and say: This can be scaled back and we can look to one of the other 89 programs to accomplish this same mission.

There is a constituency around every dollar. That is why it is so hard in this town to scale back because everyone will come forward and go: But no, no, no; this dollar is so important. And people come from our communities and go: No, don't cut back.

We are $1.7 trillion in debt. This is unsustainable. So let's come together and find this program that we can cut and look to the other 89 that can accomplish the same mission, which I think is a noble mission.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. HALL

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 113–426.

Mr. HALL. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 211. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to deliver a printed copy of the report of disbursements for the operations of the House of Representatives under section 106 of the House of Representatives Administrative Reform Technical Corrections Act (2 U.S.C. 5535) to the office of a Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 557, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HALL. Madam Chairman, I would like to thank my good friend Chairman COLE and the Appropriations Committee for allowing me to offer this amendment in conjunction with Congressman MCCAUL. My amendment today simply prohibits the Statement of Disbursements of the House from being distributed the old-fashioned way—through print.

A lot of people say I am old-fashioned and I am behind the times, but I have a Facebook account, I tweet, and just this week my congressional Web site was singled out for the Silver Mouse Award, placing it in the top 6 percent of all congressional Web sites for transparency, ease of use, and accessibility of constituent services.

Right now, the Chief Administrative Officer of the House distributes 441 copies of its three-volume Statement of Disbursements to the House at a cost of well over $300,000 per year. This quarterly public report of all reports and expenditures for U.S. House of Representatives Members, committees, leadership, officers, and offices was more than 2,400 pages long in its last edition. Multiply that by 441, and you have 100,000 pages of printed material, all of which can easily be accessed on the CAO's Web site.

To be clear, my amendment does nothing to prohibit the CAO from making the Statement of Disbursements of the House available online to Members as they currently do. But if I can learn to communicate electronically, I sure don't see why the Federal Government can't do the same thing.

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COLE. Madam Chairman, I want to accept this amendment.

You certainly aren't behind the times. You are usually ahead of the curve.

In this case, the gentleman certainly is. I appreciate him pointing out an area where we can save $300,000. He is precisely right on this. We are more than happy to accept the amendment and, again, very much appreciate our friend for bringing it to the floor and for saving the American taxpayers $300,000.

Mr. HALL. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. WENSTRUP

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 113–426.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 211. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to deliver to the office of a Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress) a printed copy of the Daily Calendar of the House of Representatives which is prepared by the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 557, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Chairman, I rise in support today of amendment No. 7.

My amendment is simple. It would eliminate the daily delivery of printed copies of the House Calendar to Member offices.

This multipage paper booklet is currently delivered each legislative day to 441 Representatives' offices. The document in my hand is about 100 pages, meaning that about 44,000 pages are wasted each legislative day, over 5 million pages a year.

The information in these pages is readily available online, and, as required, paper copies will be kept on record. Previously, the House took similar action by ending paper deliveries of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a few years ago with no adverse effects.

Let's be honest, Madam Chairman, no one sits and peruses the calendar every day. Most offices accept the delivery, turn 90 degrees, and place it in the recycling bin. Hardly a good use of time or precious paper.

Ending this outdated practice also saves money. We can save hardworking taxpayers nearly $200,000 a year, according to the Government Printing Office.

Madam Chairman, I want to note that this idea came from one of my staff members, Kate Raulin, who repeatedly recycles these Calendars and grew frustrated at the waste she saw every day. Imagine if every staff member of this body had an idea or an amendment that would save the taxpayers about $200,000 a year. By my back-of-the-napkin calculations, those savings would easily top over a billion dollars a year.

When I worked in the private sector, we had to be mindful of excess costs and waste. The government must be held to the same standard and should reform outdated policies. We should not remain stuck in the past. If the daily cost of delivery came out of each Member's personal office budget, how many of us would actually pay to get this delivered every day?

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and vote ''yea.''

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WENSTRUP. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COLE. Madam Chairman, I want to thank my friend for bringing this to the floor. He is precisely right in everything that he says about both the costs and the functionality of the document in question.

His staff member is to be commended for bringing it to his attention and for you acknowledging her. I think staff people every place are grateful. We are delighted to accept this amendment, delighted to save the money, and, again, appreciate our friend bringing it to our attention, pointing it out, and saving the taxpayers $200,000.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 113–426.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 211. There is appropriated, for salaries and expenses of the Office of Technology Assessment as authorized by the Technology Assessment Act of 1972 (2 U.S.C. 471 et seq.), hereby derived from the amount provided in this Act for the payment to the House Historic Buildings Revitalization Trust Fund, $2,500,000.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 557, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

For 23 years, Congress had an insightful nonpartisan agency aimed at providing Members of Congress and their staff with expert advice on the technological aspects of public policy. It was called the Office of Technology Assessment. From 1972 to 1995, it produced reports on topics that were striking in their relevance even today: computer software security, disposal of chemical weapons, teaching with technology, bioenergy, and many more. OTA was part of Congress, understood the congressional process; it spoke the language of Congress, and it looked at the technological aspects of a large variety of issues and provided clarity where it was needed.

□ 1045

Congress turned out the lights on the OTA in 1995 with the thought that congressional agencies like CRS, GAO, also universities and private industry would fill the void. They have not. In the years since the OTA was defunded, our need for its work has grown only more acute. Too often, we have considered or not considered legislation in ignorance of the technological factors.

That is why I am introducing an amendment to restore some funding to the OTA. My amendment would reallocate to the OTA $2.5 million appropriated for the House Historic Buildings Revitalization Trust Fund, about 1.4 percent of the surplus in that trust fund. During its 23 years, the OTA produced an amazingly high return on investment, with hundreds of millions of dollars in savings.

A study on Agent Orange helped save the government $10 million. An OTA report was the source of recommendations for upgrades in the computer system of the Social Security Administration that led to a savings of more than $300 million. Studies on the synfuels helped save, literally, billions of dollars.

When Congress stopped receiving the OTA's counsel, technological topics didn't become less relevant in the political process; they just became less understood, and scientific thinking lost its toehold on Capitol Hill, with troubling consequences for the ways we legislate on all issues, not just on those that are explicitly scientific.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on this amendment in order to give Congress a tool that we desperately need to do the people's work with clarity and reason.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLE. Madam Chairman, my friend is, frankly, one of the most thoughtful and best Members of this body. There is no question about that. So, when we discussed this, I took it very seriously because it was my friend's proposal, and I think any other Member in this House would do the same. At the end of the day, I came to a different conclusion for a number of reasons.

First, we are in a very tight budget. We have no increase at all, so funding this initiative means effectively taking money away from someplace else. Second, I looked at the long-term spending pattern of this program in the past. It actually peaked at $20 million, so I think starting at $2.5 million is not likely where it will end up over time. Third, quite frankly, I looked at what some of my predecessors in my position had thought, both Republican and Democratic. As my friend knows, obviously, the Democrats had the majority after 1995 for a 4-year period, which was relatively recently, and they looked at this and came to the same decision that was made in '95, and that, I think, we make today, which is that there are other sources of information. The Government Accountability Office, in particular, has developed a capability here, and we think there are other sources of information.

While I don't deny that this has played a useful role in the past, I just believe, given the constrained circumstances that we have today, given the possibility that this will grow, and given what at least to date has been a bipartisan judgment that this is something we didn't need to renew, I, reluctantly, decided not to include this in

the bill. For that reason, I would also oppose the amendment.

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), my good friend, the ranking member of the Legislative Branch Subcommittee.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I thank the gentleman, regretfully, because I know how passionate the gentleman from New Jersey is about this important issue.

Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to this well-intentioned amendment, which seeks to add $2.5 million to reestablish the Office of Technology Assessment, which did have an important scope of work for Congress during its existence in the 1990s. Unfortunately, the amendment takes the funding from the House Historic Buildings Revitalization Trust Fund. This fund is critical for the long-term maintenance for such items as the Cannon House Office Building's rehabilitation, which is an ongoing project that has already begun. The fund was established so we could bank resources over several years for the revitalization of our House office buildings and stave off cost overruns that have plagued previous projects.

I have been a supporter of the Office of Technology Assessment dating back to my time as chair of this subcommittee. In fact, in fiscal years 2008–2010, I included $2.5 million in this bill within the Government Accountability Office for activities similar in scope to the work of OTA's. I also supported an identical amendment offered by Mr. HOLT in fiscal year 2012, as the Cannon project had not yet commenced, but now that it has, I cannot support an amendment in good conscience that would take critical resources from a fund that supports ongoing rehabilitation projects on the Capitol complex. Perhaps, had the gentleman found another source for his funding, we could have been supportive.

I thank the gentleman for his passion on this issue, but I urge Members to vote against the amendment.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. MCDERMOTT), who observed the OTA in action in his time here in Congress.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Chairman, I was one of the 16 people who was on that committee. It used to be a committee with four Republicans from the Senate and four Republicans from the House, four Democrats from the Senate and four Democrats from the House. It was a balanced committee. It looked at the technological questions of what we are spending billions of dollars on.

Now we have a choice of where we get our information. The GAO looks backward. All of the government organizations look backward. They don't look forward. That is not their role to imagine what will happen out there. What we need is an organization that can look forward as we proceed to spend billions of dollars in technology. We can either get the information from a nonpartisan organization that is controlled evenly by both sides of the House and the other body, or we could go to industry. They will come in here, and they will give us all of the information of their having the best thing since sliced bread.

I think we need the OTA, and I urge you to adopt the amendment.

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

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), my good friend, a member of the Appropriations Committee, someone who has also observed the OTA in practice.

Mr. MORAN. I thank my friend representing Princeton, New Jersey, who has a doctorate in physics, who is a ''Jeopardy!'' award winner, who is, perhaps, one of the most academically advanced Members of the Congress. It is interesting that he is the one who knows enough to know what we don't know in this Congress. My concern is that many of us don't know enough to know what we don't know.

Madam Chairman, the size of computers is shrinking by about 50 percent every couple of years, and their capacity—their power and their speed—is doubling, yet we can't understand the implications of that, which applies to all of our constituencies. We just mandated that 30 percent of the energy that the military spends, which is billions of dollars, has to be from non-carbon-polluting forms of energy. Do we know whether that is achievable? We just committed yesterday $11 billion for computer interoperability for electronic medical records.

We have to understand the implications of our decisions, and the OTA helps us to be able to do that.

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

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chairman, in closing, for almost a quarter of a century, the OTA was one of the most respected, productive, cost-efficient agencies we have seen, producing comprehensive reports for the House and the Senate on issues related to health care policy, agricultural production, telecommunications, space policy, electronic surveillance, national defense, and much more. It prevented decisions made in ignorance, and ignorance is expensive.

My friend from Oklahoma and also the ranking member, the gentlelady from Florida, talked about cost. What we are talking about here is finding the low-hanging fruit on making government more efficient. That is what the OTA did. That is what the OTA would do. This is the last Legislative Branch appropriations I will be dealing with. I know the OTA. I worked as a staffer on Capitol Hill. I saw that it works. I saw how much it elevated the debate here on Capitol Hill. It saves taxpayer money. I urge a ''yes'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Again, I want to thank my friend because I know he is, indeed, committed to this idea.

In closing, Madam Chair, I think, as usual, my friend Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ probably made the salient point of the debate. We are taking from our historic trust fund, which preserves this building, and redirects that resource. That is a mistake. That is just simply a mistake. If there is another way to fund it, I would still have grave reservations about reintroducing it because I do think the information is available elsewhere, but robbing from your seed corn, I think, is something we shouldn't do.

We have established this fund. We have been able to maintain it under Democrats and Republicans alike. We are going to have these challenges going forward. I do not want to set the precedent of this becoming a piggy bank to fund other things out of. We need to maintain our campus. This is an important way to do it, and I think weakening it in any way would be counterproductive.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

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

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 113–426 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. NUGENT of Florida.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. HOLT of New Jersey.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. NUGENT

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT) 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 CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 196, noes 221, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 188]

AYES—196

Amodei
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Esty
Farr
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foster
Franks (AZ)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garcia
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Hahn
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hurt
Israel
Jenkins
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kilmer
Kingston
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latta
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (NC)
Reed
Reichert
Ribble
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rokita
Ross
Royce
Ruiz
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Upton
Wagner
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder

NOES—221

Aderholt
Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Bishop (GA)
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Calvert
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis, Danny
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Fattah
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gosar
Gowdy
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Higgins
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Hultgren
Hunter
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Marchant
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McKeon
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Nunes
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Speier
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—14

Becerra
Enyart
Frelinghuysen
Gingrey (GA)
Gutiérrez
Hinojosa
McAllister
McCollum
McIntyre
Miller (FL)
Richmond
Rogers (KY)
Schwartz
Stockman

□ 1126

Mr. CRAWFORD, Ms. HANABUSA, Messrs. WALBERG, ROGERS of Michigan, and GRIFFIN of Arkansas changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mrs. NOEM, Messrs. COURTNEY, TONKO, SCOTT of Virginia, LUETKEMEYER, GRAVES of Missouri, CAMP, GOHMERT, ROKITA, BURGESS, and Mrs. BLACK changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. FOXX). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) 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 is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 219, noes 198, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 189]

AYES—219

Aderholt
Amash
Bachmann
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Franks (AZ)
Gabbard
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirkpatrick
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lankford
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—198

Amodei
Bachus
Bass
Beatty
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Conyers
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foster

Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Grimm
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Roby
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—14

Becerra
Enyart
Gingrey (GA)
Gutiérrez
Hinojosa
Hurt
Matsui
McCollum
Miller (FL)
Richmond
Rogers (KY)
Schwartz
Stockman
Visclosky

□ 1132

Mr. DELANEY changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HURT. Madam Chair, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 189. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 207, noes 212, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 190]

AYES—207

Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gabbard
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hahn
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirkpatrick
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latta
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thornberry
Tipton
Tsongas
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—212

Aderholt
Bachus
Bass
Beatty
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gerlach
Gibson
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Roby
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Becerra
Enyart
Gingrey (GA)
Gutiérrez
Hinojosa
Matsui
McCollum
Miller (FL)
Richmond
Rogers (KY)
Schwartz
Stockman

□ 1136

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) 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 is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 164, noes 248, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 191]

AYES—164

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)

Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Fudge
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Matheson
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—248

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

NOT VOTING—19

Amodei
Becerra
Coble
Enyart
Gingrey (GA)
Gutiérrez
Hinojosa
Kaptur
Matsui
McCollum
Miller (FL)
Negrete McLeod
Richmond
Rogers (KY)
Schwartz
Speier
Stockman
Tsongas
Waters

□ 1141

Ms. KELLY of Illinois changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) having assumed the chair, Ms. FOXX, 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. 4487) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 557, she reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments 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 reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were 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

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

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

Mr. RUIZ. I am opposed in its current form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Ruiz moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4487 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 2, line 11, strike ''$1,180,736,000'' and insert ''$1,181,236,000''.

Page 5, line 16, strike ''$285,620,336'' and insert ''$286,120,336''.

Page 6, line 2 (relating to amounts made available for the Wounded Warrior Program), strike ''$2,500,000'' and insert ''$3,000,000''.

Page 19, line 12 (relating to amounts made available for Books for the Blind and Physically Handicapped), strike ''$50,429,000'' and insert ''$50,696,000''.

Page 22, line 16 (relating to amounts made available for the Government Printing Office Revolving Fund), strike ''$11,348,000'' and insert ''$10,581,000''.

□ 1145

Mr. COLE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

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

Mr. HOYER. Objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

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

Mr. RUIZ. 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.

Here in Congress, we wrestle with some of the hardest choices about the future of our great Nation, but sometimes these choices are very easy. Some choices cut across party lines, define our values as Americans, and give us an opportunity to stand together and fight for what is important.

The easy choice today is to either fund more wasteful and outdated printing services or fund the Wounded Warrior Program. The Wounded Warrior Program in Congress provides paid fellowships for injured veterans to work in congressional offices across the country to help serve other veterans and gain work experience as they assimilate back into civilian life.

There has never been a more important time for the heroes who have defended our country to play these pivotal roles in shaping our laws. I have the honor of working with a Wounded Warrior fellow in my office, and I have seen firsthand their dedication and greatness.

Chris Rennick is a marine from the 1st Battalion in Twentynine Palms, California, who served in Iraq. He was raised on a farm by his godparents, Linda and David Matheny. Mr.

Matheny always told him, ''Chris, do your best,'' and that is exactly what Chris did.

He deployed twice with the United States Marine Corps. His first was with the ''tip of the spear'' in the first invasion of Iraq in 2003. Chris was injured in an IED blast in his first deployment and still returned to Iraq for a second tour in 2004, and again was injured in an IED explosion.

Chris served honorably and received the Good Conduct Medal, the Combat Action Medal, and the Iraq Expeditionary Medal. Chris' unit received the Presidential Unit Citation.

After serving in the Marines, Chris came home and dealt with a traumatic brain injury and posttraumatic stress disorder. He told me he was in a bad place. He struggled to hold down three jobs while caring for himself. It was a fellow veteran in the Wounded Warrior battalion who reached out and helped Chris get back on track. Now Chris does the same for others, as a Wounded Warrior fellow.

Chris joined the Wounded Warrior Program because he still firmly believes in the Marine Corps motto, ''Semper Fidelis,'' always faithful. Chris remains always faithful to his brothers in arms and to this day is always faithful to our great country that he sacrificed for.

In his short time with my office, less than 1 year, Chris has helped over 300 veterans in my district alone receive the benefits that they have earned and get the care that they need. Chris' passion for helping veterans is an inspiration for me and, I know, for all of you, and that is the reason why we must fully fund the Wounded Warrior Program.

My motion to recommit would fund the Wounded Warrior Program with 30 slots for both Republicans and Democrats by redirecting $767,000 from the Government Printing Office. Additionally, it would provide $267,000 for Books for the Blind and Handicapped. We can do all of this with no new spending.

So the choice today is clear and it is easy: Would you rather fund more printed outdated copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and House legislative calendar, or would you rather support our Wounded Warrior fellows like Chris?

This institution and this entire country needs heroes' voices like Chris' in every decision that we make. I urge you to vote ''yes'' and support our veterans and those with disabilities by supporting these critical programs.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, after spending the last few hours debating and amending this bill, we have before us a bipartisan piece of legislation that funds this House, its safety, and the agencies that support the legislative process, and all in a fiscally responsible and, frankly, bipartisan way.

Yesterday, in nearly a unanimous fashion, this House passed a bill that provided nearly $4 billion in funding that directly supports and assists our wounded warriors, and I think most all of us on both sides of the aisle are proud of that.

This includes $2.6 billion for the Prosthetic and Sensory Aids Service, $560 million for the largest system of spinal cord injury of care in the United States, and $135 million to assist blind and visually impaired veterans. It also includes $96 million for research that benefits wounded warriors in areas like prosthetics, traumatic brain injury, spinal cord injuries, and the like.

The total medical care budget of the VA for FY15 is $59.1 billion, enough to care for 6.7 million patients and, again, is something that I think every Member in this House ought to be proud of and was more than delighted to support.

This legislation, as with all appropriations legislation that we bring to the floor, makes every stride to ensure that the very best care for our wounded warriors and veterans is available. I know that I speak for this entire body when I say we deeply respect and respect the service and sacrifices of our troops and veterans and that the bill we passed yesterday is hard-and-fast proof of that.

Frankly, had we wanted to do more, I would suggest that yesterday would have been the time to do more because, clearly, everybody was willing to support that measure.

Keep in mind, the bill before us now is the smallest of the 12 appropriations bills, but it is still incredibly important; and advancing this bill gets us one step closer to completing our necessary work, our constitutional duty of funding the Federal Government.

Motions to recommit like this one, quite frankly, are mostly political ''gotcha'' tactics, and both sides do it. I cast no partisan stones here. I have seen it happen on this floor many, many times before. But I think both sides probably ought to stop and reflect if we are really honoring the veterans or if we are using them to make a political point. I would hope not the latter, because yesterday we did the right thing; today we are trying to score points at one another's expense.

Yes, both sides have done this. I am sorry it happens. My personal opinion is that it shouldn't, and I hope we will dispense with it going forward.

The bill in front of us has bipartisan support. If it is allowed to proceed, it will pass overwhelmingly.

Over the past 2 days, we have done some great work, kicking off the appropriations process at the earliest date in decades and passing our first bill yesterday with overwhelming support from both sides of the aisle. Let's continue that good work today. Let's pass this bill. Let's reject the motion to recommit. Let's get the work of the people done.

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

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 222, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 192]

AYES—194

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
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
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
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.
Jones
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
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
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

SchultzWaters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—222

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
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)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
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
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 (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
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
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—15

Becerra
Coble
Enyart
Franks (AZ)
Gingrey (GA)
Gutiérrez
Hinojosa
Matsui
McCollum
Miller (FL)
Negrete McLeod
Richmond
Rogers (KY)
Schwartz
Stockman

□ 1202

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 14, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 193]

YEAS—402

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

NAYS—14

Amash
Broun (GA)
Duncan (TN)
Engel
Franks (AZ)
Green, Gene
Holt
Jones
Labrador
Massie
Matheson
Rogers (AL)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Wittman

NOT VOTING—15

Becerra
Coble
Enyart
Gingrey (GA)
Gutiérrez
Hinojosa
Matsui
McCollum
Miller (FL)
Negrete McLeod
Payne
Richmond
Rogers (KY)
Schwartz
Stockman

□ 1208

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

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 193, please let the record show that my vote on final passage would have been a ''yes.'' Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, due to the devastating impact of recent flooding in my district, I missed the following rollcall votes: No. 188–193 on May 1, 2014. If present, I would have voted: rollcall vote No. 188—Nugent of Florida Amendment to H.R. 4487, ''aye,'' rollcall vote No. 189—Gosar of Arizona Amendment to H.R. 4487, ''aye,'' rollcall vote No. 190—Broun of Georgia Amendment to H.R. 4487, ''aye,'' rollcall vote No. 191—Holt of New Jersey Amendment to H.R. 4487, ''nay,'' rollcall vote No. 192—H.R. 4487, Motion to Recommit, ''nay,'' rollcall vote No. 193—H.R. 4487, Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2015, ''aye.''

□ 1215

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring about next week's schedule, and I yield to my friend, the majority leader, Mr. CANTOR, from Virginia.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House is not in session.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a few suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

In addition, the House will consider H.R. 4438, the American Research and Competitiveness Act of 2014, sponsored by Representative KEVIN BRADY. This bill will provide American businesses with the certainty they need to invest in good-paying middle class jobs and develop the technologies of the future.

The House is also scheduled to consider a privileged resolution finding Lois G. Lerner, former Director, Exempt Organizations Division, Internal Revenue Service, in contempt of Congress for refusal to comply with a subpoena issued by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, the House will consider H.R. 10, the Success and Opportunity through Quality Charter Schools Act, authored by Chairman JOHN KLINE. Mr. Speaker, America does not work if our children are trapped in failing schools. This bipartisan bill provides an opportunity for our children to attend schools which foster a quality learning environment focused on those students succeeding.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information with reference to the legislation for next week. He leads with a bill that is entitled American Research and Competitiveness Act of 2014.

As the gentleman knows, we have an agenda which I have talked to him about briefly. We call it Make It In America, which is essentially about growing manufacturing and encouraging manufacturers to return to the United States and encouraging people when they want to go into manufacturing to do so here in America.

Not only will that provide for a ''Made in America'' label all over the world, but it will also provide the kind of middle class jobs and opportunities that we need.

Part of that agenda, I will tell my friend, is to make permanent the research and development tax credit. This bill does that. This bill also costs somewhere in the neighborhood of $150 billion, maybe a little less, over 10 years. It is unpaid for.

The series of bills that were passed by the Ways and Means Committee will cost $310 billion. They are also unpaid for. I suggest to my friend—and as he knows, I preach relatively regularly that one of the things that we need to do for the business community and for America is to get ourselves on a fiscally sustainable path.

Mr. CAMP offered a comprehensive piece of legislation, Mr. Leader, as you know, which I think was an honest effort, but it also made hard choices. It made hard choices not to increase the deficit and, therefore, provided offsets for tax cuts. I think that is absolutely essential for us to do.

This bill that we will consider next week, which is a proposition I think most of us support, and that is giving businesses the insurance that the research and development tax credit will in fact be available not only for 1 year, but for a series of years—in this case, I believe 10 years.

What the business community doesn't need and what America doesn't need is making the deficit worse. As a matter of fact, Mr. Leader, your party talks a lot about bringing the deficit down. This goes in exactly the opposite direction, and I think that is lamentable. I said $150 billion. It is actually $155 billion over 10 years.

I would hope that the party that is demanding that unemployment insurance be paid for, that is demanding that the sustainable growth rate be paid for, and that any change in the sequester be paid for, ought to have consistency and not add $155 billion to our deficit in a vote next week on something that I think we are all for; and it is easy, Mr. Leader, as you well know, to vote for tax cuts—easy. It takes no courage whatsoever.

I have been at this business 45 years. It has been my experience that, over those 45 years, it is easy for Members to vote for tax cuts. What is hard to do is to pay for the policies you adopt. This bill does not do that. This bill makes the deficit worse, exacerbates the lack of confidence that Americans have in the fiscal responsibility of their country, and puts us in a worse place.

So I would hope, Mr. Leader, that before this bill comes to the floor, that you and the Rules Committee and Mr. CAMP, as he did in the bill that he offered to this House, which was, frankly, dismissed out of hand because it made tough decisions, this bill makes no tough decisions. It has a tax cut. It has all the candy and none of the spinach.

It is all good, and nobody has to pay the price. Nobody has to take responsibility. I think that is lamentable, and I would hope that, before this bill comes to the floor, there would be a way to pay for this bill.

I want to suggest to you that there is a way to pay for it. There is a way to pay for the other extenders that the committee wants, and that is by passing a comprehensive immigration bill.

Mr. BOEHNER indicated that that was not being done because it was tough and people didn't want to do tough things. I understand that. It is hard to do tough things. That is why they are called tough. Mr. BOEHNER now says he was kidding when he said that.

My view is he was deadly serious, and the reason we are considering this bill next week is because it is easy to do. The reason we are not considering comprehensive immigration reform is because it is difficult, but comprehensive immigration reform would pay for all of the tax cuts that are being proposed in these six extenders and, indeed, in all of the extenders that are proposed by the Senate Finance Committee.

They only proposed that for 2 years, not 10 years, but it would pay for all of them. In fact, CBO says if we pass comprehensive immigration reform, it would mean $200 billion for the next 10 years and $900 billion over the next 20 years.

In December, the Budget Committee chairs, Mr. RYAN and Mrs. MURRAY, were able to come up with a substantial sequester replacement. We ought to be able to do that as well.

Let me close this part of my comment with two quotes, one from Republican Secretary of the Treasury Hank Paulson, who said:

> As a general rule, I don't believe that tax cuts pay for themselves.

And then Mr. Alan Greenspan, who initially said in 2001 and 2003 that he thought the tax cuts would pay for themselves. However, upon review of those tax cuts, he came back in response to a question on ''Meet the Press'' from David Gregory, and the question was:

> You don't agree with the Republican leaders who say tax cuts pay for themselves?

Mr. Greenspan:

> They do not.

So all of your Republican colleagues are being asked to vote for a $155 billion increase in the deficit, which they all say they want to bring down. I am sure they will get up and rationalize—as they did in 1981, in 2001, and 2003—that those tax cuts would magically grow the economy, so that they would not exacerbate the deficit. In the 33 years I have been in Congress, that has not been our experience.

So, Mr. Leader, I very sincerely hope that we can join together in a bipartisan way and support this legislation because it is the right thing to do in terms of growing manufacturing, and it is the right thing to do in bringing down our deficit to pay for it.

I yield to my friend.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MESSER). The Chair reminds Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would say to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that for 30-plus years, the R&D tax credit has been on temporary extension. This is nothing but reflecting reality, saying that this is a very important part of incentives, so that we can fulfill the mission that the gentleman is on, that we share as well, which is more manufacturing here in America.

If making it in America is important, the R&D tax credit is fundamental to that mission. This has been in place for over 30 years on temporary extension, and to hold it hostage as the gentleman suggests, Mr. Speaker, is not the way to go about facilitating growth in our economy.

I respect the gentleman's commitment to fiscal discipline. Obviously, we have different opinions about how to get to that goal, but both of us, I think, would agree, Mr. Speaker, that growth is something that has been too little, too tepid, and we need to return to an era in which we can see some robust growth in our economy.

It will help those who are chronically unemployed. It will help businesses grow. It will help communities grow and families get by easier, so they can see a better future. This R&D tax credit is something that, as the gentleman says, he supports, and to support that means support it as it has existed, but let's once and for all send the signal of certainty that this will be the policy for manufacturing and others in this country, so we can continue to innovate.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. I would say that the rationale he uses, however, is applicable to the sustainable growth rate reimbursement for doctors serving Medicare patients. We do that every year as well. The Republican side of the aisle demands that be paid for.

We do unemployment insurance.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I would be glad to yield on that.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, the difference in the SGR to this is we have consistently offset the expenditures under SGR. This R&D tax credit is a tax credit. It is allowing businesses who invest to keep more of that investment, to plow it back into research.

The precedent is not there, as it is on SGR and the other items that perhaps the gentleman would point to. This is important to growth. This is important to manufacturing. We should all join together and support the current extension of what has been in place for over 30 years, on extension over a dozen times.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his observation, Mr. Speaker. The other side of the aisle laments the deficit; they lament the debt. We have the debt, we have the deficit because we don't pay for what we buy. That is why we have a debt. That is why we have a deficit.

When we were in charge, we put in a pay-as-you-go rule. That rule said, if you are going to spend money, this is essentially a tax expenditure; it is a worthy tax expenditure. It is something that I support. It helps to grow the economy, but it is a tax expenditure.

No one on this floor can say that it does not make the deficit worse; no one with any degree of credibility.

□ 1230

The argument has been made, of course, though, that tax cuts, they will grow so much that you won't get the deficit. That is what President Reagan argued and his proponents argued in 1981. The debt increased 187 percent under President Ronald Reagan because they didn't pay for themselves.

When the Republicans took over, Mr. Speaker, they amended the rule so we didn't have to pay for things. This bill comes to the floor without any necessity to pay for it. So we will give a tax cut, assuming it passes, and somebody is going to pay for it. My children, my grandchildren, your children, Mr. Speaker, they are the ones who will pay for it because we are going to make a decision, apparently, not to pay for something that we know is going to increase the deficit.

So the analogy when we want things paid for is not always followed, Mr. Speaker, for instance, unemployment insurance almost invariably not paid for. Almost every economist says investing in unemployment insurance grows the economy, will help grow the GDP, but we don't follow that practice here, unfortunately.

We have a bipartisan paid-for unemployment insurance bill that the Senate has passed that we can't even get to the floor. That is paid for. It grows the economy and it helps 2.5 million people who are falling through the cracks. Yet we bring a bill to the floor that has a $155 billion cost, we don't pay for it, and the unemployment insured, 2.5 million, are ignored.

Mr. Speaker, we don't think that policy is one that we ought to pursue. We would hope, again, before this bill comes to the floor that it is paid for.

I referred to comprehensive immigration reform, Mr. Speaker.

I will yield to my friend if he wants to make a comment on a previous comment.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to just point out that the last time the gentleman's party was in the majority in this House during a lame-duck session we did extend the R&D tax credit unpaid for. I hear what the gentleman is saying, but I would point that out for historic accuracy.

I would say this, Mr. Speaker. I guess there may be a little bit of different view on how deficits are created. The disproportionate cause for our deficit is the fact that we have demographics in this country, 10,000 people every day turning 65 becoming eligible for our health care entitlement programs, and those programs are almost 50 percent—the Medicare program is almost 50 percent underfunded. That is the disproportionate cause of the deficit.

I think all of us have said you can't tax your way out of it; you can't grow your way out of it; you have to change the structure of the program. That is something that the gentleman's party nor the President will agree with us on. That is the disproportionate cause of the deficit.

An additional cause of the deficit is we don't have enough growth; we don't have revenues coming into the Federal Government. For some reason, there has been an acceptance around here of a new norm, a very low and tepid growth. The R&D tax credit is something that is growth oriented; it is certainty. The gentleman said so himself. The gentleman said that manufacturing in America needs certainty in the R&D tax credit.

We have essentially been allowing an R&D tax credit since 1981 in this country. So let's just call it what it is and make it permanent so that we can get back on the path to growth. Addressing growth, addressing our unfunded liabilities connected with entitlement programs, that is the sure way to reduce deficits and reduce the debt burden.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the gentleman point that out. I have been trying to work with the gentleman and his party for some period of time now starting with Bowles-Simpson and some other comprehensive suggestions.

As I said, Mr. CAMP, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, has offered a comprehensive bill. I don't agree with some of the things in it, but it is an honest piece of legislation that makes the tradeoffs, the tough choices, that need to be made. This bill does not. That is my point.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, because I know the majority leader has another engagement, comprehensive immigration reform, I said that it scores approximately $1 trillion positive for our economy over the next 20 years; but it is also morally the right thing to do to fix a broken system, a system that doesn't work, with which everybody agrees.

I would again appeal to the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, to bring a comprehensive immigration bill to the floor. I understand that there are many on his side of the aisle that don't agree with it. Fine. Vote against it, but give this House an opportunity. Give the American people the opportunity to have a comprehensive immigration bill voted in the people's House on this floor so that we can fix a broken system, or offer alternatives to that which is proposed by the United States Senate and passed overwhelmingly by the United States Senate.

If the gentleman wants me to yield to him, I will, certainly.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would just respond, we have had this discussion before. The majority is in opposition to the Senate bill. The Speaker has said as much, and I have said as much.

I have also said, Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman, to the President, and others that we have got a lack of trust between this House and the White House. I have said to the President that what could help is we start rebuilding that trust, which starts with an admission that it can't be my way or the highway, and it must instead be building trust, understanding where we can agree together.

Yes, we all agree the system is broken. We have a system that is broken on the legal side, and we have illegal immigration. There are things that this House has done before, like a green card stapled to a diploma. The President says, no, we can't do something like that; we can't do something like that without taking care of everything. That, to me, Mr. Speaker, is where the problem lies.

There is not enough trust on the part of the Members of this body to think that the White House and the administration is going to implement whatever it is that we pass. So instead, why shouldn't we focus on where we agree and start from there? That has been the position that I have expressed to the gentleman as well as to the administration.

So again, I just take issue with his insistence that somehow we can just do that and it will all be fixed. That is the fundamental problem here, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the fundamental problem is not my way or the highway. It is no way.

The Republican Judiciary Committee has passed out a number of immigration reform bills. The Homeland Security Committee headed by a Republican chairman has passed out an immigration reform bill dealing with border security. None of those bills have been brought to the floor. It is not a question about liking the Senate bill or trusting the President of the United States.

Everybody agrees, Mr. Speaker, the immigration system is broken; but there is no way, no bill, no option that has been brought to this floor to fix that system to respond to what everybody agrees is a broken system of immigration.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the Taoiseach, otherwise known as the Prime Minister of Ireland, celebrated St. Patrick's Day here with us at a luncheon, and part of his speech was about passing comprehensive immigration reform.

They don't have to take our bill; they don't have to take the Senate bill; but, Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve to have a bill on the floor to fix a broken system. It is not a question of whether they trust the President; it is whether or not they trust the word of the House of Representatives that it can work its will. I would hope that we could work our will on this issue. It is important for the American people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon tomorrow; and when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Tuesday, May 6, 2014, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

LET THE STATES LEAD ON JOB CREATION

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a recent Monthly Labor Review report from the Bureau of Labor Statistics reiterates that energy production and energy jobs are surging in parts of the country, including my home State of Pennsylvania.

The report, which reviews employment trends from 2007 to 2012, states:

> Pennsylvania has seen a surge in natural gas production and employment over the past 2 years, resulting in substantial growth in terms of both employment and wages.

Over the report's study period, Pennsylvania went on from being the tenth largest State by oil and natural gas employment in 2007 to being the sixth largest in 2012, and the Commonwealth also had the second largest employment increase over the same period, positioning itself only after Texas.

We talk a lot about what Washington can do to boost growth and employment. Well, Mr. Speaker, this report speaks to the fact that we should allow private innovation in States like Pennsylvania to lead the way.

HUNGER IN AMERICA

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Chairman PAUL RYAN held a hearing on poverty—a timely and necessary conversation. But the problem is that not one single person living in poverty was a witness at that hearing, and that is really a shame.

There are plenty of men and women, like Barbie Izquierdo or Tianna Gaines Turner from the Witnesses to Hunger, who should be invited here to describe what it is like to be hungry or cold simply because there isn't enough money to heat a house and buy enough food to eat. They can describe for Mr. RYAN how difficult it is to stretch a SNAP allotment for the entire month and, most importantly, how hard it is to make ends meet with a job that pays an inadequate wage.

We need to hear from those who struggle with poverty and not just those think tank gurus. We need to hear what is working and what is not working on the ground in our communities.

Chairman RYAN's hearing missed the mark. When it comes to issues involving poverty and hunger, Mr. Speaker, this majority that runs this House doesn't have a clue.

I urge everyone to listen to real people who are struggling in poverty. Perhaps if we did, this Congress wouldn't be so cruel to poor people.

HONORING WORLD WAR II VETERAN DONALD BUSKA

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

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to honor Donald Buska, a Montana World War II veteran who passed away earlier this week.

I had the honor to meet Donald on Monday, just a day before he passed away. Donald was in Washington, D.C., as part of the Big Sky Honor Flight, an incredible program that allows Montana veterans to travel to D.C. and see their memorials.

One of the best parts of my job is meeting with these Montana veterans and honoring their service and their sacrifice. It is an honor to hear their stories, to stand with them before the memorials honoring their service, and to shake their hands.

I am glad Donald was able to participate in this once-in-a-lifetime trip to accomplish his lifetime dream.

Thank you, Donald, for your service. Cindy and I join all Montanans in saying ''thank you'' and keeping your family in our thoughts and prayers.

GLOBAL HUNGER/LIVE BELOW THE LINE

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is the lunch hour here in Washington, D.C., but for the over 840 million people around the world who are struggling with hunger, an adequate lunch is a luxury they cannot afford. Instead of enjoying food, they are facing a terrible, gnawing pain in their gut right now. By the time I finish this statement, six children will have perished because of hunger or inadequate nutrition.

This week, the World Food Program is asking everyone to try to Live Below the Line—to put yourself in the shoes of the hungry, and to try to get by on

only $1.50 of food per day—the purchasing power of people living in extreme poverty, as defined by the World Bank. I and members of my staff are taking this challenge. But for millions of people, this is not about 1 day or 1 week. This is about their everyday lives.

It should not be this way. As President Kennedy said over 50 years ago:

> We have the ability, we have the means, and we have the capacity to eliminate hunger from the face of the Earth. We need only the will.

In the past, Republicans like Bob Dole and Democrats like George McGovern came together. They led this battle against global hunger. Today, we have a moral obligation to continue that battle, to meet our responsibilities to our fellow man and woman—and to our children—and to do what we can to end the scourge of hunger in our own Nation and around the world.

Mr. Speaker, let's take advantage of this challenge. Let us end hunger in this generation.

□ 1245

HONORING THE LIFE OF DEPUTY SHERIFF MICHAEL SEVERSON

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

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize Polk County Deputy Sheriff Michael Severson for his bravery, for his selflessness, and for his sacrifice in the line of duty on April 19, 1991.

On that day, Deputy Severson was shot in the spine and suffered paralysis from the neck down. Also from that incident, his partner, Deputy Allen Albee, lost his life. He was a husband and a father of two.

In the 23 years since that incident, Deputy Severson's life would change as a result of his injuries, but he would never give up on life. Deputy Severson traveled and shared his story with others. He provided inspiration and hope for those struggling to adjust to the challenging life of paralysis.

Then, sadly, on Monday, April 14, Deputy Severson succumbed to his wounds, and he passed away in his hometown of St. Croix Falls, Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, for the past 23 years, Deputy Severson persevered. For his bravery, for his selflessness, and for his sacrifice in the line of duty, he is one of our heroes.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I would ask all of you to join me in offering our gratitude for his service. On behalf of this entire body, we thank him, and we extend our condolences to his family.

HONORING THE LIFE OF PASTOR R.C. JOHNSON

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute and honor to a great man, Pastor Raymond Charles Johnson, Sr., known in Fort Worth as ''R.C. Johnson.''

Pastor Johnson moved to Fort Worth in 1953, where he began his work at the Greater Saint James Baptist Church. He was ordained as pastor of the church in 1985, and he dedicated 61 years to the preaching of the Word. Although many in the community knew that he was a pastor, he also worked at General Motors for over 32 years and was a Korean war veteran. In addition to his work in the ministry, he was a precinct chairman for over 50 years in the same precinct.

Pastor Johnson was so proud of his work in Ministers Against Crime, where they went to local schools and worked in communities. I can tell you that they worked in those schools and that they made a difference in those kids' lives—in their behavior and in their grades. He really made a difference in the community.

Sadly, earlier this year, I was at his wife's funeral. They had been married for 63 years. She died back in the January-February time period, which was really, really tough on him. He, too, succumbed just this past week.

I want to thank Pastor Johnson for everything he did to help me and so many other people in the community. He is someone the Fort Worth community will be proud of for many years.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DR. JERRY UMANOS

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

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I stand before you today to honor the life of Dr. Jerry Umanos, the father-in-law of my former staff member, Krista Umanos, and the father of her husband, Ben.

Dr. Umanos was killed at the CURE International Hospital in Kabul, Afghanistan, on April 24. He was a pediatrician, a man dedicated to his Christian faith, who felt called to serve those in need. Since 2005, this calling led him to Afghanistan to treat patients and to train Afghan medical personnel. Dr. Umanos had a love of and a dedication to the people of Afghanistan—a love that transcended the typical call to serve.

His wife, Jan, asked that we honor her husband's memory by opening our hearts to the Afghan people and to everyone around the world who needs to see Christ's love for all.

Dr. Umanos' caring for all mankind, regardless of country or creed or religion, is inspiring. His death is a loss for his family and friends, as it is a loss for all of those touched by his selfless service. While Dr. Umanos' earthly mission is complete, the positive effects of his works in this world shall never perish.

God bless Dr. Jerry Umanos and his family.

You have made the world a better place.

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this afternoon because of interference in the local affairs of the District of Columbia that is about to take place pursuant to a hearing that has been called by the Government Operations Subcommittee of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

First, let me be clear. The Oversight and Government Reform Committee, led by Chairman DARRELL ISSA, has been respectful of self-government in the District of Columbia. Chairman ISSA has not only observed the same self-government for our District that he insists upon for his, but he has gone beyond that to encourage greater home rule and budget autonomy for the District of Columbia. This subcommittee hearing is not done under the aegis of the full committee but, rather, under the leadership of the subcommittee chair, JOHN MICA.

The respect for local control lies at the heart of the formation of the United States of America, itself. It was the denial of that respect that led to the Revolution and to formation of the United States. Essentially, at that time, when Americans were saying taxes are a matter for local jurisdictions, it meant the United States, and when the Constitution, itself, was drawn, the Framers were at pains to separate out local matters over which the Federal Government would have no say and no control.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that the House, of course, as well as the Senate, maintain some control over the District of Columbia that Congress does not have over other jurisdictions. I assert what should be clear in that illegitimate control, but at the very least, I respect and thank Members who have not gone out of their way not to violate their own principles of local government in order to exercise that control, as the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, under Chairman ISSA, has been clear to avoid. In short, don't have hearings on the District of Columbia—that's for the District of Columbia City Council.

The Government Operations Subcommittee has called for a hearing on Wednesday on the recently decriminalized marijuana law in the District of Columbia. It is important to note that there are Federal and State matters that are implicated in this hearing. The subcommittee has held two hearings on those implications because of the conflict between State and local law that is emerging very rapidly on

marijuana possession—but look at what the subcommittee did in its two prior committee hearings:

In one hearing, it called a U.S. attorney, who is a Federal official. It was a U.S. attorney from a district in Colorado and in addition, an official from the Drug Enforcement Administration. In another hearing, it called only one witness, the Deputy Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy. Do note that each and every one of these officials was legitimately called as a Federal official.

Why was no official from the State of Colorado called? There was no State official, no local official—only a Federal official from the State of Colorado. The reason is clear: Colorado would have taken umbrage at the audacity of this body to dare call them to account on their own local laws.

Be on notice that we take the same umbrage. We will not silently allow this Congress or its committees and subcommittees to interfere in our local affairs, and on this matter, we are standing on very solid ground.

Eighteen States went quite ahead of the District and decriminalized their marijuana laws. ''Decriminalization'' means that a fine rather than prison results from the possession of marijuana. Twenty States proceeded to enact medical marijuana laws, which to enable people who have certain medical conditions to get medical marijuana. It took me 11 years to remove—or to get the Congress to remove—an amendment that kept the District from allowing its own citizens to have access to medical marijuana at a time when we had a runaway HIV–AIDS problem, where medical marijuana had been helpful. I was finally able to do that. Two States of the Union—Washington and Colorado—have legalized marijuana.

How dare any committee or subcommittee call the District of Columbia local officials—any local official—to testify on our local law? I will get to why we enacted that law in one moment.

Let me say who preceded us and who has not been called before this House or any committee or subcommittee of this House even though they have done either precisely the same thing or have gone even further than D.C. I am going to call the roll, Mr. Speaker, so you will know the company in which we find ourselves and why we insist upon treatment without discrimination, because we are the exact equivalent of other American citizens:

Alaska: going back more than almost 40 years now—decriminalized marijuana. No penalty for use in one's home. Actually, that is further than decriminalization. That legalized marijuana in one's home;

California: a $100 fine. Some of these are quite old, these laws. More recently, there has come a flood of marijuana laws changes.

Colorado: no penalty. Of course, there are different amounts involved, and most of these involve people over 21;

Connecticut: a $150 fine;

Maine: as low as a $350 fine, as high as a $1,000 fine depending on the amount;

□ 1300

Maryland, $100 fine; Massachusetts, $100 fine; Minnesota, $300 fine; Mississippi, $100 to $250 fine; Nebraska, $300 fine. That goes back to 1978, by the way. Nevada, $600 fine; New York, $100 fine; North Carolina, up to $200 fine; Ohio, $150 fine; Oregon, $650 fine; Rhode Island, $150 fine; Vermont, up to $200 in fines; and the State of Washington, no penalty for those 21 or older.

What has the District of Columbia done? Its decriminalization involves a $25 fine instead of a criminal misdemeanor, penalty of up to 6 months in jail, and as much as a $1,000 fine. It also prohibits law enforcement from using the smell of marijuana as grounds for stopping and searching a resident.

The reason for the low fine is that the District faced the possibility—in fact, very real possibility—that if it didn't have a low fine, it would end up with another disparity, namely, those who could afford the fine would not go to jail, and those who could not would.

I want to say something about why going to jail becomes so important. First, let me quote the President, who said:

> Middle class kids don't get locked up for smoking pot and poor kids do. And African American kids and Latino kids are more likely to be poor and less likely to have resources and the support to avoid unduly harsh penalties.

What the President said in general should be understood in particular in the District of Columbia, and I suspect in many States as well because the problem of disparity in enforcement is nationwide.

The District of Columbia is a very progressive jurisdiction, and it is very racially sensitive. We have a population that is about half Black and half White, about 10 percent Latino, very progressive. And yet, in the progressive District of Columbia, African Americans are eight times more likely to be arrested for marijuana possession than Whites.

Understand that, in the District of Columbia as across the country, Blacks and Whites use marijuana at the same rate. Why then are African Americans eight times more likely to be arrested? I can only guess. Sometimes they live in high-crime areas where there may be more police out on the street.

Notice that the legislation bars arresting someone because an officer smells marijuana on the person. Of course, if that is the reason for an arrest, what you can do is take somebody in who has violated no law except possession of a small amount of marijuana—and all of the amounts we are talking about are small amounts—and what happens is that that an African American or White person or any other resident has a criminal record for the rest of his or her life. For an African American, that matters.

We have a whole generation particularly of young men who, with that first arrest, are essentially ruled out of the job market because they have a ''drug possession arrest.'' That drug possession is a small amount of marijuana. That ruins that young man's life not only for work, but as the world turns, for the opportunity to have a good marriage, to raise children, and for African Americans to have a stable community, all beginning with one marijuana possession arrest.

The result may be to lead this person, frankly, into a life of criminal activity. You can't get work because you have a drug possession arrest on your record. And if you can't get work and you need money, what can you do? What you often do is you go from possessing marijuana, as many young people do, to the next level, to distributing it or otherwise being involved in criminal activity.

We don't have to go this way.

I suspect that some of the jurisdictions that have decriminalized marijuana have done so—and you will notice they are very diverse—simply because they are more libertarian, a bit more open to what they see around them, which is that people engage in alcohol consumption as much as they do, in smoking marijuana, at least as much. We learned the hard way that you don't put people in jail when it comes to drinking alcohol or even distributing it.

I want to be clear. I do not and will never advocate the smoking of pot, don't think it is a good thing, don't think being high is fine. I also don't think drinking alcohol is a good thing, but I wouldn't want to put anybody in jail for it. If someone is unfortunate enough to develop a habit, I want to do what we do with people who develop that habit with alcohol and try to get them off that habit.

Look. It is a free society. We cannot keep everybody from every sin, but we don't lock them up in the jails. That is why you find State after State opening their jails and letting out people who have been convicted of drug possession, don't want to ruin lives, particularly what amounts to young lives.

We feel very deeply about this. If I may say so, I think every jurisdiction that has passed these laws feels deeply about it and would tell Congress which way to go if Congress came anywhere close to their local laws. I am not going to tell Congress which way to go. I am just going to tell Congress: Don't mess with our marijuana laws. And the reason I have to say that to the Congress is because Congress can.

This hearing could be the first step toward overturning D.C.'s marijuana law. Usually when they try to overturn one of our laws, they don't give us a hearing. They just try to do it in some sneaky way.

This hearing is for show. But it is a dangerous hearing because it is about a real law and real people and real racial disparity and, yes, real discrimination against my district because we have been pulled out as no other jurisdiction has been.

I want to compliment those Members on the floor from the other side who were consistent with their own principles yesterday. There was a marijuana amendment on the floor yesterday, and the full details of it I don't have before me, but I recall it would allow prescription by Veterans Administration physicians for medical marijuana for certain wounded veterans because of the finding that it has a beneficial effect on some of their concerns, especially nausea and other kinds of conditions they bring back with them.

The vote was divided, but I looked at the members of the subcommittee who will be hearing on Wednesday about cannibus laws in the District of Columbia. There are seven members of that subcommittee; and two Republicans on that subcommittee, that seven-Member subcommittee, voted to respect states' rights and voted, in effect, to allow States to do what is necessary when it came to medical marijuana for veterans.

Yes, the parties are coming together on this issue, and for that reason it makes no sense whatsoever to have a divisive hearing that calls out one local jurisdiction—the weakest in the country because the District of Columbia has no Senators, because while I vote in committee, whatever you do to my District or even for my District, I cannot vote on it on this floor.

I can tell you this. As a result of this hearing and because the D.C. decriminalization bill has to lay over here for 60 days before it becomes final, it is still here, I have alerted my allies throughout the country, and particularly in those States which have decriminalized marijuana or legalized it. So if any Member of this House ever gets oversight over this matter and dares to vote that the District can't decriminalize cannibus, even though their citizens have the opposite right, we will call them out.

I don't believe that kind of hypocrisy exists in this House, nor do I know whether there is any attempt to try to overturn our laws. I have to come to the floor proactively, my friends, because Members don't exactly come to me ahead of time and tell me when they want to perform the illegitimate act of overturning a local law in the District of Columbia. So I am calling them out right now: Don't you dare to seek to countermand the elected, the democratically elected D.C. council which has decided what is best for its citizens, particularly if your own jurisdiction—and I have called your names—has decided that some form of marijuana possession decriminalization or legalization should occur in yours.

Even for those of you who come from parts of the United States which have not changed their marijuana laws, let me say to you: I respect that your local jurisdictions, your State jurisdiction has not acted in that way. There are real issues here. We don't want people smoking marijuana to end up where people who smoke cigarettes did.

A lot of what is being done now, the city is already holding hearings on the law's effects, is putting in place measures that would have the effect of not only alerting people to the problems of smoking anything, but keeping this matter from being excessive. Smoking pot perhaps has more of a chance of being excessive at least among young people if it is barred. I am not so sure now that it is allowed in so many States, a third of the States, that you will have nearly the excitement about smoking pot as you did before it was decriminalized.

Whatever is the result is not for a national legislature, not in America where local matters get decided by local folks. Yes, there is a conflict with Federal law. That is for the Federal Government in its implementation of drug laws to take care of.

□ 1315

And if you want to somehow go out against these States which are rapidly decriminalizing marijuana laws—you have got to come after all of them, not just one—that is what I am here to say. We don't intend to be the outlier that Congress uses to prove its point about marijuana.

We demand respect for the principles for which the Constitution stands. Nothing in the Constitution says anything about respecting local control, except for the District of Columbia. The Framers left some control of D.C. matters with Congress, but certainly not the kind of control that would be exercised here. The Congress on its own decided that even the control that the Framers left in the Congress, it would never exercise, when it passed 40 years ago the Home Rule Act of the District of Columbia.

The Home Rule Act says that matters of local law are for the local jurisdiction of the District of Columbia, just as they are for the local jurisdiction of each of the 50 States. That was a landmark law. We intend that it will be respected. No hearing called, however illegitimate as this hearing is, is enough to override that law and its intent.

That law needs to be expanded, not sat upon with a hearing that picks out one local law. It needs to be expanded so that the 100 percent of local funds raised in the District of Columbia don't have to come before a national body before we can spend our own money, as if you were the masters of our local funds—almost $4 billion of it raised from local citizens and local businesses.

You want to bring us before you on Federal funds? Be my guest. But don't come to the District of Columbia when it comes to its own money. And don't come to the District of Columbia when it comes to its own laws.

Nobody in this House can speak with any credibility to the reasons, and they are legion, but don't forget the most important reason that the District decided to decriminalize its laws. It didn't even legalize marijuana, as two States have done; it decriminalized them.

It is a modest step, it is a responsible step. And it is a step taken in the face of horrific evidence, shameful evidence, that showed that, essentially, the only people that got arrested in the District of Columbia for marijuana possession are Black people. That is an outrage. The council had to do something about it. Just as the other States, for whatever reasons, have decided to move for local reasons, our council has moved for entirely local reasons.

We ask you to respect that move, especially when it comes to what I am sure will be countless lives of African American citizens in the District of Columbia that will now have a chance, at least, to escape from penalties of law enforcement, to live a fruitful life because they will not start off in life with marijuana possession penalties that ruin their entire lives.

We ask for equality of treatment. We are equal citizens under the law. If your citizens were treated unequally, each and every Member of this House would be on this floor. I come in that spirit, and I come asking for the very same respect.

I yield back the balance of my time.

SUDAN TRAGEDY

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the 20th anniversary of the Rwandan genocide in which nearly a million perished in a horrific 100-day span while the world idly stood by.

As has been documented in print and film, including Samantha Powers' riveting book, ''A Problem From Hell: American and the Age of Genocide,'' cables were sent, reports of the violence and the targeting of innocents received, and yet the American foreign policy apparatus was largely consumed not with stemming the bloodshed, but rather with avoiding use of the word ''genocide'' less it necessitate a response. And so many people died.

Of course, there is the now notorious negligence of the United Nations in this regard, which culminated in a catastrophic moral failure on the part of the international community.

Kofi Annan, then head of U.N. peacekeeping, was receiving on-the-ground intelligence from General Dallaire, who was a Canadian general, about the impending tragedy, and yet he repeatedly refused to authorize General Dallaire to seize known weapons caches

until it was too late. What horrors might have been prevented had Annan chosen otherwise?

Fast-forward several years.

President Clinton traveled to the Kigali Airport in Rwanda and issued what has come to be known as the ''Clinton apology'' for failing to do more to stop the violence.

Later, President George W. Bush famously wrote ''not on my watch'' in the margin of a report on the Rwandan genocide.

No President, Republican or Democrat, wants atrocities to occur on their watch. I venture this much is true of President Obama. And yet every indication points to the fact that the crisis currently unfolding in South Sudan is headed the way of Rwanda.

In fact, yesterday, the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights, Navi Pillay, characterized South Sudan as ''on the verge of catastrophe.'' But with the stakes as high as they are, the situation is simply not being met with the urgency it demands.

It is time for bold action.

President Obama, who so far has failed on this issue, should immediately dispatch former Presidents George W. Bush, who has a great reputation in Africa, and former President Bill Clinton, who also has a good reputation in Africa, to the region to help negotiate a lasting peace and to convey in no uncertain terms that the fate of South Sudan is a U.S. foreign policy priority.

Both of these men, President Bush and President Clinton, have done a great deal on this issue and have remained invested in Africa beyond their Presidencies.

This pair of statesmen, hailing from two different political parties, would send a powerful message to the warring factions, and especially as it relates to President Kiir, with whom President Bush and his team forged a lasting relationship during intensive negotiations involved with the Comprehensive Peace Agreement, and would open immediate lines of communication at a pivotal time.

I first visited Sudan in 1989, years before Darfur became a household word, and I have prayed for the day when the people of that long-suffering land would enjoy peace and representative government. I have been five subsequent times, most recently in 2012.

For more than two decades, a steady stream of Sudanese activists, Lost Boys and Girls who resettled in the United States, humanitarian groups operating in the region, and others have visited my office.

Whether it was the seemingly intractable war between the North and the South, the genocide in Darfur, or, in recent years, the violence in the Nuba Mountains set against the backdrop of the birth of a new nation, I have followed events closely in that part of the world, urging U.S. administrations of every stripe to engage vigorously in pursuit of lasting peace, justice, and rule of law.

I asked President Bush to appoint a special envoy. He appointed former Senator John Danforth, who did an incredible job with then-Secretary of State Powell.

While I did not support Obama's candidacy, I was heartened and encouraged by his rhetoric on Sudan during the 2008 campaign. I took further encouragement from some of the individuals who joined his foreign policy team—senior advisers with strong human rights credentials and a stated desire to see the United States lead in the prevention of crimes against humanity and other atrocities.

Sadly, those words have not translated into action.

As I noted earlier, Samantha Power, who rose to prominence for her reporting on genocide prevention, now represents the U.S. at the United Nations in New York. I wish her voice was stronger within this administration on this issue. I urge everyone to read her book. It was a profound book. I urge her to take the message of the book and be a spokesman in this administration.

Today, I stand before you as concerned as I ever have been about the state of affairs in South Sudan and the potential for the recent violence to spiral into genocide—a genocide that could defy even the horrors of Rwanda, given that oil reserves are in play.

On Monday, I received deeply troubling reports from individuals on the ground about recent atrocities in South Sudan and the lack of an effective U.S. or international response. I heard of civilians, including women and children, indiscriminately targeted and killed. I learned of houses of worship turned from places of sanctuary to mass graves. I was told of ethnic divisions that now run so deep, it could take generations to heal.

These reports, coupled with a smattering of news stories from the last several months, belie what can only be characterized as an emergency situation in urgent need of high-level intervention.

Consider the following excerpts from media accounts.

Voice of America, April 21:

> The United Nations Mission in South Sudan on Monday accused opposition forces in Bentiu of carrying out targeted killings, including of children, and inciting ''vengeful sexual violence'' against women after they captured the town last week from government troops . . . UNMISS also said that individuals associated with the opposition have been using an FM station in Bentiu to broadcast hate speech.

It sort of reminds you of exactly what took place in Rwanda.

Will we ever learn?

The Washington Post, April 22:

> Gunmen in South Sudan who targeted civilians, including children and the elderly, left ''piles and piles'' of bodies, many of them in a mosque and a hospital, the United Nations' top official in the country said Tuesday.

CNN, April 23:

> South Sudanese rebels seized a strategic oil town last week, separating terrified residents by ethnicity before killing hundreds . . . Residents sought shelter in churches, mosques, and hospitals when the rebels raided Bentiu town.

Fox News, April 3:

> As rebel forces entered Bentiu last week, residents were led to believe that by entering the mosque, they would be safe . . . But once inside they were robbed of money and mobile phones and a short while later gunmen began killing, both inside the mosque and inside the city hospital . . . If you were not Nuer, nothing could save you. The gunmen killed wantonly, including children and the elderly.

The Economist, April 26:

> Even in a civil war that has been rife with atrocities, the scale of the massacre of civilians in South Sudan's oil hub of Bentiu on April 15–16 plumbed a new depth of hell. The rebel White Army, so-called after the ash its fighters sometimes smear on themselves, killed anyone they suspected of supporting the government, including—it is reported—200 people in a single mosque and others in churches and aid-agency compounds.

□ 1330

> Local radio broadcasts helped to stir up ethnic hatred to direct the violence at perceived enemies of Riek Machar. No side is winning. Hopes of building a new country from scratch are drowning in blood.

I have a photo here—and many others—a graphic visual image of what you have just heard described. It is from the most recent massacre in Bentiu this month.

We see pictured the piles of bodies described in the news accounts, and just yesterday morning, I received reports from someone on the ground that another attack in that town could be imminent.

Where is the urgency from the Obama administration? Where is the outrage?

I read with great interest the recent statements by Kenya's president, in which he said: ''During the 20th commemoration of the 1994 genocide in Rwanda''—the 20th anniversary is this month—''I expressed our region's disappointment at having done little to nothing at the time to end the slaughter of a million innocent victims, human beings in Rwanda, by a bloodthirsty cabal.''

He went on—and I commend the president of Kenya for saying this: ''I also pledged,'' he said, ''in the name of Kenya and the region that we would never again allow a similar genocide to happen within our shores.''

''I return,'' he said, ''to the pledge today because of what is happening in parts of Sudan. We are outraged and gravely concerned at seeing the killings of hundreds of innocent civilians caught up in the internal conflict of the South Sudan Liberation Movement.''

''We refuse,'' he said, ''to be witnesses to such atrocities and to remain helpless and hopeless in their wake.''

President Obama, Vice President BIDEN, this is happening on your watch. Will you allow it to continue? Will you to refuse to be a witness to the atrocities?

News coverage of these events have been sporadic, at best. While most

Americans are likely unaware of the horrors being perpetrated in South Sudan, people who are in a position to help know what is happening.

Yesterday, I had a press conference with Congressman PITTS and Congressman SMITH. Two members of the press—two members, only two members of the press even came. The room was empty. Nobody's covering this story hardly.

Will it be like Rwanda, when they all had all the stories, and you remember the movies that they did on Rwanda, looking back? Will the press then cover it, looking back? Will they then say whose fault it was that they didn't act?

Where is the media today? Where are the networks? Where is the Obama administration?

Cables are now being sent to Washington. Talking points are being drafted at the National Security Council and the State Department. These events are not happening in a vacuum.

Will we see the contents of the reports only after it is too late, when enterprising filmmakers and authors dredge up the documents and wonder why no one mustered the will to act?

A joint op-ed piece yesterday by long-term South Sudan expert Eric Reeves and John Prendergast, who has been on the scene, who has done so much to bring the attention to these issues, opened with the following line—they say: ''No civilians in the world are in greater danger than those in South Sudan.''

Again, here is what they said: ''No civilians in the world are in greater danger than those in South Sudan.''

You see how powerful—where they say even more than in Ukraine, more than in Syria?

The pair continue:

> Unlike the asymmetric warfare to which we have been accustomed to hearing about in Iraq, in Afghanistan, and in Darfur, symmetric warfare ensures heavy casualties in military confrontations, but victories and defeats now have more ominous consequences; for in South Sudan, the victors see a military victory as justifying civilian slaughter of the predominant ethnic group of the opposing forces, and with a terrifying momentum, ethnic slaughter leads yet to greater ethnic slaughter.

In short, crimes have been committed by both sides. There are no angels in this conflict. There must be accountability for anyone implicated in these atrocities. We have the technology, the capacity, the eyewitness accounts to know who is involved and who is actively violating the ceasefire.

Reeves and Prendergast further warn of looming famine, given that the planting season has already been disrupted with more than a million forced out of their homes, and ominously, they predicted that as many as 7 million—7 million—could face starvation this fall.

The atrocities must stop. The suffering must cease. What is the end game?

America helped give birth to South Sudan. We have a moral obligation to do something and something bold. So I say this: President Obama, you must not allow this to continue on your watch. I call on your predecessors, President Bush and President Clinton, to immediately engage in this crisis before more innocent blood is shed.

President Bush would go. President Clinton would go. Can you imagine the image of both President Bush and President Clinton there together?

So I close with this last thought: President Obama, Vice President BIDEN, failure to act—and this will be in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for future generations to see—failure to act will be a stain on your administration and a blot on your conscience.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAMALFA). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN LEGAL AND ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) for 42 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that makes America great is that our country is a country that—regardless of one's race, one's religion, or one's ethnicity—we, as citizens of the United States, make up a collective family, the American family; yes, a diverse family, but a family, in and of itself, composed of all the people, the great variety of people we have here from every part of the world who have come here to live in freedom and enjoy the opportunity and the liberty and the justice that America represents.

Here, despite where one was born or whose one's parents are or when even one became a citizen, we are all equally part of that family.

Just as many families across our Nation have come to discover, at one point or another, in a time when there are scarce resources, when you are going through perhaps an economic crisis or trying to avert an economic crisis, it is not unreasonable to provide for one's family before helping others.

It is not selfish to watch out, thus, for our fellow Americans. It is not selfish to watch out for our fellow Americans above the well-being of foreigners, even foreigners who wish us well and, yes, foreigners who would like to become part of the American family; but, first and foremost, those Americans from every part of the world who are citizens of this country or, yes, who have come here legally in the attempt to become a U.S. citizen, their interest must be our first priority.

Tonight, I draw my attention and the attention of my colleagues to the dire consequences that we face if many—and many people have been insisting that we do this—if we implement the so-called immigration reform which, of course, would legalize the status of those who are currently unlawfully living and working in our country.

Just as we are a nation of immigrants, we are also a nation of laws. What the American people and my colleagues must keep in mind, while debating this issue of immigration, is the distinction between legal immigration and illegal immigration.

Perhaps the thing that has disturbed me most in this debate is the attempt to blur the difference between the two, the difference, even to the point where statistics are being used to say: well, this is what immigrants have done for our society.

No, the statistics are what immigrants have done, but that does not include the illegal immigrants that are part of the equation.

No, illegal immigration is on a totally different plane. Legal immigration and illegal immigration are on totally different planes. Too often, we see these lines blurred, as I say, in this debate.

I happen to be very pro-legal immigration, and there is no reason for most Americans not to lift their head up when we actually understand that our country admits more legal immigrants annually than all the other countries of the world combined, totaling roughly a million legal immigrants every year.

While our immigration system certainly needs reforming or making it more effective and more efficient in what it is doing, this controlled and open process of legal immigration has worked well for America and demonstrates the capacity for our people to have compassion and generosity towards other human beings, other people who would like to come here to be part of the American family—coming here while obeying the rules, coming here not thumbing their nose at our legal system, coming here with respect towards the rest of us by obeying the laws and the regulations that are necessary for someone to come here legally.

Those folks have been wondrous, and, in fact, we all trace our roots back to people like this who came here and have contributed so much to the well-being of our country, and those million people who come here legally every year are a major positive asset to our country.

Despite our generous legal immigration policy, it is estimated that anywhere from 11 to 20 million foreigners are unlawfully present in the United States today.

While I certainly understand the positive motives and the essential goodness of the vast majority of these trespassers, of these people who are here illegally, it does not negate that they are lawbreakers, nor does it negate the economic and social consequences of inundating our country—

far above that million-person mark of legal immigration, but inundating our country with a large number of people, thus causing a growing damage to the American family, to people who are here who have come here legally, and to our U.S. citizens.

□ 1345

The dire consequences are evident to average Americans who see the decline in the quality of their schools, their neighborhoods—the safety of their neighborhoods, yes—and their health care. Yes, even their jobs. They can see the decline in the quality of the jobs that are available to working people in this country. Not only are citizens hurt by permitting illegals to cut in front of the line, but it is also a slap in the face to those who continue to wait their turn to come to America.

When we give in to trying to placate and trying to meet the interests of people who come here illegally, it is done at the expense of those people who are waiting in line and want to be American citizens and want to obey our laws and want to come here legally. Yes, illegal immigrants hurt the American people and hurt legal immigrants even worse.

Earlier this year, President Obama's 2012 unilateral deferral of deportation for certain illegal immigrants, essentially an amnesty decree, caused huge delays for thousands—that is thousands who are here legally seeking green cards, seeking to have government employees do their job and to actually make the immigration system work. Our government employees were servicing illegal immigrants at the expense of legal immigrants. They got it totally backwards. And that is the argument that we face today. It has a lot of things totally backwards.

While it is concerning that the President's actions appear to be political—which is this effort that we saw to try to appeal to the various segments of our population in order to conduct policy in the interest of illegal immigrants—I am most troubled by the fact that, basically, our President would defy the rule of law and congressional intent by unilaterally granting preferential treatment to those immigrants who are here illegally. And our President then, without congressional intent or any rule of law behind it, actually shifted the services of our government to service the needs of people who are here illegally at the expense of those people who are here legally.

Nearly 4.5 million mostly legal immigrants are currently caught up in the backlog of our bureaucratic immigration process. That is 4.5 million people who we need to be concerned about. They are part of the American family. They have come here as part of those 1 million legal immigrants that we have coming in, but yet they end up waiting decades—years, and sometimes decades—to make sure that their papers are processed so that they can become citizens.

The last thing we need to do—and unfortunately this administration has been doing it—is shift over the work effort and the time and the resources that are necessary to help these people who come here legally become citizens, shift that over to trying to service those people who are here illegally and have thumbed their nose at our law.

A policy which hurts those who follow the law and hurts those who are U.S. citizens and then rewards illegal and dishonest behavior is going to have some pretty bad consequences.

We are not fooled by the rhetoric—and no one should be fooled by the rhetoric—that we need to have ''comprehensive immigration reform'' and that it will in some way impact in a positive way what I have been talking about this afternoon. What they really mean when they talk about ''comprehensive immigration reform''—what they really mean—is ''amnesty.'' They don't want to use that word because the American people learned what that was all about. What they are really doing is rewarding those who have broken the law; and they do so at the expense of American citizens and, yes, at the expense of those immigrants who are here legally.

As the saying goes: Fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me. Mr. Speaker, we have already been fooled once. Amnesty has been tested, and it has proven to be a failed policy. In fact, it has served only as a catalyst for chain migration, which has compounded many of the horrific economic and social challenges that we face today.

So we have already had an amnesty in the past, and we know what it has done to the challenges that we had then. It has made them worse. And now we have ended up with, as I say, horrific economic and social challenges.

I am, of course, speaking—when I talk about the amnesty of the past—of the 1986 immigration reform bill, where Congress infamously promised President Reagan that they would enhance border security in exchange for an amnesty on the behalf of nearly 3 million illegal immigrants then residing in the United States.

Needless to say, border security was never enhanced and, needless to say, many more than the 3 million that we were supposedly talking about were legalized through chain migration. And millions upon millions more would continue to illegally flock to our country.

Why?

Because they saw that those people who had come here illegally ended up becoming naturalized, ended up being put in front of the line of those people who were waiting diligently in other countries to come here legally. Thus, it created a major increase in the flood of illegals into our country.

As common sense would dictate, the U.S. Government cannot continue to send this type of mixed message, the message which basically says we are going to reward that person who is here illegally by making him a citizen, putting him through the process actually even before those people who have come here legally, and anybody who gets here illegally, we will reward them with citizenship. They will then have the rights of Americans for education, for health care and the opportunities that are abundant here for American citizens and legal immigrants.

Well, if we continue to say anybody who can get to this country illegally or not is going to have those benefits, that is a mixed message if we expect that illegal immigration is going to be halted or in some way that the people overseas who are considering will hesitate to come here. In fact, we are rewarding those who made it here. Without expecting the legal immigration invasion of our country to increase, we actually gave people the incentive to come here illegally.

Illegal immigration only dramatically jumped after the 1986 amnesty deal, setting the path for our current predicament.

And what is our current predicament?

We have social and economic dislocation that is harming the American people, especially middle class working people. Like after the 1986 amnesty deal, those admitted into the United States under a new amnesty will surely have spouses, children, parents, even siblings back in their home country with whom they will want to reunite. They will insist on reuniting with—legally or illegally—those people who are in the United States.

So that is why we have ended up in a situation where we hear people say: Well, we have these people that we will never see in our family in this other country. Well, the people who are saying that have every right to go to that other country. It is as if someone who is in the United States who is saying that we have to reunite the families—and they are here illegally in the first place—that that is a reason that we should legalize their status so that they can reunite the family that has been left behind. No. The other option is people who are here illegally should go home and be with their families that they left behind. It is better for them to do that.

So this has really been a potential threat when we talk about family reunification and the rest because there is a potential to triple the number of people who are currently here in this country illegally. Let's get that right—triple. If we give amnesty and we legalize the status of those who are here illegally, we could be tripling the number of people. We could be inserting this number of people into our system.

If true, this abrupt population swell will fundamentally change America socially, economically, and, yes, politically, causing major consequences that we can even see across the board. And you can see what those consequences

will be because those people that now are swirling in the ranks of our population will mainly be poorer people, people at the poorest end of the economic level. We will be importing millions—tens of millions—of poor people, increasing poverty in America.

The stress that would place on our social services is one thing, but to our economy and what that does to the American people in the job market would be horrendous. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, every 1 percent increase in the labor force attributable to immigration tends to lower the relative wages of all American workers. Let's get that straight. That is what happens when you have an increase in the labor force by immigrants who come to this country. That is why we want to limit it to 1 million people.

If we have 11, 20, 30, 40 million people coming in, we can expect major decreases in the actual wages that all Americans receive. It is going to impact the American wages. Surprise, surprise. When you have a flood of illegal immigrants into a country, they are bending down the wages, bending down the wages of the American people.

However, those who stand to lose the most are whom, when we say that these people are mainly people from lower income levels? So what we are talking about, the people who are really losing by legalizing the status of illegals, by having a plan that would eventually bring tens of millions of more people into our country and insert them into our process, the people who are hurt the most are low-income, low-skilled American workers.

One major study found that increases in immigration during the 1980–2000 era resulted in an 8 percent decrease in wages for high school dropouts and a 3 percent decrease in wages for the average American worker. Well, this is hardly surprising. Well, for me, it wouldn't be surprising.

During my college days, I was a janitor. I worked as a janitor. And let's note, I worked as a janitor because I needed a job. I was cleaning toilets. I was scrubbing floors. I was picking up trash. That was not my desired job, but I needed the money.

Historically—right now—jobs such as these would be a steppingstone for those who perhaps lacked an education or were trying to earn their way through school. I was trying to help pay my education expenses. But after decades of illegal immigrants who have been bending back the wages and the businesses willing to exploit them, many of the jobs that we are talking about, like janitorial jobs, no longer pay even the wages that were paid in real dollars then.

□ 1400

I have gone back and taken a look at what a janitor makes, and janitors were making basically the same pay as I made back 40 and 50 years ago. Well, why is that? Our economy has quadrupled, maybe tripled, in the last 40 years. How come janitors make exactly the same amount of money?

They have been left out. They have been left out because the job of janitor has been bid down. The wages for people who would be janitors in our country have been bid down, bid down by people who flooded into our country illegally willing to work for a pittance, willing to live in homes where you have three or four families to a house that is only supposed to have one family.

We have a situation where who is being hurt? It is that American who would have had that job being that janitor—maybe working his way through school, maybe not—who now can't take that job because it pays so little. People say, well, how can we afford to take care of buildings if you are going to have to pay a certain amount of money, more money to those people who are taking care of the buildings?

Well, proportionately it is the same. The people who own the buildings are making a bigger profit now at the expense of the fact they are paying a pittance to illegals to take care of the building.

But also we can rest assured that technology would by now have developed that would make the life of a janitor and the job of a janitor much more efficient. You probably would have toilet bowl machines that would permit one person to clean 100 toilet bowls a night rather than 12 or 15, and that, then, would mean that the person running that machine and making that machine would be an American citizen or a legal immigrant who is earning a decent wage.

There is nothing wrong with having people who are working those jobs earn a decent wage so that they could then raise a family and, yes, maybe own their own little home some day. That is the way it used to be. When you are a working person, then you can expect to earn enough to maintain a decent standard of living. But we have a flood of illegals coming in. Especially after we gave that amnesty, what we have done is bid down the wages of the American people as tens of millions of illegals are now present in our society.

To this point, between 1960 and 2012, a time when America was experiencing its highest levels of immigration, native-born workers and legal immigrants lost an average of $402 billion in wages while native-owned firms, meaning American-owned companies, profited by an average of $437 billion.

So thus we have wages being depressed by illegal immigration that actually lowered the amount of money by $400 billion in money that was paid in wages, yet the people running the business or owned the property were $437 billion richer. So what we have seen here is a huge shift of wealth to whom? To upper-class owners of businesses at the expense of the lowest level of Americans.

Now, how is our country a safe country? Our country is a safe country because all of us who are part of the American family are doing our part to protect our country. Those people at the lower end of the economic sphere, they are the ones who join the military and go out and defend us. They are the ones who obey the law. They are the ones whom we rely upon in their good judgment to support the Constitution and a rule of law. If they lose faith in the system, we will suffer greatly.

That is one of the things that is happening is that the poor people are being left out. Actually, their standard of living is going down. Of course, our friends in the other party have provided very lucrative welfare abilities to people to be on the dole rather than giving them a good job. At the same time, they are pushing for more government programs to give the dole, to make people dependent and thus, I might say, lose their dignity of being able to be self-sufficient. At the same time, the folks on the other side of the aisle are pushing for amnesty, for illegal immigration, that would bring in 40 million new people, insert 40 million people, foreigners, into our system.

What is that going to do for the poor people of this country? Why are the unions in our country not jumping up and supporting the rights of their working people not to be having to face illegal immigrant labor bidding down their labor? Over the last 50 years, there has been a massive transfer of wealth going on, and yet at the same time we see the business wages, business profits, going up and workers' wages going down. Yet we have policies that seem to encourage it that don't make any sense.

We have people who use the rhetoric of trying to care for America's poor. The last thing they should be doing is bringing in 40 million new foreigners—mostly poor—into our country.

Knowing this, it should be no surprise that Big Business has been a consistent advocate of amnesty. Big Business wants cheap labor, and this, I might add, is not being loyal to the American family. To be loyal to the American family, no matter who they are, whether they are poor Americans, working class Americans, we should be watching out for each other.

Lower wages, however, are not the only negative impact of mass illegal immigration into our country. Similar structural breakdowns and strains can be seen in our education system. People in the lower income parts of town are seeing their education system fall apart. We see the health care system in our country falling apart. We see as well in a variety of other institutions that people rely on that the strain of millions of illegals—and they want to bring more in—is destroying this social, this economic, and this infrastructure that our people depend on.

All things considered, if amnesty were being granted to the 11 to 20 million illegal immigrants currently in

the United States, it would cost the American taxpayers an additional $6.3 trillion over the next 50 years. At least 45 million foreigners, mostly poor, would be inserted into our society.

Is that going to make America a better place? Are the working people, the people who are part of the American family, going to be better off because of that? Absolutely not. And the voices of the American people need to be heard because we have people posturing as if they are doing a favor for the less fortunate by advocating this amnesty for illegal immigrants which would bring in tens of millions of more poor people from foreign countries into our country.

With our national debt approaching $18 trillion, a budget deficit of over half a trillion dollars and two unsustainable entitlement programs that we need in order to maintain some sort of security for the American people, Medicare and Social Security, these are currently on the road to bankruptcy, and if we bring in these millions more people, we can expect that the expenses of our government will shoot up trying to provide benefits for people who now—by the way, now after making them legal, they are entitled to those benefits.

Someone who is here legally is entitled to every benefit and protection as people who are here who were born here. And if we legalize the status of illegals, we are taking tens of millions of foreigners who are here illegally and granting them the rights to all those programs.

America cannot afford amnesty for those foreigners who are here illegally. We must take care of the needs of the American family, of American citizens, and of legal immigrants into our society who have joined our family. Their interests have to come first over the interests of—yes, and let me just say, there is no doubt that those people who are here illegally in our country, the vast, vast majority, 90 percent or more, are wonderful people.

We should not fool ourselves into thinking that we can somehow take care of all of the wonderful people in the world. We can't do it. As we try to do it and try to open up our borders even more than the 1 million legal immigrants that we have, we are going to attract even a bigger flood into our country which will put even more pressure on us. What we are doing in that case is hurting our fellow Americans.

Even if these people are wonderful people who come here legally and they are seeking opportunity, I am sorry, we can't take care of the whole world, and we can't tell the world that whatever good person comes here illegally we are eventually going to give them amnesty and they will be eligible for all our programs.

There is an argument about what are called the DREAMers, young people who were brought here by their parents. They didn't come here voluntarily. Their parents brought them here when they were 2 or 3. And now they don't have legal status. There are a lot of obstacles in their way. They want those obstacles removed. They want themselves to be legalized. But do you know what will happen if we do that, if we say that a young person going to school because they are young and they have been brought here by their parents, what is going to happen? What will be the message if we do that?

If we legalize the status of just the DREAMers, we are telling the people throughout the world, man, when you come here illegally to the United States, make sure you bring your children. We are telling people throughout the world, bring your children to this country so we can take care of the needs of your children.

We have needs of our own children in the United States of America. And they are wonderful kids out there that we care about, but we have to care about our own kids first. People who have come here legally have that right. They are part of our family. American citizens are part of our family. But the well-being of children from foreigners in various countries throughout the world has to be second on our list, down on our list, way down as compared to the well-being of our own people.

Yes, if we take care of the DREAMers, what is going to happen is we will be encouraging a mass flow of young people into our country. Younger people who are in school, we will have to take care of their education, et cetera. That is not right. You can't give the incentive to people to come here and expect that we are not going to have many, many more people coming here. We will have many more DREAMers coming here if we legalize the status of those who have been brought here illegally by their parents.

This issue continues to be presented as a humanitarian imperative, as something that without cost we could help these people among us. We can do that without cost? There is nothing without cost. We are being presented that we can have an amnesty as if it is not going to cost the American people. It is costing us right now. What we have done in the last 20 years to ignore this influx of illegals into our country has already caused great damage to the well-being and the standard of living of American workers at the lowest level.

People say they think they are appealing to Mexican Americans by being for amnesty for illegals. The hardest-hit community in America, perhaps the hardest-hit, and certainly minority communities, including Mexican Americans, they know where their jobs are going. They know when they have a job and an illegal comes across the border from whatever country, Asia or Mexico or Honduras or Ireland or wherever they are coming from, if they are taking the job of an American, the Mexican American community is the hardest-hit. Their education funds are the hardest-hit. Their neighborhoods are the hardest-hit.

That is why I believe that Americans of Mexican descent are patriots. They are part of the American family. And that is why I do not believe that they want to legalize the status of every illegal that has poured into our country. It hurts their families more than anyone.

So what we need to do now is make sure that as we discuss legalizing the status of illegals, of amnesty—they don't want to call it that, they want to call it comprehensive immigration reform—that we keep in mind these things could have a dramatic, negative impact on the well-being of American people. Whose side are we on? That is what you have got to ask.

What are the answers to this? Let me just say that solutions are not easy, but I would suggest there is a simple but not easy solution. We should make sure that anyone who comes here illegally does not get a job. We need to E-Verify all the jobs that are here in the United States to make sure they are not going to illegals, and they should be going to Americans or legal immigrants. And we should make sure that no illegal immigrant or the immigrant's family receives government benefits, whether it is health care or education.

I don't believe in deportation, actually. I think deportation is the wrong tactic. But unless you are going to—the President, obviously, didn't fulfill his obligation for deportation, but he didn't take another step that would then deter illegal immigration. The step to do it is no deportation. It is dehumanizing. No sweeps through people's community. But don't give jobs and benefits that belong to the American people to foreigners who are here illegally. That is the solution.

They will go home. They will go home in peace. They have our well wishes. But they are not going to have our jobs and our scarce resources that should be going to the American people.

□ 1415

I would ask my colleagues, as this discussion on the legalizing of illegal immigrants takes place, that we be honest with each other, and yes, that we be compassionate, but that our compassion is aimed at the American people and legal immigrants and not just compassion for those who come here illegally.

No matter how wonderful people these people are, we have to consider the American people first.

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

SECURITY THREATS TO THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I don't know if my dear friend from California

has seen this, but following up on his comments, this is part of the front page of the Army Times, April 28, and it says here:

Thousands more will be forced out; staff sergeants now on hit list.

It talks about the career killers, but because of the cuts to our military, we are forcing out thousands and thousands of patriots who wanted to make a career of the United States military. I, along with my friend from California, don't necessarily think it is a good idea to be saying: look, if you are illegally in the country, all you have to do is go displace yet another American patriot and take their job in the military, force them out into the civilian sector, where our United States military veterans have a much higher unemployment rate than the general population.

That is not a good idea. It is not fair to our patriots, and it should not be something that this Congress passes, to once again not only run out patriots who wanted to make the United States military a career, but force them out with illegal immigrants using their job, taking their jobs, forcing them into an unemployment sector, where their unemployment rates are so very high. They shouldn't be high.

People should be willing to hire veterans. They have phenomenal work ethics, or they wouldn't have been in the military, unless they got bumped out early for not working; but otherwise, from my 4 years in the Army, right after we turned to being a volunteer Army, it was a very difficult time. Our military was not appreciated.

I went through officer basic at Fort Riley, Kansas, and it was a standing order not to wear your uniform off post because of hatred for the military, and if you got caught by yourself in uniform, there might be a gang that would beat you up. It happened, so it was a standing order. You couldn't wear your uniform off post because of potential violence upon our military by American citizens.

It has blessed my heart to see America begin again to appreciate those who answer the call of their country, serve their country, and do so honorably and well in the United States military, which should result in our promises to our military and promises that, to some, helped induce them into the military of good health care, good veterans' care.

Now, I was only in 4 years and don't have a disability. I have never been provided any VA assistance or health care, but for those who need it, deserve it, were promised it, we can't be having a socialized medicine system that ends up being like most socialized medicine systems become; and the way ObamaCare will eventually lead this country into being, with regard to health care, you get put on lists.

Socialized medicine doesn't go broke because you get put on lists, and you die waiting for your procedure in sufficient numbers, at least we have people die who won't get the procedure, or perhaps they need a hip or a knee, pacemaker, or whatever it is, they don't get them because they are having to wait in line.

We shouldn't do that to our Nation. We should repeal ObamaCare outright before it takes us there, but for the sake of this country, we can't continue betraying our veterans and not ensuring that they have the best health care that is available.

If VA clinics or hospitals aren't doing the trick, let's give them a card that lets them walk into any health care facility in the Nation and get the best care we have got, and let's keep our promise to them that we will take care of that.

My dear friend, Andrew C. McCarthy, has an article out in National Review Online today. He posted it at 4 a.m. I know Andy is up that time in the morning because, sometimes, we exchange emails at that time in the morning.

He is a brilliant lawyer, constitutional scholar, historian, and a patriot himself, who was the lead prosecutor in ensuring that the planner, the one most responsible for the first World Trade Center bombing in 1993, when President Bill Clinton was in office, he made sure he was convicted.

If one actually looks at comments by the brother of that al Qaeda leader, you find references to his brother saying: hey, you know, there is violence, there is going to be a lot more violence against the U.S., but I will be glad to help negotiate this thing if we can get release of The Blind Sheikh.

Morsi, who became president of Egypt, a Muslim brother, he made clear, before he was even elected, that he wanted to secure the release of The Blind Sheikh who plotted, planned, carried out the first bombing of the World Trade Center, which we can be thankful that it didn't result in more death and more damage.

We should have learned a lesson from that. We didn't learn it. We continued, under the Clinton administration, to treat that like it was some civilian crime, instead of what it actually was, an act of war. As an act of war, it should have stirred more of a response.

So perhaps there was someone in the White House after the World Trade Center was bombed in 1993, who wondered out loud within the White House: well, what difference at this point does it make why they bombed the World Trade Center or what we might have done to provide more security? What difference at this point does it make?

Because perhaps, if that kind of thinking were not in the White House during the 1990s, perhaps we could have looked more closely at the causes of the 1993 World Trade Center bombing and looked more closely at the forces behind it and determined, wow, this is really a group that is at war with the United States, radical Islamists have been at war with the United States since 1979.

We just didn't know it. There was a war going on, but it was one-sided because the other side, the United States, didn't know there was a war, so they weren't fighting a war. They just kept retreating.

In 1979, an act of war occurred in an attack against our embassy. The man, the Ayatollah Khomeini, radical Islamist who became the head of Iran, that President Jimmy Carter welcomed as a man of peace, that one of the top advisers right now in our Homeland Security Department spoke up for as a featured speaker at the Ayatollah Khomeini man of vision ceremony that was held some years back in this country.

Now, this featured speaker on behalf of the man of vision, the Ayatollah Khomeini, he is advising the Homeland Security Department; not only that, the FBI in 2011 gave him their highest civilian award. Some people do not understand there is still a war going on. Some in this administration and some in the Senate and some in the House may refuse to recognize it, but there is still a war going on.

Mr. McCarthy writes:

Here is the main point: The rioting at the American embassy in Cairo was not about the anti-Muslim video. As argued here repeatedly, the Obama administration's ''Blame the Video'' story was a fraudulent explanation for the September 11, 2012, rioting in Cairo every bit as much as it was a fraudulent explanation for the massacre in Benghazi several hours later.

Once you grasp this well-hidden fact, the Obama administration's dereliction of duty in connection with Benghazi become much easier to see, but let's begin with Jay Carney's performance in Wednesday's exchange with the White House press corps, a new low in insulting the intelligence of the American people.

Mr. Carney was grilled about just-released emails which corroborate what many of us have been arguing all along: ''Blame the Video'' was an Obama administration crafted lie, through and through. It was intended, in the stretch run of the 2012 campaign, to obscure the facts that (a) the President's foreign policy of empowering Islamic supremacists contributed directly and materially to the Benghazi massacre; (b) the President's reckless stationing of American government personnel in Benghazi and his shocking failure to provide sufficient protection for them were driven by a political-campaign imperative to portray the Obama Libya policy as a success—and, again, they invited the jihadist violence that killed our ambassador and three other Americans; and (c) far from being ''decimated,'' as the President repeatedly claimed during the campaign (and continued to claim even after the September 11 violence in Egypt and Libya), al Qaeda and its allied jihadists remained a driving force of anti-American violence in Muslim countries—indeed, they had been strengthened by the President's pro-Islamist policies.

The explosive emails that have surfaced thanks to the perseverance of Judicial Watch make explicit what has long been obvious: Susan Rice, the President's confidant and ambassador to the U.N., was strategically chosen to peddle the administration's ''Blame the Video'' fairy tale to the American people in appearances on five different national television broadcasts the Sunday after the massacre. She was coached about what to say by other members of the President's inner circle. One of the emails refers

expressly to a ''prep call'' that Ambassador Rice had with several administration officials on late Saturday afternoon right before her Sunday show appearances.

□ 1430

The tangled web of deception spun by the administration has previously included an effort to distance the White House (i.e., the President) from Rice's mendacious TV performances. Thus, Carney was in the unenviable position Wednesday of trying to explain the ''prep call'' email, as well as other messages that illuminate the Obama White House's deep involvement in coaching Rice. The emails manifest that Rice's performances were campaign appearances, not the good-faith effort of a public official to inform the American people about an act of war against our country. Her instructions were ''to underscore that these protests are rooted in an Internet video, and not a broader failure of policy,'' and ''to reinforce the President and administration's strength and steadiness in dealing with difficult challenges.''

Carney risibly claimed that the ''prep call'' was ''not about Benghazi.'' Instead, according to him, it was ''about the protests around the Muslim world.''

Two points must be made about this.

The first involves the administration's blatant lying. Benghazi was the only reason Rice was on the Sunday shows. If the massacre had not happened, there would not have been an extraordinary administration offering of one top Obama official to five different television networks to address a calamity that had happened a few days before.

Moreover, as is well known to anyone who has ever been involved in government presentations to the media, to Congress, to courts, and other fact-finding bodies, the official who will be doing the presentation is put through a ''murder board'' process. This is a free-wheeling session in which the questions likely to be asked at the presentation are posed, and potential answers—especially to tough questions—are proposed, discussed, and massaged. The suggestion that Rice, less than 24 hours before being grilled by high-profile media figures, was being prepped on something totally separate and apart from the incident that was the sole reason for her appearance is so far-fetched it is amazing that Carney thought he could make it fly.

The second point brings us full circle to Egypt.

Why would Carney claim, with a straight face, that Rice was being prepped ''about protests around the Muslim world?'' Because other than Benghazi, the ''protest around the Muslim world'' that Americans know about is the rioting, not protest, the rioting at the U.S. Embassy in Cairo a few hours before the Benghazi siege. When Benghazi comes up, the administration—President Obama, Hillary Clinton, Susan Rice, Jay Carney, et al.—love to talk about the Cairo protests. Why? Because the media—and, thus, the public—have bought, hook, line, and sinker, the fraudulent claim that those ''protests'' were over the anti-Muslim video. Obama & Co. shrewdly calculate that if you buy ''Blame the Video'' as the explanation for Cairo, it becomes much more plausible that you will accept the ''Blame the Video'' as the explanation for Benghazi; or, at the very least, you will give Obama officials the benefit of the doubt that they could truly have believed the video triggered Benghazi, despite a mountain of evidence to the contrary.

You see, the Benghazi fraud hinges on the success of the Cairo fraud. If you are hoodwinked by the latter, they have a much better chance of getting away with the former.

But the ''Blame the Video'' is every bit as much a deception when it comes to Cairo.

Thanks to President Obama's policy of supporting the Muslim Brotherhood and other Islamic supremacists in Egypt, post-Mubarak Cairo became a very hospitable place for jihadists. That included al Qaeda leaders, such as Mohammed Zawahiri, brother of al Qaeda emir Ayman Zawahiri; and leaders of Gama'a al-Islamiyya, the Islamic group, the terrorist organization that was led by The Blind Sheikh, Omar Abdel-Rahman, the terrorist I convicted in 1995 for running the jihadist cell that bombed the World Trade Center and plotted to bomb other New York City landmarks.

In the weeks before September 11, 2012, these jihadists plotted to attack the U.S. Embassy in Cairo. In fact, The Blind Sheikh's son threatened a 1979 Iran-style raid on the embassy. Americans would be taken hostage to ransom for The Blind Sheikh's release from American prison, where he is serving a life sentence thanks to Andy McCarthy. Other jihadists threatened to burn the embassy to the ground, a threat that was reported in the Egyptian press the day before the September 11 ''protests.''

The State Department knew there was going to be trouble at the embassy on September 11, the 11th anniversary of al Qaeda's mass murder of nearly 3,000 Americans. It was well known that things could get very ugly. When they did, it would become very obvious to Americans that President Obama had not decimated al Qaeda as he was claiming on the campaign trail. Even worse, it would be painfully evident that his pro-Muslim Brotherhood policies had actually enhanced al Qaeda's capacity to attack the United States in Egypt.

The State Department also knew about the obscure anti-Muslim video. Few Egyptians, if any, had seen or heard about it, but it had been denounced by the Grand Mufti in Cairo on September 9. Still, the stir it caused was minor, at best. As Tom Joscelyn has elaborated, the Cairo rioting was driven by the jihadists who were agitating for The Blind Sheikh's release and who had been threatening for weeks to raid and torch our embassy. And indeed, they did storm it, replace the American flag with the jihadist black flag, and set fires around the embassy complex.

It is important here, Mr. Speaker, to note that the al Qaeda leader's brother, Zawahiri's brother, he was out there even after the attack on Benghazi's consulate, basically saying: Hey, there could be more rioting, more trouble, unless you work with me, and let's get The Blind Sheikh released and then we can avoid future violence. Amidst all that is what Andrew McCarthy is pointing out, claiming it was all about a video.

In his article, McCarthy says:

Nevertheless, before the rioting began but when they knew there was going to be trouble, State Department officials at the embassy began tweeting out condemnations of the video while ignoring the real sources of the threat: the resurgence of jihadists in Muslim Brotherhood-governed Egypt, the continuing demand for The Blind Sheikh's release (which underscored the jihadists' influence), and the very real danger that jihadists would attack the embassy (which demonstrated that al Qaeda was anything but ''decimated'').

The transparent purpose of the State Department's shrieking over the video was to create the illusion that any security problems at the embassy—violent rioting minimized as mere ''protests''—were actually attributable to the anti-Muslim video, not to President Obama's policies and patent failure to quell al Qaeda.

Because there was a kernel of truth to the video story, and because the American media had abdicated their responsibility to promote the predominant causes of anti-Americanism in Egypt, journalists and the public have uncritically accepted the notion—a false notion—that the video caused the Cairo rioting. That acceptance is key to the administration's ''Blame the Video'' farce in connection with the lethal attack in Benghazi.

At about 10 p.m. Washington time on the night of September 11—after they knew our Ambassador to Libya had been murdered and while the siege of Benghazi still raged—Secretary of State Clinton and President Obama spoke on the telephone. Shortly afterwards, the State Department issued a statement from Secretary Hillary Clinton blaming the video for the atrocity in Benghazi. That was the beginning of the fraud's Benghazi phase—the phase Susan Rice was prepped to peddle on nationwide television. But it wasn't the beginning of the fraud.

Secretary Clinton's minions at the State Department had started spinning the video fraud hours earlier in Egypt. The sooner Americans grasp that, the sooner they will comprehend the breathtaking depth of the President's Benghazi coverup.

Today, our Oversight Committee was having a hearing to see a retired general on the verge of tears finally coming forward, who was with AFRICOM. He knew what was going on, he knew the truth, and he could not remain silent; and so he came forward and said: Yes, there was really much more we could have done.

Mr. Speaker, I hope and pray that all of those who were part of the

AFRICOM intelligence community will find courage from the general coming forward—some I know that have left our intelligence service and gone on to good civilian jobs. He has broken the ice. They can come forward now. I hope, Mr. Speaker, they get the message. He has come forward, the ice is broken, you won't be the first should be the message.

All of the hostility—I mean, when I have an intelligence officer, former intelligence officer, tell me—when I ask, ''Where have you been?''—''I have been scared.'' I said, ''You have never been scared of anything.''

''I have been scared since 9/12.''

All of those who have been forced to remain silent, I hope they will come forward.

A mom with a son in our country's service had told me after 9/12 about where her son was and what he was doing. So I called him, and it took a long time to get hold of him. He wasn't forthcoming. His mom told me yesterday, or this week, that he'll be out of the U.S. service before long and he wants to talk and come clean. I hope more will start coming clean on the strength of this retired general's courage.

But in the remaining minutes, it should not be lost that today is the National Day of Prayer. For some that still are not convinced at what is at war here, we simply need to look at a statement from Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, the mastermind who is at Guantanamo. I am grateful to President Obama that he has kept him there. He is a threat to the world, and particularly the United States. He was the mastermind behind 9/11.

In the pleading he prepared himself on page 4—this has been declassified so anybody can find it on the Internet—he says:

> We do not possess your military might, not your nuclear weapons. Nevertheless, we fight you with the almighty God. So, if our act of jihad and our fighting with you caused fear and terror, then many thanks to God, because it is him that has thrown fear into your hearts, which resulted in your infidelity, paganism, and your statement that God had a son and your trinity beliefs.

In other parts of the pleading he makes clear that Jews should be destroyed.

Here he makes clear, also, anyone who has a trinity belief believes that God had a son. Then he quotes from the Koran saying:

> Soon shall we cast terror into the hearts of the unbelievers, for that they joined companies with Allah, for which he has sent no authority; their place will be the fire; and evil is the home of the wrongdoers.

So he bases his belief that anyone who believes in a holy trinity should go to the fire and burn forever on that part of the Koran. Others have different interpretations, but radical Islamists believe that.

That is why I think it is immensely helpful to go back to after the Declaration of Independence but before the Constitution.

In 1783, the Treaty of Paris was entered in Paris, France, between American diplomats and British diplomats. Britain was the strongest country in the world, and our American diplomats knew they had to come up with something that was so important that the strongest nation in the world would not quickly come back after the new United States.

□ 1445

When I first saw this document, I was shocked at the first words, and then it made sense. The beginning of the treaty that forced Great Britain to acknowledge United States' independence starts with these words: ''in the name of the most holy and undivided Trinity.''

They believed in the Holy Trinity. They knew that Great Britain believed in the Holy Trinity. They wanted something under which the Brits would swear that would be so important that they would not dare break that oath. That is why it started, ''in the name of the most holy and undivided Trinity.'' That is where we got our start. That is why radical Islam is at war with us.

I hope and pray on this National Day of Prayer that we will humble ourselves, admit our wrongdoing, turn back to the God who has protected us—and He will bless our land.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LEWIS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for April 29 and 30.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 2, 2014, at noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

5504. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act in the Office of International Affairs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5505. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a piece of proposed legislation to authorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States for the period of October 1, 2014 through September 30, 2019; to the Committee on Financial Services.

5506. A letter from the Acting Director, Directorate of Whistleblower Protection Programs, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Procedures for Handling Retaliation Complaints Under the Employee Protection Provision of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 [Docket Number: OSHA-2011-0540] (RIN: 1218-AC58) received April 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

5507. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Advisory Committee: Bone, Reproductive and Urologic Drugs Advisory Committee [Docket No.: FDA-2014-N-0355] received April 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5508. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Spirulina Extract [Docket No.: FDA-2012-C-0900] received April 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5509. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Department's final rule — NRC Assessment Program for a Medical Event or an Incident Occurring at a Medical Facility; Management Directive 8.10 [DT-14-07] received April 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5510. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Pub. L. 107-243), the Authorization for the Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 1991 (Pub. L. 102-1), and in order to keep the Congress fully informed, a report prepared by the Department of State for the December 17, 2013 — February 14, 2014 reporting period including matters relating to post-liberation Iraq, pursuant to Public Law 107-243, section 4(a) (116 Stat. 1501); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5511. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting a notice of a proposed lease with the Government of United Arab Emirates (Transmittal No. 05-14) pursuant to Section 62(a) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5512. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Syria that was declared in Executive Order 13338 of May 11, 2004; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5513. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the stabilization of Iraq that was declared in Executive Order 13303 of May 22, 2003; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5514. A letter from the HR Specialist, Small Business Administration, transmitting two reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5515. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Type certificate Previously Held By Eurocopter France) (Airbus Helicopters)

[Docket No.: FAA-2013-0822; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-004-AD; Amendment 39-17783; AD 2014-05-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5516. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0789; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-127-AD; Amendment 39-17782; AD 2014-05-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5517. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0642; Directorate Identifier 2011-SW-035-AD; Amendment 39-17777; AD 2014-05-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5518. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0835; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-095-AD; Amendment 39-17790; AD 2014-05-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5519. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0171; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-038-AD; Amendment 39-17812; AD 2014-06-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5520. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting the final feasibility report and final supplemental environmental impact statement; (H. Doc. No. 113–105); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and ordered to be printed.

5521. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Determination of Housing Costs Amounts Eligible for Exclusion or Deduction for 2014 [Notice 2014-29] received April 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5522. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting fourth quarterly report of FY 2013 on Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Veterans' Affairs.

5523. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting first quarterly report of FY 2014 on Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Veterans' Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 4539. A bill to require the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, when issuing a research paper, to include all studies, data, and other analyses on which the paper was based; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 4540. A bill to regulate certain deferred prosecution agreements and nonprosecution agreements in Federal criminal cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 4541. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to develop a strategy report to address the skills gap by providing recommendations to increase on-the-job training and apprenticeship opportunities, increase employer participation in education and workforce training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. ESTY (for herself, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. GIBSON):

H.R. 4542. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend expensing of environmental remediation costs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HONDA, and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 4543. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to apply CMMI waiver authority to PACE programs in order to foster innovations in such programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GARCIA, and Mr. RUIZ):

H.R. 4544. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to disallow a deduction for any fine paid by an owner of professional sports franchise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARPER (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. NUNNELEE, and Mr. PALAZZO):

H.R. 4545. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the Pat Harrison Waterway District approximately 8,307 acres of National Forest System land within the Bienville National Forests in Mississippi, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. COLE, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. KILMER):

H.R. 4546. A bill to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide further self-governance by Indian tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

H.R. 4547. A bill to modify the definition of ''antique firearm''; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 4548. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to include programs that teach technology literacy in any job training program for ex-offenders offered under the Workforce Investment Act of 1998; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 4549. A bill to require the Forest Service to meet annual volume targets for timber harvesting in the management of a unit of the National Forest System and to provide for the transfer of such management responsibility to the State in which the unit is located when such targets are not consistently met, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 4550. A bill to extend the emergency unemployment compensation program, and to stimulate the economy and create opportunities for new job creation; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Education and the Workforce, Small Business, Energy and Commerce, Financial Services, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GIBSON (for himself and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 4551. A bill to amend the Forest Legacy Program of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 to authorize States to allow certain entities to acquire, hold, and manage conservation easements under the program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HIMES (for himself, Mr. CARNEY, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 4552. A bill to encourage and ensure the use of safe equestrian helmets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BARR, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ENYART, and Mr. CRAMER):

H.R. 4553. A bill to authorize appropriations for fossil energy research and development programs at the Department of Energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. MULVANEY (for himself and Mrs. WAGNER):

H.R. 4554. A bill to amend the securities laws to improve private market offerings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself and Mr. CAMPBELL):

H.R. 4555. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand and make permanent rules related to investment by nonresident aliens in domestic mutual funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERS of Michigan (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 4556. A bill to help small businesses access capital and create jobs by reauthorizing the successful State Small Business Credit Initiative; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 4557. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide for notice to, and input by, State insurance commissioners when requiring an insurance company to serve as a source of financial strength pursuant to such Act; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ROSS (for himself and Mr. MURPHY of Florida):

H.R. 4558. A bill to clarify the authority of States to regulate private flood insurance coverage; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SCHOCK (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mrs. NOEM):

H.R. 4559. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the time period for contributing military death gratuities to Roth IRAs and Coverdell education savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 4560. A bill to allow members of the Armed Forces and National Guard to defer principal on Federal student loans for a certain period in connection with receipt of orders for mobilization for war or national emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 4561. A bill to specify requirements for the next update of the current strategic plan for the Office of Rural Health of the Department of Veterans Affairs for improving access to, and the quality of, health care services for veterans in rural areas; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 4562. A bill to authorize early repayment of obligations to the Bureau of Reclamation within the Northport Irrigation District in the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina):

H. Res. 562. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to enhanced relations with the Republic of Moldova and support for Moldova's territorial integrity; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER (for herself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina):

H. Res. 563. A resolution expressing support for designation of May as ''National Asthma and Allergy Awareness Month''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. VEASEY (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H. Res. 564. A resolution expressing support for designation of May 2014 as ''Health and Fitness Month''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 4539.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 4540.

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

Art. I, Section 8, clause 18: ''The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 4541.

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

Article I; Section 8; Clause 1 of the Constitution states 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; and

Article I; Section 8; Clause 3 of the Constitution states The Congress shall have Power To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

Ms. ESTY:

H.R. 4542.

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

clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 4543.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 4544.

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

Article 1, Section 1.

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 4545.

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

Clause 2 of Section 3 of article IV of the Constitution

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 4546.

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

U.S. Const. art. I, sec. 8, cl. 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;

U.S. Cont. art. IV, sec. 3, cl. 2, sen. a

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rule and Regulations respecting the Territory of other Property belonging to the United States;

By Mr. CASSIDY:

H.R. 4547.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 4548.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause I of the United States Constitution related to general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 4549.

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

Article IV, Section III, Clause II

''The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.''

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 4550.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. GIBSON:

H.R. 4551.

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

Clause 1, of section 8, of article I.

By Mr. HIMES:

H.R. 4552.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, as this legislation provides for the general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 4553.

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

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution: the Congress shall have the power to provide for the general welfare of the United States.

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. MULVANEY:

H.R. 4554.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3. ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

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 Officer thereof.''

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 4555.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PETERS of Michigan:

H.R. 4556.

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

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 4557.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States: 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 of the Constitution of the United States: The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the forgoing 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. ROSS:

H.R. 4558.

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

Article I, section 8, clause 1; and Article I, section 8, clause 3

By Mr. SCHOCK:

H.R. 4559.

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

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress as stated in Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 4560.

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

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 4561.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 4562.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 6: Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 309: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 498: Mr. VELA, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 543: Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 596: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1020: Mr. GIBSON and Mr. FLEMING.

H.R. 1097: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 1125: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 1239: Mr. MCALLISTER.

H.R. 1413: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1428: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1441: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1449: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. MARINO, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 1461: Mr. MASSIE and Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 1462: Mr. ROONEY and Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 1551: Mr. OLSON, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 1563: Mr. MCNERNEY and Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 1652: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 1717: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 1733: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1750: Mr. FLORES, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. OLSON, Mr. DENT, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. FOXX, Mr. STOCKMAN, and Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 1779: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1798: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 1812: Mr. ROONEY and Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 1830: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. BARBER.

H.R. 1918: Mr. GARCIA, Mr. PASCRELL, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 2028: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2146: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2156: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 2203: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. DAINES, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. VELA, Mr. WALZ, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MESSER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HOLT, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 2315: Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 2415: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 2417: Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 2429: Mr. DENT, Mr. CAMPBELL, and Mr. MICA.

H.R. 2548: Mr. ROONEY and Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 2708: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 2725: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 2807: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 2870: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 2932: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 2936: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 2939: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. DENT.

H.R. 3135: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 3179: Mrs. ELLMERS.

H.R. 3283: Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 3318: Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. HAHN, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 3338: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 3344: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 3367: Mr. LATTA, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 3382: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 3383: Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 3408: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 3481: Mr. JOLLY, Mr. FLEMING, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. DAINES.

H.R. 3490: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 3516: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 3530: Ms. ESTY, Mr. STIVERS, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 3581: Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 3600: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 3610: Mr. COTTON, Ms. ESTY, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 3616: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 3665: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 3673: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 3708: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 3722: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. DENT.

H.R. 3723: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 3776: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 3850: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 3877: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 3921: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 3930: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 3976: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 3992: Mr. KLINE, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 4016: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 4031: Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 4040: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 4058: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 4060: Mr. HANNA and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 4092: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 4119: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 4158: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. JONES, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 4162: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 4190: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 4221: Mr. ELLISON and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 4225: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 4229: Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 4250: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 4260: Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 4285: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 4315: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 4316: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 4320: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 4321: Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 4329: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 4342: Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 4351: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. RAHALL

H.R. 4365: Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. MOORE, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 4372: Mr. WELCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 4374: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 4383: Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 4423: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 4433: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 4438: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 4447: Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 4450: Mr. POCAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 4457: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 4471: Ms. MOORE and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 4485: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 4491: Mr. POSEY and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 4504: Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 4510: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. DUFFY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. ROSS, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 4528: Mr. ENYART.

H.J. Res. 5: Mr. LONG.

H.J. Res. 20: Mr. GARAMENDI and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H. Con. Res. 86: Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. GALLEGO.

H. Res. 30: Mr. BARROW of Georgia.

H. Res. 72: Ms. EDWARDS.

H. Res. 190: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California and Mr. VARGAS.

H. Res. 456: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. KIND.

H. Res. 525: Mr. HOLT and Mr. GRAYSON.

H. Res. 538: Mr. POSEY and Mr. WOLF.

H. Res. 540: Mr. VEASEY, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H. Res. 542: Mrs. BACHMANN.

H. Res. 547: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, and Mr. RAHALL.

H. Res. 561: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. YODER, Mr. COOK, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 1, 2014 No. 64

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 Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Gracious God who brought light out of darkness causing the morning to appear, give to our Senators the vigor needed for today's tasks. Lord, protect them from every evil way, empowering them to live with integrity. Keep their bodies fit and healthy, their thinking straight, and their hearts pure. As they strive to serve You, may they accomplish their daily duties with simplicity, uprightness, and faithfulness. Give them the grace of faith by which they may lay hold of things unseen.

We pray in Your sacred 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, May 1, 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.

ENERGY SAVINGS AND INDUSTRIAL COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2014—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 368, S. 2262, the Shaheen-Portman energy efficiency legislation.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 368, S. 2262, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 11:15 a.m., with the time equally divided and controlled. At 11:15 a.m. there will be three rollcall votes, cloture on two U.S. district judges from Maryland and cloture on a U.S. circuit judge for the Tenth Circuit.

At 1:45 p.m. there will be up to four rollcall votes on confirmation of the U.S. district judges in Maryland and the circuit judge.

TRIBUTE TO TERRY GAINER

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there are a number of us who have large families. I have five children and lots of grandchildren, but the person about whom I am going to speak has an even larger family than I have. Terry Gainer has a huge family. He and his wife Irene have 6 children and 14 grandchildren, but that is just the beginning because he has 10 siblings himself.

His family extends far beyond the immediate family I just talked about. As the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, Terry Gainer has taken care of roughly 6,500 people who work in the Senate and all the facilities around here, but that is not the end of it. He is also someone who is concerned and feels responsible for the thousands and thousands of people who come to this building every day. They are also a part of his family. So he has a huge family, and he has nurtured and taken care of his family, from his wife Irene to the thousands of people whom he has never known and never will know who come into this building, and he has done a wonderful job.

Senators and staffers are oftentimes split along ideological lines, but we all agree on one thing: We are utterly dependent on the Sergeant at Arms office, and we are aware of the wonderful job Terry Gainer has done as Sergeant at Arms.

The daily needs of the world's greatest deliberative body are not few in number, and Chief Gainer has been up to this task. As the Sergeant at Arms, he has been responsible for the enforcement of Senate rules as well as the security of the Capitol and Senate office buildings.

I try not to talk about this often, even though I would like to talk about it more than I do. For a number of years of my life I was a police officer. I was a Capitol policeman. I have my badge in my office across the hall from here, and I am very proud of that. I was a Capitol policeman, but today the Capitol policemen who work in this facility and around this great building and all the office buildings have so many more responsibilities than someone who was a police officer during my day.

Every minute of every day we have evil people trying to do harm to these beautiful buildings and the people who work in them. It is the responsibility of the Sergeant at Arms and the Capitol Police—for whom he is responsible—to take care of us, and he has

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

done an admirable job. We are confident in him every day.

Under his leadership, the day-to-day operation of the Senate has never been better, even though we have been through some difficult times with the government shutdown, sequestration, and all of those issues that have been very difficult, but none of this is surprising considering that Terry Gainer has been in public service for almost 50 years.

He was a young homicide detective in Chicago. He comes from Chicago. He did a lot of things as a police officer. He is a lawyer. He has been Chief of the Capitol Police. Over the many years I have seen Chief Gainer—that is what I call him, Chief Gainer. I don't call him Mr. Gainer or Terry, I call him Chief because to me he will always be the Chief of Police of the U.S. Capitol Police Force, for whom he did an admirable job.

I check with the officers often and ask: How are things going? I think that during the time he was the Chief of Police, the positive attitude of the police officers has been significant because of his experience with the bad guys and his ability to do such a good job. They felt very confident in his leadership abilities. He has been a wonderful Sergeant at Arms. Only one of his functions is to take care of the Capitol police.

As his time in the Senate comes to an end, Terry leaves his successor with an organization that has weathered a government shutdown, as I mentioned, a crippling sequestration, and is adequately prepared for the challenges of the future.

I try to be as praiseworthy as I feel is appropriate, but having done that, I know I have not done justice to Terry Gainer. I will truly miss him. I will miss him significantly. He is somebody we can all turn to, and he is very direct; whether it is the latest big problem we had with some issues dealing with the Intelligence Committee and their battles with the CIA, whatever it is, he has the ability to step forward and put out the flames.

I say to Terry Gainer: I am going to miss you. I have great affection for you. I have great confidence in your having a wonderful future. You have experience that very few people in the world have, and I wish you the very best in all of your future endeavors and that of your wife Irene and all the kids.

TRIBUTE TO DARYL CHAPPELLE

Mr. President, not everybody knows the next individual I am about to acknowledge. He has a job in a small part of this great Capitol complex. He is retiring after having been a Senate employee for approximately 40 years. His name is Daryl Chappelle.

When I first came to the Senate, all rides to the office building were in an old train. It was, as they still are, old, old, old. They would crunch and bang as they went along the tracks. The handicapped can't get on those trains. But a Republican Senator from Oklahoma who is now retired and I worked to change that so the train system would not be the old, dilapidated trains, and now all the people coming from Hart and Dirksen are in these beautiful enclosed trains that you can wheel a wheelchair in without any effort whatsoever, and that is wonderful.

There is a person there to help people who travel from the Old Senate Office Building, as it was called when I was there. It is now called the Russell Building. They still have this old train, and Daryl is always there. He is so nice and greets everybody who comes on those trains. We all recognize him when we are trying to get from here to the Russell Building.

He has operated the underground trains that run between the Capitol office buildings for 41 years. He has a smile that covers his whole face. He has a voice that is infectious. You can hear him when he laughs, and we will all miss that.

I join my colleagues in wishing Daryl all the best as he embarks on his much needed and deserved retirement.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority leader is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO TERRY GAINER

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I too want to comment on the great service of Terry Gainer and Daryl Chappelle.

Our departing Sergeant at Arms, Terry Gainer, whose decade-plus period of Senate service has been the capstone to a very long and distinguished career.

Terry is a familiar presence in the halls of the Capitol and always a reassuring one. Whenever you saw Terry, you always had the sense that things were under control around here, even though you knew how much work and preparation went into it. It is the same feeling you might have being around the father of a large family or a veteran big city cop, and I think it is no accident that Terry is both of those as well.

He has the bearing of a guy with long experience who has seen it all. We have all gotten the benefit of that experience over his years here, and that is something that just can't be bought.

Those of you who have watched the majority leader and I spar down here on the floor in the mornings know we don't agree on much, but picking Terry was one decision he got just right.

Terry's resume is pretty well known by now. He spent nearly half a century enforcing the law at the Federal, State, and city levels in a number of very demanding, high-profile posts. He started his law enforcement career in Chicago during the tumultuous year of 1968, making him one of five boys in his family to serve in the Chicago Police Department. That is to say nothing of his extended family. It is a point of pride in the Gainer family that there has been a Gainer on the Chicago PD for more than a century.

Terry volunteered to serve his country in Vietnam and served with distinction. He spent several years as a homicide detective in Chicago before moving over to the State police. He later served as an official at the Transportation Department, and for a time he was No. 2 in the DC Police Department. Somehow along the way he also got a law degree and helped negotiate Chicago's first-ever labor contract with the police union there.

He is the only person ever to serve as both the Chief of the Capitol Police and the Senate Sergeant at Arms. During his tenure as the Senate's top law enforcement officer, he has overseen a dedicated team of 850 professionals. He has presided over major improvements to the physical safety of the Capitol Complex and the Senate's IT infrastructure here and in our State offices. He has kept us all informed during emergencies.

For one night every January, he is the public face of the institution. I know Terry says he tries to get out of camera shot during the State of the Union, but we won't blame a guy with 14 grandkids for sneaking in a little face time on the State of the Union night.

Terry recently admitted to having a few secret signals for the grandkids—sort of like a third base coach. One time, he even got President Obama and the First Lady to pose for a photo with Flat Stanley. It is just one of the fond memories he says he will carry with him into his next chapter, and we wish him all the best.

We will miss his intelligence, his professionalism, and his good humor. Terry's colleagues will tell us that among his many other qualities, he is a lot of fun to be around. We will also miss the wisdom and judgment he brought to the job every morning. Terry leaves a legacy of excellence and a stellar example for his successors.

Let me add on that note that one of the most impressive aspects of Terry's legacy is the fact that despite the incredible demands of a high-pressure, high-profile career, he and Irene managed to raise six wonderful kids. I know they both share a deep and lively faith and would attribute much of their success to that. But it is still impressive, and we are glad the family will get to spend even more time with Terry now.

So, Terry, thanks for your service. You are a credit to your profession, your native Chicago, and to the Senate you have served so well. You have every reason to be proud. Now go enjoy your retirement, at least for awhile.

TRIBUTE TO DARYL CHAPPELLE

Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to another beloved member of the Senate family, Mr. Daryl Chappelle. Daryl has been here for more than four decades, and this week he takes his final turn at the helm of one of the two subway cars that run from Russell to the Capitol.

Daryl came here right out of Springarn High School, over in northeast Washington, when he was 19 years

old, and by all accounts he has been an exemplary worker. He began his career in the night labor division of the Senate superintendent's office in 1972. Since 1986, he has worked off and on as a mechanic and driver for the subway service. By one estimate, he has taken 130,000 trips between Russell and the Capitol.

But it is not the length of Daryl's tenure that I wish to honor this morning, as impressive as that is. It is the spirit in which Daryl did his job every day. It is literally legendary.

The motto of the Architect of the Capitol is to serve Congress and the Supreme Court, preserve America's Capitol, and to inspire memorable experiences, and I think Daryl Chappelle embodies that motto.

First of all, he is the happiest guy you ever met, and he has a genius for lifting people's spirits. One of the stories I heard about Daryl this week came from a woman on my staff. She told me she met Daryl on her very first day here, more than a decade ago, and still remembers it vividly. She had just moved here from Kentucky for an internship. She didn't know her way around, and she was pretty nervous, and it must have shown too because after giving her directions to the office, Daryl not only gave her a big warm smile, he also left her with a message that she has never forgotten. As she stepped off the train and headed off to her first day on the job, Daryl looked at her and said, ''Everything is going to be OK.''

It is a great story, because it not only captures Daryl's spirit, it points to the secret of his success: Daryl is the undisputed champion of making the most of a brief encounter.

He showed us all the power of the small gesture. He reminded us that when all is said and done, what really matters is how we deal with each other. If you didn't happen to find yourself down by the trains this week, you missed something special. People were pretty much tripping over each other to say goodbye to Daryl Chappelle: Senators, visitors, colleagues, locals—everybody saying goodbye. It has been like a rolling party down there all week.

Over the years, through all of these trips, Daryl has had a tremendous impact on this place. Today we want to thank him for warming this place every single day, and for helping our image around here, because Congress may not have a very high approval rating these days, but nobody who ever had the pleasure of riding Daryl's train could ever leave Washington without feeling a little bit better about this place.

Now, Daryl, you may not have had any major pieces of legislation named after you during your years here; reporters may not have snapped photographs of you when you walked down the hall, but at the beginning or the end of the day, you lifted our spirits. You brought us all back to Earth. It is hard to think of this place without you.

We wish you and Pat all the best in your retirement. I know you have been looking forward to spending more time with your bride. Thank you for your service, my friend, and thank you for your wonderful example.

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 11:15 a.m. with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, and with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The assistant majority leader.

HONORING SENATE RETIREES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in the history of the United States of America, we estimate some 500 million people have lived in this great Nation—60 percent of them as of today. But in the history of America, with 500 million people, only 1,950 men and women have been given the opportunity to serve in the Senate, including the Presiding Officer, our newest Senator, from the State of Montana. So 1,950 men and women who have occupied this Chamber in the previous Senate, becoming part of the history of this Nation and contributing to this great institution. I have been fortunate enough to have served with some of the greatest, and I have noted their presence, their impact, and I have noticed their absence too.

When we take stock of the Senate and what it has done for America, what it means to America, it goes way beyond the men and women who occupy these desks. It includes a lot of people who make a contribution to this institution who may never be recognized for it, but, nevertheless, make this the great institution it is, serving this great Nation. Today we honor two of those people.

TRIBUTE TO DARYL CHAPPELLE

First I wish to join in honoring Daryl Chappelle. Daryl, thank you so much for 41 years of service in the Senate. His legendary smile has warmed my spirits on days when I was really down in the dumps. He always had that happy smile, wishing me well. He was always making a person's day a little bit better. Daryl, I want to thank you. Time and time again, I am sure even on days when you weren't so up, you made a point of adding to a positive feeling for everyone—not just Senators and staff but visitors as well. You have been a great part of our Senate family. I wish you the very best in your retirement. We are going to miss you on that rickety old train that runs back and forth between the Russell Building and the Capitol. I wish you the very best.

TRIBUTE TO TERRY GAINER

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I also come to the floor to give special tribute to our Sergeant at Arms, Terry Gainer, who is retiring. If one is not from Chicago and one doesn't know the scene very well, one may not understand what I am about to say. Let me make it clear. When one asks where Terry Gainer is from and someone says Chicago, one would then say: And?

He would add: The South Side.

And?

Beverly.

And?

Saint Barnabas.

When a person reports their parish in that section of Chicago, they have really identified themselves as being part of that great city and part of a great American Catholic tradition—Irish Catholic tradition in many respects—that Terry Gainer represents.

I think about him today and what his life has meant, but first I think of his family name. There aren't many names like the Gainer family name that carry with it so much respect in the city of Chicago. I think of his relatives I have worked with, the families who are related to him that I know, neighbors to staffers—the list goes on and on of the Gainers who have made an impact on the city of Chicago and the State of Illinois. Few can make the claim Terry can make in terms of what he has given to the city, the State of Illinois, and to our Nation.

Terry Gainer, of course, is the Sergeant at Arms today and has announced his retirement soon, after 7½ years serving in that capacity, or at least serving in the Senate with the Capitol Police and with the Sergeant at Arms office. He has served longer than any Sergeant at Arms since World War II. Terry served as Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper since January of 2007. His accomplishments are so many.

Do not underestimate the responsibility that has been given to him and the men and women who work with him. This building is a target for people who would bring destruction to this building and death to those who visit. Sadly, we have seen graphic examples of that in recent years past. It has been Terry's job, both with the Capitol Police and now with the Sergeant at Arms office, to keep us safe and to keep the business of the Senate working every single day.

Terry had the background to achieve it. He volunteered to serve our Nation in Vietnam. After his service, he retired as a captain in the Naval Reserves in the year 2000. He earned his bachelor's degree from St. Benedict's College. He continued his family's proud tradition of law enforcement by serving in the Chicago Police Department for nearly two decades. As Senator MCCONNELL mentioned earlier, over a century of service by the Gainer family to the Chicago Police Department was carried on by Terry. He obtained a master's of science degree and

his law degree from DePaul University. He was appointed superintendent of the Illinois State Police by Governor Jim Edgar and held that position for 7 years. He was then called to Washington, DC, to serve as second in command at the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police Department.

In 2002, Terry became chief of the United States Capitol Police and was instrumental in facilitating the substantial growth of that force in the challenging days following 9/11/2001.

After a brief stint in the private sector, Terry returned to public service when he was appointed by Majority Leader HARRY REID to serve as Sergeant at Arms. HARRY REID, himself a former Capitol Hill policeman, understood the responsibility and understood Terry was the right person for the job.

As I noted earlier, during his tenure as the Sergeant at Arms, Terry has done an exemplary job of balancing security and public access to the Capitol and to the Senate. His steady management hand, his quick smile, his constant presence in the halls of the Capitol and Senate office buildings are going to be greatly missed.

I wish to thank Terry Gainer personally for his friendship, support, the little favors he has done for me and for every Member of the Senate to make our lives and the lives of our family better. You have truly added to this great institution, as much as any person who served because you have made your mark and you have kept us safe and you have kept the millions of visitors during your tenure safe as well.

That is quite an accomplishment, Terry.

Congratulations to you and especially to Irene, who has been patient throughout it all, with her own career and her own effort, raising the family and making her mark professionally. The two of you are quite an example to all of us of public service at its best.

Thanks, Terry, for your service.

And now comes the tough responsibility of following in the steps of Terry Gainer.

Majority Leader REID has announced that Drew Willison, who is in the Chamber here today, will be replacing Terry as the next Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper—officially on Monday.

Drew has spent more than 5 years in two stints as the Deputy Sergeant at Arms, and he has learned from the best—Terry Gainer.

Prior to his work in the Sergeant at Arms office, Drew was a senior member of the Senate Appropriations Committee staff, where we worked together. He had roles in the Energy and Water Subcommittee effort, as well as the Legislative Branch Appropriations. His experience and knowledge of the legislative branch will serve him well in his new capacity.

I congratulate Drew and wish him the very best of luck. Terry's service as Sergeant at Arms has set the bar very high, but I know, Drew, you are up to the challenge.

Mr. President, let me end by thanking again Terry, Irene Gainer, the Gainer family, and all who support them for unselfishly giving to this Senate such an extraordinary contribution—for sharing their husband, father, and grandfather with our home State of Illinois and with this great Nation for so many years.

Terry and Irene have more than earned the right to move to the next chapter in their lives and to celebrate that time with their 6 children and 14 grandchildren.

I congratulate Terry on his distinguished public service career, for his accomplishments as a law enforcement officer, a decorated veteran, and the Senate Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper. Most importantly, I thank Terry for his friendship.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO TERRY GAINER AND DARYL CHAPPELLE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, before he leaves the floor, let me offer my congratulations to the Sergeant at Arms, Terry Gainer, and also my thanks to him for his service to this great institution. We know we will miss him but also wish him well in the next chapter of his life.

Mr. President, I also want to express, as have the majority leader and the Republican leader, my best wishes to Daryl Chappelle, as he leaves after 40 years of service to the U.S. Senate.

There are some people you run into each day who sort of make you feel better and brighten your day, and Daryl was one of those people.

I know we get involved in some pretty tough debates around here, and people sometimes walk around with a scowl on their face, but it is nice when people like Daryl help break that mood and remind us that we are lucky to be alive each day and come to work in such a wonderful place as the U.S. Senate.

I wish both Chief Gainer and Daryl well in the next chapter of their lives.

VA ACCOUNTABILITY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I came to the floor primarily to talk about a very serious matter; that is, our U.S. military and our commitment not only to those who wear the uniform of the military—and, of course, I am aware of the Acting President pro tempore's long distinguished service—but also the solemn obligation we have to our veterans once they leave active-duty status.

They have more than upheld their commitment—in the mountains, in the valleys of Afghanistan, in the deserts of Iraq, and in postings around the world, from Japan, to Korea, to Kuwait, to Israel, to Germany, and all across the globe. Of course, they have joined generations of men and women—the ''greatest generation,'' of which my dad was a member, the World War II generation; and, of course, then those who fought in Korea, in Vietnam, and, of course, the most recent conflicts we have had, which I just mentioned, in Iraq and Afghanistan.

My strong conviction is that we owe a moral obligation, not just a legal obligation, to those veterans, to keep our commitments to them once they separate from military service.

I am sorry to say the Department of Veterans Affairs has repeatedly and outrageously failed to uphold its own commitment to America's Armed Forces and our veterans.

The problem, the way I see it, is we have almost become desensitized because we all know as a result of the drawdown of our military after our exit from Iraq and now Afghanistan we are getting a large number of people retiring from military service, so it is understandable there would be more pressure put on the Department of Veterans Affairs to process these claims, to process these retirements, but what we have learned is there are outrageous examples—for example, in Phoenix, where 40 veterans died because their names were taken off of the appointment system list in order to make the backlog look not as bad as it really was. Many of them had been put on what was called a secret waiting list that was designed to conceal the unconscionably long wait times endured by up to 1,600 sick veterans.

So what I mean when I say I think we have become almost desensitized to this backlog—where more than half of the claims now made with the VA are backlogged, according to the Department of Veterans Affairs' own criteria—it takes something like this, where 40 veterans have died because they were put on a secret waiting list in order to cook the books at the Phoenix VA, to hopefully wake us up and to get us to do something about this outrageous situation.

According to the investigation, high-level officials in the Phoenix VA knew about the secret waiting list, and they did nothing about it. It is even worse than that. Not only did the Phoenix officials tolerate this list, they actually defended it.

A former Phoenix VA doctor told CNN that the list ''was deliberately put in place to avoid the VA's own internal rules.'' That is why I call this a case of cooking the books. To avoid accountability, to avoid solving the problem, they tried to sweep the problem under the rug, and that is outrageous.

One of the victims of the secret waiting list was a 71-year-old Navy veteran named Thomas Breen. In late September, Mr. Breen was rushed to the

Phoenix VA hospital after he became ill. The doctors diagnosed him, knew he had a history of cancer, and they very clearly designated his condition as ''urgent.'' That would indicate Mr. Breen should get another checkup within a week of his visit to the emergency room. Yet Mr. Breen was forced to wait and wait and wait and wait—even as he and his daughter-in-law made daily phone calls to the VA asking about an appointment and emphasizing the urgency of his medical condition. Each time they were told to wait just a little longer. Finally, a full 2 months after his initial ER visit, Mr. Breen passed away. The cause of death was stage 4 bladder cancer.

A week after that the VA finally called with Mr. Breen's appointment—after he died. By then, obviously, it was too late.

Stories such as Mr. Breen's should be a wake-up call to the U.S. Senate. They should be a wake-up call to the White House. They should pierce our sense of moral indignation and say: When are we going to do something about this backlog? When are we going to hold people accountable for cooking the books so that they avoid accountability for a backlog that we all know exists?

So I am suggesting again that the President needs to designate a point person who will come in and deal with this on an emergency basis; it is that serious. The President needs to treat this seriously—not ignore it, not sweep it under the rug—and the Senate needs to treat this with the urgency it deserves as well, which is why I hope the majority leader, who is the person responsible for such things, would designate or ask the committees with jurisdiction to hold emergency hearings to get to the bottom of this because we do not know whether this just happened in Phoenix. Chances are it did not, and I will mention another outrageous example in a minute. We need to know if this is just a local matter or endemic to the whole VA disability and health care system.

In Pittsburgh, we know there have been other problems. Six patients at the VA hospital died, and more than 20 others became sick, after an outbreak of Legionnaires' disease. As in Phoenix, patients at the Pittsburgh facility were kept in the dark about what was going on. It took ''CBS News'' doing an investigation to bring this to the light of day.

''CBS News'' concluded:

> An internal memo shows a top doctor at the hospital knew that Legionella—

Which causes Legionnaires' disease—

> could potentially be in the hospital's water system, and [he] recommended the use of bottled water. Though staff members were told to test patients for Legionnaires' disease if they exhibited certain symptoms, there is no evidence to suggest patients or their families were informed of management's concerns about a potential outbreak.

In other words, they were kept in the dark.

It is scandals such as this and a rampant lack of accountability that have prompted people such as Senator MARCO RUBIO from Florida to introduce legislation that would give the VA Secretary more authority to fire and discipline senior officials for abuses and failures on the job. I think that is a smart move, and I am proud to cosponsor that bill. Because the lack of accountability leading to the problems I have just described is absolutely appalling. It should shock all of us.

The underlying problem, which we have known about—to which I fear Congress and the Federal Government have become desensitized—is there are literally hundreds of thousands of U.S. military veterans who are waiting to have their disability, compensation, and pension claims processed and waiting more than the 125 days the VA calls a backlog.

According to the VA's own figures, in mid-April there were 602,000 compensation and pension claims pending nationwide, and a majority of them had been pending and in the backlog category.

For that matter, there are still 51,000 entitlement claims pending at just two VA regional offices, in Houston and Waco in my State. A majority of those claims are backlogged too.

I know that Congress has taken steps to address the backlog in claims. In the national defense authorization bill from last year, we included some of the provisions which authorized State-based veterans organizations, like those in Texas, to help the Federal Veterans' Administration expedite processing of these backlogged claims. But it is not enough. The evidence from Pittsburgh and the evidence from Phoenix indicates that it is not enough. So we have to do more.

This is not partisan politics. This should not be treated as business as usual. This should be a call to action on the part of the Senate and the Federal Government to live up to its obligations and its commitment to our Nation's veterans.

Just a few concluding words and thoughts about the challenges that face our current generation of military veterans. According to a recent survey, more than half of those who served in Afghanistan and Iraq struggle with some sort of physical or mental health issues stemming from their service. Some of them are relatively minor. Some of them are very serious, indeed. The serious ones have manifested themselves in horrible ways. For example, one out of every two Afghan and Iraq war veterans says they know a fellow servicemember that has either attempted or committed suicide. As I said a moment ago, those who sign up for the U.S. military and our all-volunteer force receive a promise—a promise that if they serve their country, if they can do their part, their country, our country, will do our part.

All they are asking for is us to make good on that promise. Serving America's veterans is one of the most important responsibilities the Federal Government has. The VA's failure to meet its responsibility is an ongoing scandal—one that I will continue drawing attention to until our veterans get the support they so rightfully deserve.

I hope my other colleagues, who I know share this commitment to our veterans, will come to the floor and urge the majority leader to ask the committees with jurisdiction to convene emergency hearings to get to the bottom of this, to find out if what happened in Phoenix and Pittsburgh are isolated events or if this a cancer that is eating away at our VA health care and disability system.

I call upon the President once again to appoint a point person to make sure that we get to the bottom of this as soon as possible because, of course, this is an executive branch function—the veterans health care system. I remember when healthcare.gov was rolled out and the Web site did not work the way the President expected it to. He appointed a point person to help make sure that all hands were on deck and we got to the bottom of the problem as soon as possible. I would think that this scandal in the Veterans' Administration and the way our veterans are being treated would at least equal the same sense of urgency and call for the same sort of response as the failure of the Web site for healthcare.gov.

So I hope our colleagues in the Senate can pull together to come to the service of our veterans in a way that they deserve. I hope the President views this with the kind of urgency that it really deserves and appoints a point person who can get to the bottom of this, working with Congress as quickly as possible so we can meet our obligations to our Nation's veterans.

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.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO DARYL CHAPPELLE

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, before I give my intended remarks, I want to add my voice to others who have paid tribute to Daryl Chappelle, who retires today after 42 years of working in the Senate. I have only been here for 3 years, but I can tell you, in the time that I have been here, I look forward to running into Daryl as I make my trips back and forth between the Russell Senate Office Building and the Senate floor. There are certain people in life who just brighten your day. Every occasion when I have encountered Daryl during the workday, it has just been that experience.

I pay tribute to an individual about whom I don't know a lot personally or of his background or his family. It is a sad thing about the nature of today's busy world in which we don't know people—as I certainly do at home and in hometowns across our country—but I will tell you that the opportunity to be with and experience the conversation and joy that Daryl adds to this place has been a real treat and a wonderful experience for me.

I wish him and his family best wishes in his retirement and thank him for his service to the Senate and to the people of our country.

NOMINATION OF NANCY MORITZ

I rise to tell my colleagues about a nomination we are considering, and I speak in support of Justice Nancy Moritz.

She is currently a supreme court justice on the Kansas Supreme Court, and she is before us today as a nominee to sit on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

I appreciate working with my colleague Senator ROBERTS and those in the White House as we came together to try to find an acceptable and honorable nominee, and I believe we did. I extend my appreciation to Justice Moritz for having agreed to answer the call to serve her country in a new capacity as a member of the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals.

She comes today before the Senate and again on Monday as someone who is highly qualified, greatly prepared, and who has the necessary background. Certainly the educational requirements are there, but the experience that she has encountered in her distinguished legal career, both public and private, really adds a dimension to this person and something that I would look for in a member of the tenth circuit.

For the past 4 years she has been a justice on the Kansas Supreme Court. Prior to that she spent 15 years as an attorney in the U.S. attorney's office in our State in both Kansas City and Topeka. Prior to that she had 6 years of experience in private practice as well.

Justice Moritz was raised in a small neighboring town of mine. Her hometown is Tipton. It is in many ways a typical small Kansas town. I know folks in Tipton would tell me how exceptional they are—and I have seen many instances of how true that is—but I know the people of Tipton. I have witnessed their character, their integrity, their work ethic, their kindness, their care and genuine concern for others. That sense of community you attain when you grow up in a town of just a few hundred people is something I think has great benefit in becoming who we are.

I, in some ways, admire the justice for that background and know what that kind of experience means in molding her character as well as her work ethic and how she conducts herself.

She also served for a period of time as a law clerk to Judge Ed Larson. Ed Larson was a law partner of mine, and he remains a good friend. I called to visit with him about the nomination of Justice Moritz, and I trust his judgment. He not only was a law partner in practice with me—or really I was in practice with him—but he then went to the court of appeals and then was elevated to the Kansas Supreme Court.

Of all the people I have met in life, and certainly many of the attorneys I have met in life and the judges, if you were looking for someone whose opinion and judgment you would trust, Judge Ed Larson is certainly that person. He has made clear to me that Justice Moritz was one of the very best law clerks he ever had, and he believes her to be highly qualified. With his recommendation, my judgment about Justice Moritz was even more increased and enhanced.

Again, I am convinced that her background, growing up the way she did, her experience with Judge Larson and his stamp of approval upon her character and abilities, suggests we have a great person to join the tenth circuit.

I encourage my colleagues to review her qualifications, and I would hope and assume they would reach the same conclusion that I have, that the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals will be well served with this Kansan on it. I look forward to supporting her confirmation, and I ask my colleagues to do the same.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland.

NOMINATIONS OF GEORGE HAZEL AND THEODORE CHUANG

Mr. CARDIN. I rise in support of the nominations of George Hazel and Theodore Chuang to be U.S. district judges for the District of Maryland.

Let me say from the beginning that I am very proud of the manner in which Senator MIKULSKI, the senior Senator from Maryland, and I have established a process to review and make recommendations to the President for the vacancies in the U.S. District of Maryland.

We have used a process that we think works. It gets us the most qualified individuals, and these two today are certainly an example of highly qualified individuals who want to be judges for the right reasons. They have a demonstrated track record of public service.

I particularly appreciate their commitment to pro bono. They understand that the courts need to be open to all and that we have a special responsibility as lawyers and as judges to make sure that there is equal access to justice. They understand the appropriate role of a judge in our system to be objective and to carry out the laws of this land.

George Jarrod Hazel received his B.A. cum laude in 1996 from Morehouse College and his J.D. in 1999 from Georgetown University Law Center. He was nominated to fill the vacancy created by the taking of senior status in May of 2013 by Judge Alexander Williams, Jr.

I might just say Judge Williams had a very distinguished record on the district court.

Mr. Hazel began his legal career in private practice from 1999 to 2004. He then became a government prosecutor as an assistant U.S. attorney in the District of Columbia from 2005 to 2008.

He then joined the Greenbelt, MD, U.S. attorney's office for the District of Maryland. Finally, Mr. Hazel joined the office of the State's attorney for Baltimore City and now serves as the chief deputy State's attorney.

I can attest that being the chief deputy State's attorney in Baltimore City is a demanding position. In his present job, Mr. Hazel helps to oversee 200 prosecutors and 200 support staffers, and he has fought tirelessly to keep our communities safe and make them safer. In fact, he has played a key role in achieving those objectives.

He has demonstrated in his entire career as a lawyer a commitment to public service in each of the positions that he has held. He wants to serve the public, and these are the types of people I would hope we would like to see in our district court.

Mr. Hazel has extensive Federal and State court litigation experience, including civil and criminal matters, as well as jury trials. He has served as a prosecutor, private attorney, and manager of a large legal office.

Mr. Hazel lives in North Potomac with his wife and two children. He is an active member of his community. He is a leader in the Metropolitan Baptist Church of Largo, MD, and in Washington, DC, and has served as a member, trustee, and now as a deacon.

In terms of his pro bono commitment, Mr. Hazel has been president of his church's legal ministry, where he has assisted members of the church, including many who could not afford lawyers, in obtaining legal representation when they are in need.

He also prepares meals at the church and teaches Sunday school classes.

Mr. Chuang was nominated to fill the vacancy created by Judge Roger Titus when he took senior status in January of this year.

Judge Titus had a very distinguished record and continues to have a very distinguished record in our district court.

Mr. Chuang received his J.D. magna cum laude in 1994 from Harvard Law School and his B.A. summa cum laude in 1991 from Harvard University. He began his legal career as a law clerk for Judge Dorothy W. Nelson in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit from 1994 to 1995. From 1995 to 1998, Mr. Chuang served as a trial attorney in the Civil Rights Division of the U.S. Department of Justice. From 1998 to 2004, Mr. Chuang served as an assistant U.S. attorney in the District of Massachusetts. He spent 3 years in private practice from 2004 to 2007.

He served as a deputy chief investigative counsel for the U.S. House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform from 2007 to 2009. In 2009 he became the chief investigative counsel for the Committee on Energy and Commerce in the House of Representatives. Mr. Chuang currently serves as deputy chief counsel of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, where he has worked since 2009.

Like Mr. Hazel, Mr. Chuang has devoted his entire professional career to serving the public. He is very much interested in helping this community and, again, he is the type of individual I hope we would all like to see in our district court.

Mr. Chuang has extensive Federal court litigation experience, both civil and criminal cases, including jury trials. He has served in all three branches of government: as clerk, law clerk, congressional investigative counsel, and agency deputy general counsel. The American Bar Association's Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary gave him a ''well qualified'' rating. You can see that he has the type of experience and type of sensitivity to understand the appropriate role of a district court judge.

Mr. Chuang lives in Bethesda with his wife and his two children. He is an energetic member of his community. In terms of his pro bono work, he has served on the board of directors of the Asian Pacific American Legal Resource Center, a nonprofit legal services organization that serves low-income, limited-English proficient Asian Americans and immigrants in Maryland, Washington, DC, and Virginia, and which provides legal representation and referral services in cases involving domestic violence, family law, immigration law, employment law, and a variety of other areas.

Mr. Chuang also told us that from approximately 2002 to 2003, as president of the Asian American Lawyers Association of Massachusetts, he oversaw and promoted a project of the organization's Community Service Committee to provide a pro bono legal workshop in Boston's Chinatown, at which attorneys provided general information about immigration law, employment law, and other areas of law that may affect the lives of area residents.

He is committed to helping his community, and he has demonstrated that during his entire professional career.

Mr. Chuang's parents emigrated from Taiwan to the United States seeking freedom and opportunity. I would note that if confirmed, Mr. Chuang would not only be the first Asian-American Federal judge in Maryland but also the first Asian-American Federal judge in the Fourth Circuit, covering five States in the Mid-Atlantic and South.

President Obama nominated these two individuals in September of 2013 and the Judiciary Committee held their confirmation hearings in December of 2013. The Judiciary Committee then favorably reported both nominations in January of this year.

I urge the Senate to confirm these very well-qualified nominees and fill these important vacancies to better serve the people of Maryland.

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.

Mr. LEAHY. 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.

JUSTICE FOR ALL REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, last year, the Senate came together to pass meaningful legislation that was supported by victims of violence, law enforcement, and those committed to working to end domestic and sexual abuse. That bill, the Leahy-Crapo Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act, had the support of all Senate Democrats and a majority of Senate Republicans. It cleared the Republican House overwhelmingly and it was signed into law 1 year ago. In a divided Congress, this historic reauthorization was made possible because so many victims and service providers stood together to push for a comprehensive bill.

The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act, which I was proud to co-author with Senator MIKE CRAPO, a Republican from Idaho, strengthens protections on campuses, where far too many students have become victims of devastating violence instead of enjoying the wonderful experience of learning and growth that we all wish for our children. Our bill, which was signed into law last year, ensures that college students are informed of the resources available to them if they are victims of sexual assault or stalking, and of their school's planned response to such crimes.

For women like Laura Dunn, these provisions have real meaning. When many skeptics called for a watered-down VAWA bill to make it easier to pass, champions like Ms. Dunn, a courageous survivor of campus sexual assault, urged us to stand strong for all victims. More than 200 survivors of campus violence at 176 colleges and universities joined her in an open letter to Congress calling for the passage of the Leahy-Crapo VAWA bill. People like her made all the difference in our ability to ultimately pass this important legislation.

One year after its enactment, I am heartened that the Obama administration has begun to implement the Leahy-Crapo VAWA bill and that it announced a series of steps that will help colleges and universities meet new requirements contained in the law. This includes stronger reporting requirements and better training for university officials, more coordination between campus police and local law enforcement, and the implementation of privacy policies to protect the identity of victims. I can remember the horrific scenes I witnessed when I was a prosecutor in Vermont. I can also remember that I never asked a victim about their nationality, immigration status, religion, sexual orientation, or political affiliation. As I have said countless times, a victim is a victim is a victim. Providing a victim with the services they need in a safe and private environment is common sense and I am glad the Obama administration is making the protections Senator CRAPO and I fought for a reality for students across the country.

We cannot stop there, however, and we should be doing even more to protect all victims of crime. That is why I urge my fellow Senators to support the Justice for All Reauthorization Act. This comprehensive and bipartisan legislation was unanimously approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee in October. The Justice for All Reauthorization Act protects victims of crime by providing them with the resources they need and enhancing protections for crime victims. It also helps to prevent and overturn wrongful convictions, and provides law enforcement with the tools and resources necessary to ensure justice for all.

The Justice for All Act reauthorizes the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Reduction Act, which has provided significant funding to reduce the backlog of untested rape kits so that victims need not live in fear while rape kits languish in storage. It also strengthens the Kirk Bloodsworth Post Conviction DNA Testing Grant Program, one of the key programs created in the Innocence Protection Act.

Kirk Bloodsworth was a young man just out of the Marines when he was sentenced to death for a heinous crime that he did not commit. He was the first death row inmate in the United States to be exonerated through the use of DNA evidence. There are certainly others out there like Kirk Bloodsworth now, wrongly convicted, waiting for the day when a DNA test will prove their innocence and set them free. We must never stop trying to improve our imperfect criminal justice system, to bring closure to cases swiftly but accurately, and to correct mistakes when they happen.

The Justice for All Act reauthorizes funding for the Paul Coverdell Forensic Science Improvement Grant Program, which assists laboratories in performing the many forensic tests that are essential to solving crimes and prosecuting offenders.

The Justice for All Reauthorization Act is a bipartisan bill that Senator CORNYN and I introduced nearly 1 year ago. All Senate Democrats support passage of this bill, and it is even cosponsored by the minority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, but it has not passed the Senate because some Senate Republicans object. In the face of this obstruction, some would have us pick

apart pieces of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act, with the hope that we can do the other pieces later. To me, to law enforcement, and to countless victims of crime, this is not acceptable. Just last year, we showed the country it was possible to stand with all victims of domestic and sexual violence when we ignored the critics in the House who tried to divide us. When they told us we could only protect some victims, we refused to let them pit survivors of injustice against one another.

By remaining unified in the face of such efforts, this divided Congress was able to pass a historic Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act that for the first time provided key protections for college students, tribal women, and members of the LGBT community. This year, we should again stand by all victims of crime and do what is right by passing a comprehensive Justice for All Reauthorization Act. We should not let the House of Representatives lessen our resolve to reauthorize public safety programs widely supported by crime victims and law enforcement.

I remain steadfast in my resolve to get this done. I know every Senate Democrat shares this resolve, and I know that law enforcement, civil rights leaders, victims groups, and countless others feel the same way. I hope Senate Republicans will join us to pass meaningful legislation that supports all victims of crime and upholds our system of justice. We should stand united for all victims. I urge all senators, and particularly those in the Republican Caucus, to clear the Justice for All Act without further delay.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa.

NOMINATION OF THEODORE CHUANG

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am going to talk for a few minutes on one of the nominations we have today, the nomination of Theodore Chuang to be district judge for Maryland. This nomination was voted out of committee on a 10-to-8 vote. I opposed the nomination in committee, and I would urge my colleagues to do the same today. I can't support the nomination because of the central role Mr. Chuang played in the administration's persistent and steadfast stonewalling of the congressional investigation into the attack on our diplomatic mission in Benghazi on September 11, 2012. That attack resulted in the first murder of a sitting U.S. Ambassador in over 30 years. Three other brave Americans serving their country were killed in Benghazi as well.

As we all know too well, just hours after the fighting had ended, this administration—in the middle of a Presidential campaign at the time—rushed to blame the attack on an obscure Internet video. The administration denied what was already clear: that what had happened at Benghazi was a premeditated terrorist attack that had nothing to do with any video. The CIA's Libya station chief and other administration officials immediately recognized and reported that the attack was an act of terror, not a spontaneous demonstration. The American people demanded answers. Congress demanded answers as well. But the administration has systematically stonewalled our ability to get those answers. That is where this nominee's role comes into play.

Following the Benghazi attack, Mr. Chuang left his position at the Department of Homeland Security to undertake a special detail at the State Department. His job at the State Department was to provide legal guidance and manage the Department's responses to the congressional investigation into a terrorist attack.

For months the State Department ignored congressional inquiries. That forced the House Oversight & Government Reform Committee to issue subpoenas in August 2013. Mr. Chuang received those duly issued subpoenas but continued the administration's policies of systematic stonewalling.

So let me be very clear. The State Department has never asserted that the emails, the documents or witness interviews conducted by the Benghazi Accountability Review Board are protected by executive privilege. The State Department has never asserted any privilege justifying its refusal to disclose documents responsive to these subpoenas. The State Department has never provided any legal basis whatsoever for its continued stonewalling of this investigation.

So following Mr. Chuang's nomination hearing before our Judiciary Committee, I asked him several questions for the record about why the State Department refused to comply with its legal obligation to respond to the subpoenas. Mr. Chuang, who was in charge of coordinating the State Department's responses, couldn't come up with a legal basis. Instead, he cited only ''institutional concerns.''

That ought not be a good enough answer for what is a legitimate role of oversight by the Congress, trying to get answers to legitimate questions. In other words, abstract ''institutional concerns'' does not permit the executive branch to toss a congressional subpoena into the garbage.

Benghazi raises questions of vital national importance that to this very day remain unanswered. They remain unanswered because this administration refuses to honor its legal obligations to comply with the congressional oversight that is being done through the extraordinary measure of subpoena. The American people deserve better and so do we. We are members of coequal branches of the Federal Government.

But the Benghazi scandal isn't simply going to go away. In fact, just this week additional emails came to light demonstrating that the White House led a coordinated messaging effort on Benghazi from the very beginning.

This is what one of the emails said: It was the administration's goal ''to underscore that these protests are rooted in an Internet video and not a broader failure of policy.''

That quotation is from an email sent by the administration's Deputy National Security Advisor on September 14, 2012—2 days after the attack. That email was sent even though officials on the ground in Libya had reported that the attack was an act of terror.

Some have called this email the smoking gun, proving that the administration intentionally misled the American people about the terrorist attack, but no matter how this email is characterized, it was clearly responsive to congressional subpoenas and does not seem to have been produced until a government watchdog group filed a Freedom of Information lawsuit seeking to compel the administration to comply.

So let me be clear. From what we know now, it took a Freedom of Information Act request and an ensuing lawsuit to force the State Department to produce documents that were obviously related to the terror attack at Benghazi, and this is the case even though the House committee made multiple requests for those documents and then issued subpoenas compelling their production.

I am sure Mr. Chuang thought he was doing his duty to zealously represent his client when he was managing the document subpoenas the State Department received from Congress, but his role in coordinating administrative responses was plainly unsatisfactory and unacceptable and something that goes against the grain of an administration that on day two of their administration—in other words, January 21, 2009—said this was going to be the most transparent administration in the history of the country.

We should demand more and expect more respect for congressional oversight. For this reason I have decided to oppose this nomination, a nomination that was reported out of committee on a 10-to-8 vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the nominations related to the cloture vote of Theodore Chuang and George Hazel.

Senator CARDIN and I are recommending these two outstanding men to serve on the U.S. district court in Maryland. Senator CARDIN and I are proud to nominate these men because of the outstanding qualities they will bring to the Federal bench in Maryland that has had a long and distinguished career of absolutely fantastic judges.

We have before us two Maryland judges who will be taking a different status—Judge Titus and Judge Williams. Judge Williams served in the Southern District of the Maryland Federal court—and we salute those two for

their outstanding service. On another day I will say what a great job they have done.

Senator CARDIN and I take our responsibilities for recommending to the President the people of the highest caliber to serve as judges. We believe very strongly in the concept of an independent judiciary, people who will bring to the bench absolute integrity, judicial competence and temperament, a commitment to the core constitutional principles that have made our country great, and also though a history of civic engagement in Maryland—because a judge is not how many Law Review articles they write but can they administer equal justice and continue to honor equal protection under the law. Mr. Chuang and Mr. Hazel meet and exceed these standards.

Mr. Hazel comes with an incredible background. He served as an assistant U.S. attorney to the district court of Maryland. He has been the southern division coordinator on tough issues such as Project Exile, a Federal-State partnership addressing gun and violent crimes in Prince George's County and surrounding areas. He spent 5 years in private practice at Weil, Gotshal & Manges. He is also a man of faith, involved deeply in his church, Metropolitan Baptist Church, where he serves as a deacon.

Most recently, he has worked with the Baltimore State's attorneys office. The Baltimore State's attorney's office faced a lot of challenges. It faced dated technology and difficulties in maintaining chain of custody on evidence. He came in to work with our new State's attorney, which is an elected position, and he is a real reformer. So whether you were a prosecutor or you were a defendant, you knew it was going to be one of the best well-organized offices in Maryland.

Hazel brought that kind of know-how to make sure the apparatus of government worked because that was all part of making sure people got equal justice: Did we have the right guy when we were a prosecutor? Did we have the right evidence? Did the prosecutor have the right tools? Did the public defender or their private counsel have the opportunity to provide the defense of them? We have been able to do that. Also, working in his church he has shown he has been available to provide all kinds of pro bono services.

He is a graduate of a distinguished law school and he is a Morehouse man. I think when he takes the Federal bench and takes that oath, we are going to be proud of the service he does.

Then there is Mr. Chuang, the one who has been under dispute today. Gosh, I wish the whole Senate could meet him as well as Mr. Hazel. This is a new generation coming into the Maryland Federal judiciary. Mr. Chuang's parents and his own story is that of the American dream.

Mr. Chuang's parents came with practically nothing from Taiwan seeking the American dream and a better life for their family. He worked very hard and then went on to some of our most distinguished schools. He went to Harvard Law School and Harvard University. He was a summa cum laude undergraduate and named by Time magazine as one of the high achievers. At Harvard, he was with the Law Review. But as I said, it is not how many Law Review articles one writes; it is, do they right wrongs in our society.

Yes, he has served at the U.S. Department of Homeland Security; yes, he has worked in government positions; yes, he has worked in private practice at Wilmer Cutler; yes, he has been at the Department of Justice; and, yes, he did provide legal counsel to the State Department. I am going to talk about that.

First of all, I am kind of tired of this Benghazi witch hunt stuff, but I am not going to go into that. I respect my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Congress has a right to oversight.

But let me make the record clear: Mr. Chuang's role during his temporary assignment was as legal counsel providing legal advice and representation to his client. His client was the State Department. Although he provided legal advice related to the House Committee on Oversight & Government Reform, he did not have decisionmaking authority over whether to provide subpoenaed documents to the committee. That was at higher levels. If the committee had a beef with the State Department, they should have taken it up with the Secretary of the State, which I know they did.

During his 6-month detail, the State Department produced a vast majority of documents and witnesses requested by the HOGR.

In the case of the subpoena in question—which was for internal files of the independent Accountability Review Board that conducted the Benghazi investigation—the State Department agreed to produce most of the documents but has to date declined to produce memoranda of interviews of State Department personnel because disclosure of those witness statements may chill cooperation in future ARBs. Although State offered to discuss alternative means of serving the committee's request, the House Committee on Oversight & Government Reform has not actively engaged the State Department on this since the fall of 2013.

Opposition to Mr. Chuang's nomination will have no impact on whether the State Department produces the documents, and he is not a State Department employee.

So I respect my colleagues for wanting to have cooperation. I don't dispute whether they have a legitimate grievance. I leave that in that field and domain, but I would say Mr. Chuang's role was that of a civil servant, providing advice to the leadership of the State Department on this matter. Then the State Department's job, at its highest level, was to negotiate with the House Committee on Oversight & Government Reform, chaired by Mr. ISSA and the ranking member, our very good colleague Congressman CUMMINGS of Baltimore.

So if we are going to vote against Chuang because the Secretary of State did or did not do something, I think we have other problems.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I ask for 1 additional minute to summarize.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. If we continue to attack people because of the job they did for which they had no decision about, we are going to have a chilling effect on who comes into government.

If these two men whom I am recommending and whom the President has nominated were in private practice, they could be making hundreds of thousands of dollars. Because these two men are duty-driven, with outstanding educations, backgrounds, and experience, they have chosen public service. I hope the Senate chooses them to serve on the Federal bench. This body is going to be very proud of them the way Senator CARDIN and I are in bringing them to the floor's attention. I urge that we invoke cloture.

I yield the floor and ask that we follow regular order.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Theodore David Chuang, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Elizabeth Warren, Robert Menendez, Barbara Mikulski, Jack Reed, Richard Blumenthal, Carl Levin, Christopher Murphy, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Sheldon Whitehouse, Patty Murray, Thomas R. Carper, John D. Rockefeller IV, Jeff Merkley, Richard J. Durbin, Benjamin L. Cardin.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today, we are again voting to overcome Republican filibusters of three highly qualified judicial nominees. Republicans

continue to refuse to consent to vote on much needed judges to our Federal Judiciary. We currently stand at 80 vacancies and have not had fewer than 60 vacancies since February 2009, at the beginning of President Obama's first term. For most of President Obama's tenure in office, judicial vacancies have continued to hover around 80 and 90 because of Senate Republican obstruction. Nevertheless, Senate Republicans continue to object to votes on these nominations. This includes the three nominations that we are voting on today.

Nancy Moritz has been nominated to serve on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit. Justice Moritz is currently a justice on the Kansas Supreme Court, where she has been serving since 2011. Prior to joining the Kansas Supreme Court, she was an appellate judge on the Kansas Court of Appeals from 2004 to 2011. Before becoming a judge, Justice Moritz spent nearly ten years as an assistant U.S. attorney in the Kansas City and Topeka offices. From 1989 till 1995, she was an associate at Spencer, Fane Britt & Browne, LLP in Kansas City and Overland Park. From 1987 to 1989, she served as a law clerk to the Honorable Patrick F. Kelly, U.S. District Court for the District of Kansas. Justice Moritz has the support of her Republican home state senators, Senator ROBERTS and Senator MORAN. She was also reported from the Judiciary Committee unanimously by voice vote on January 16, 2014.

Theodore Chuang has been nominated to serve on the U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland. Since 2009, Mr. Chuang has served in the Office of General Counsel at the Department of Homeland Security. He currently serves as deputy general counsel and as counsel on detail to the U.S. Department of State. Previously, Mr. Chuang served as the chief investigative counsel for the House Committee on Energy and Commerce and the deputy chief investigative counsel for the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reforms from 2007 to 2009. From 2004 to 2007, Mr. Chuang worked in private practice as a counsel at the law firm Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP. Prior to that, Mr. Chuang served as an assistant U.S. attorney, Criminal Division, for the District of Massachusetts from 1998 to 2004 and as a trial attorney in the Housing and Civil Enforcement Section of the Justice Department from 1995 to 1998. Upon graduating from Harvard Law School, magna cum laude, Mr. Chuang served as a law clerk to Judge Dorothy W. Nelson on the Ninth Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals from 1994 to 1995.

Mr. Chuang has the support of his home State Senators, Senator MIKULSKI and Senator CARDIN. He was voted out of the Judiciary Committee on a 10–8 vote on January 16, 2014. During the committee vote, the ranking member urged others to vote ''No'' based on the fact that Mr. Chuang has been serving on temporary detail to the State Department and has been working with the agency to assist in its response to the ongoing congressional investigation into Benghazi. The ranking member argued that because the administration has refused to turn over interview notes and summaries that he would vote ''No'' on Mr. Chuang's nomination. This appears to be a case where Mr. Chuang is being held responsible for the decisions of the administration not to turn over the documents when it was not his decision to make. Moreover, Mr. Chuang has responded to the ranking member's Question for the RECORD on this issue fully and forthrightly, and nothing in those responses indicates that Mr. Chuang has conducted himself improperly in any way. Mr. Chuang is a superbly qualified attorney with an impeccable background, and should be supported by the entire Senate.

George Hazel has been nominated to the U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland. Since 2010, he has served as the chief deputy State's attorney for the office of the Maryland State's attorney for Baltimore City. Prior to taking this position, he was an assistant U.S. attorney for the district of Maryland from 2008 to 2010 and for the District of Columbia from 2005 to 2008. From 1999 to 2004, Mr. Hazel also served in private practice at the law firm Weil, Gotshal and Manges, LLP. An experienced trial counsel, Mr. Hazel has tried approximately 50 cases to verdict. Mr. Hazel also has the support of his home State senators, Senator MIKULSKI and Senator CARDIN. He was reported from the Judiciary Committee unanimously by voice vote on January 16, 2014.

All three of these nominees have the experience, judgment, and legal acumen to be terrific judges in our Federal courts. Let us end these unnecessary filibusters. I thank the majority leader for filing cloture petitions and I hope my fellow Senators will join me today to end these filibusters so that these nominees can get working on behalf of the American people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Theodore David Chuang, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 124 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Baldwin	Harkin	Murphy
Begich	Heinrich	Murray
Bennet	Heitkamp	Nelson
Blumenthal	Hirono	Pryor
Booker	Johnson (SD)	Reed
Boxer	Kaine	Reid
Brown	King	Sanders
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cardin	Landrieu	Schumer
Carper	Leahy	Shaheen
Casey	Levin	Stabenow
Coons	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Donnelly	Markey	Udall (NM)
Durbin	McCaskill	Walsh
Feinstein	Menendez	Warner
Franken	Merkley	Warren
Gillibrand	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Hagan	Murkowski	Wyden

NAYS—43

Alexander	Fischer	Moran
Ayotte	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Chambliss	Heller	Rubio
Coats	Hoeven	Scott
Coburn	Inhofe	Sessions
Cochran	Isakson	Shelby
Collins	Johanns	Thune
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Cornyn	Kirk	Vitter
Crapo	Lee	Wicker
Cruz	McCain	
Enzi	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—3

Boozman	Rockefeller	Tester

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 54, the nays are 43. The motion is agreed to.

NOMINATION OF THEODORE DAVID CHUANG TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Theodore David Chuang, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, has the clerk reported the nomination?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination has been reported.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of George Jarrod Hazel, of Maryland, to be

United States District Judge for the District of Maryland.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Elizabeth Warren, Robert Menendez, Barbara Mikulski, Jack Reed, Richard Blumenthal, Carl Levin, Christopher Murphy, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Sheldon Whitehouse, Patty Murray, Thomas R. Carper, John D. Rockefeller IV, Jeff Merkley, Richard J. Durbin, Benjamin L. Cardin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of George Jarrod Hazel, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 55, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 125 Ex.]

YEAS—55

Baldwin	Harkin	Murray
Begich	Heinrich	Nelson
Bennet	Heitkamp	Pryor
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reed
Booker	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Boxer	Kaine	Rockefeller
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Landrieu	Shaheen
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Levin	Udall (CO)
Collins	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Coons	Markey	Walsh
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	Menendez	Warren
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Franken	Mikulski	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murkowski	
Hagan	Murphy	

NAYS—42

Alexander	Fischer	McConnell
Ayotte	Flake	Moran
Barrasso	Graham	Paul
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Burr	Hatch	Risch
Chambliss	Heller	Roberts
Coats	Hoeven	Rubio
Coburn	Inhofe	Scott
Cochran	Isakson	Sessions
Corker	Johanns	Shelby
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Crapo	Kirk	Toomey
Cruz	Lee	Vitter
Enzi	McCain	Wicker

NOT VOTING—3

Boozman	Sanders	Tester

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 55, the nays are 42. The motion is agreed to.

NOMINATION OF GEORGE JARROD HAZEL TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of George Jarrod Hazel, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield back all time before the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Nancy L. Moritz, of Kansas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Dianne Feinstein, John D. Rockefeller IV, Debbie Stabenow, Barbara Mikulski, Carl Levin, Benjamin L. Cardin, Tom Harkin, Amy Klobuchar, Barbara Boxer, Patty Murray, Jack Reed, Robert Menendez, Sheldon Whitehouse, Christopher A. Coons, Richard J. Durbin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Nancy L. Moritz, of Kansas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 60, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 126 Ex.]

YEAS—60

Ayotte	Hagan	Murphy
Baldwin	Harkin	Murray
Begich	Heinrich	Nelson
Bennet	Heitkamp	Pryor
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reed
Booker	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Boxer	Kaine	Roberts
Brown	King	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Sanders
Cardin	Landrieu	Schatz
Carper	Leahy	Schumer
Casey	Levin	Shaheen
Coburn	Manchin	Stabenow
Collins	Markey	Udall (CO)
Coons	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	Menendez	Walsh
Durbin	Merkley	Warner
Feinstein	Mikulski	Warren
Franken	Moran	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murkowski	Wyden

NAYS—38

Alexander	Flake	McConnell
Barrasso	Graham	Paul
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Burr	Hatch	Risch
Chambliss	Heller	Rubio
Coats	Hoeven	Scott
Cochran	Inhofe	Sessions
Corker	Isakson	Shelby
Cornyn	Johanns	Thune
Crapo	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Cruz	Kirk	Vitter
Enzi	Lee	Wicker
Fischer	McCain	

NOT VOTING—2

Boozman	Tester

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 60, the nays are 38. The motion is agreed to.

NOMINATION OF NANCY L. MORITZ TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Nancy L. Moritz, of Kansas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask unanimous consent that the time until 1:45 p.m. be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, the Highway Trust Fund is a vital resource for States to tackle much-needed transportation projects. But right now that trust fund is running on fumes. States from Vermont to California and many in between are rethinking their plans for construction because of funding uncertainty in the Highway Trust Fund. One example is New Mexico. Their State officials are starting to ramp up construction plans for Interstate 25 in Albuquerque. That project has been a high priority for city officials for a number of years. Once it is completed, it is going to reduce traffic and improve safety. That is vital for that area. But right now State officials in New Mexico have said they are concerned about Federal funding for that project and it now might be in jeopardy.

That is not an isolated case. The trust fund supports transportation projects across our entire country. It eases congestion for our commuters and for businesses that need to move their goods efficiently and quickly. It funds safety initiatives and construction that improves our roads and bridges. It sparks job creation for American workers.

But the Department of Transportation now says that trust fund will not be able to keep up with its payments to States as soon as this summer. This crisis is right around the corner. Many States are now planning for worst-case scenarios. In fact, the State of Missouri has stopped planning for

new projects. In Colorado, a State official has said: Without these funds, major projects probably will not be completed or ever get underway.

Arkansas has begun planning several projects to replace old bridges and widen highways and repair roads, but now, their transportation officials have put 10 projects on hold because of this looming crisis.

Construction is at its height during our summer months. So if the Highway Trust Fund hits a crisis in the next few months, we could potentially see a construction shutdown, meaning workers are going to be left without paychecks.

That could add up to 10,000 jobs in Florida, according to the President of the Florida Transportation Builders Association. Across the country, failing to shore up our Highway Trust Fund could cost more than 180,000 jobs in fiscal year 2015. That is according to an analysis from the Center for American Progress.

In Kentucky, Governor Steve Beshear summed it up by telling reporters: ''We can't afford for the Highway Trust Fund to go insolvent.'' States and workers are counting on us to solve this. I am hopeful that we can replenish the Highway Trust Fund in a bipartisan way. In fact, House Republican DAVE CAMP, who chairs the Ways and Means Committee, has proposed using corporate revenue to replenish the Highway Trust Fund.

President Obama's Grow America Act also calls for corporate revenue to address this crisis and make important investments in our infrastructure. That approach makes a lot of sense. Closing wasteful loopholes so we can create jobs here at home would be good for our workers, good for our economy, and it would make our broken tax system fairer in the process. I am here today to say I am hoping that Republicans will come to the table willing to close just a few corporate loopholes so we can avoid an unnecessary crisis in our Highway Trust Fund, so that we can give our States more certainty to plan and we can help spark job growth in the summer.

But if Republicans are not willing to work with us, they are going to have to explain why egregious corporate tax loopholes are more important than workers in our construction industry and more important than drivers and businesses that rely every day on safe roads and bridges.

I am here to say and to warn that construction projects are at risk across our country. Another example happens to be in New Hampshire, where construction crews have been working on a major project to widen Interstate 93. That project was designed to ease congestion and improve safety. Last month the State transportation commissioner said the project could be stalled and thrown off schedule if Congress does not resolve the Highway Trust Fund crisis. He said, ''Any hiccup in federal funding could have a negative impact on the ending.''

For many States this looming crisis is already a reality. We have to act now. So let's show our States that together we will continue to invest in projects that help drivers and help businesses move their goods, and let's show the American people that Congress can work together to ensure vital transportation construction projects will move forward this summer. Let's shore up that Highway Trust Fund and avoid this unnecessary and totally preventable crisis.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COONS. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE

Mr. COONS. Madam President, I come to the floor today to speak about the corrupting power of money in our national politics and the tragic impact of a whole series of decisions by the Supreme Court that has steadily strengthened that power.

Over the last 40 years a bipartisan coalition in this body and bipartisan coalitions in Congress have come together behind commonsense measures that actually succeeded in limiting the power of money in politics. Most recently, back in 2002, a bipartisan coalition in this Chamber led by Senators JOHN MCCAIN and Russ Feingold, Republican and Democrat, took a few steps to effectively limit the use of so-called ''soft money'' and to ban special interests from pouring money into national elections in the month or two before Election Day.

As actual elected representatives, their perspective as Members of Congress who enacted that legislation was informed by their real experience as public officials who have run and won elections and who have written, fought for, and passed actual legislation.

Since Members of this Chamber, Members of this Congress, have seen and experienced the corrosive effect of money every day, Congress, in my view, should be given great deference when it has been able to transcend partisan division and put in place commonsense protections.

Yet over the past few years a bare majority on the current Supreme Court has, in decision after decision, dismantled many of those critical protections and shows no signs of stopping.

In doing so, this Court's decisions display a significant and stunning naivete about how our political system actually works and how it is continuing to change and as a result have brought us closer to a world where, as a recent New Republic piece argues, ''millionaires and billionaires speak loudly and the rest of us do the listening.''

Most recently, in a 5-to-4 decision, the Supreme Court struck down a limit that has stood since 1971, when Congress passed the Federal Elections Campaign Act, on total campaign donations anyone may make in the same election cycle.

Before this recent Supreme Court ruling, individuals couldn't give more than $117,000 between candidates and party committees. After the ruling, that limitation has been swept away, and there is nothing to stop a wealthy donor, an ultrawealthy donor, from contributing to every Federal race each election cycle.

Some here have cheered the decision as upholding the First Amendment and free speech, but in my view, when you are able to spread around hundreds of thousands of dollars in donations to dozens and dozens of candidates in a coordinated way, you are not speaking, you are coming dangerously close to buying.

For ultradonors, the reality is not just about making their voices heard. Under existing Supreme Court precedent under these recent decisions, there is no limit on anybody's ability to spend whatever amounts he or she wishes to conduct actual speech, to buy newspaper ads, buy television spots, or even to make a politically motivated movie.

The reality is it is about trying to control more and more of the legislative agenda of this Congress and more and more of the direction of our government.

In McCutcheon, this recently decided case, the Supreme Court hasn't just enabled speech, it has made it dramatically easier for the wealthiest and the special interests they represent to hedge their bets by diversifying their political portfolio. It has more in common, sadly, with Wall Street investment strategies than with the free speech rights envisioned by our Founders at the Constitutional Convention.

Frankly, I think the Founders would not recognize our political system today and the increasingly harsh influence of big-money donors in our overall national political scene.

Together with the Citizens United decision of the Supreme Court of 5 years ago, we see the truly dangerous implications of the decisions rendered. One of the boldest decisions I have ever seen—Citizens United, with another 5–4 decision—killed off nearly half of that bipartisan compromise bill of 2002 of McCain-Feingold by allowing corporations and other special interests to anonymously fund campaign ads in the months before an election.

In doing so, as Justice Stevens wrote in a dissent, the Supreme Court ''relied largely on individual dissenting opinions. . . . blaz[ing] through our precedents [and] overruling or disavowing a body of case law.''

Justice Stevens noted that to do so the Court decided a question the parties did not present directly to it, saying:

Essentially, five justices were unhappy with the limited nature of the case brought

before us, so they changed the case to give themselves an opportunity to change the law.

I understand this is a dissent, but a dissent that I think should draw our attention to the direction these two vital, difficult Court decisions are taking this Nation.

Soon after the Supreme Court extended these rules to State campaign finance laws as well. In combination these two decisions, McCutcheon and Citizens United, have brushed aside important bipartisan legislation that was designed to prevent corruption of the political branches and to provide Americans some level of confidence that their voices, not just those of the ultrawealthy and powerful, mattered to their elected representatives. We have all seen the impact of this decision, of Citizens United in particular, as commercials by groups nobody has ever heard of, funded by donors who can remain in the dark, have flooded the airwaves of our election years ever since.

Earlier I mentioned that these two decisions show a stunning naivete about how politics in our modern world really works. Let me be clear I don't say this because the Supreme Court overturned a law that Congress passed. It is the Court's job to be a check on Congress to defend our fundamental freedoms in the face of congressional overreach or improvident action. But in the McCutcheon decision, the Court overturned a core holding of its own previous decision in Buckley v. Valeo, the case it purports to apply. As Justice Breyer wrote in dissent in McCutcheon, the Court's holding:

> understates the importance of protecting the political integrity of our governmental institutions. It creates a loophole that . . . taken together with Citizens United . . . eviscerates our Nation's campaign finance laws, leaving a remnant incapable of dealing with the grave problems of democratic legitimacy that those very laws were intended to resolve.

For instance, in the Court's decisions, it consistently refers to traditional political corruption as quid pro quo corruption, corruption of the sort where a specific contribution is made for a specific vote or action in arguing that campaign donations and political spending or speech have shown no signs of leading to corruption. The majority argues that campaign giving and the ''general gratitude'' that a candidate or elected official may feel is not the same thing as quid pro quo corruption in the sense of directly buying votes or action in the Congress.

But as Justice Breyer notes in his opinion in McCutcheon in the dissent, the majority's:

> narrow view of corruption . . . excludes efforts to obtain ''influence over access to elected officials or political parties.''

Every single Member of this body and every Member of the House of Representatives knows that to be true and knows this influence to be pernicious. Let me give an example. As many of my colleagues would attest, hanging over everything we do is the shadow of anonymous big-money ads getting dropped into the airwaves out of nowhere in the last weeks before an election, and it influences, in pervasive and corruptive ways, decisions made in this body week in and week out.

Of course, tough opposition ads are nothing new. Robust debates in campaign season go back to the very first campaigns of this Republic. As politicians, we all welcome the opportunity to those who engage to disagree with them. That is an important and healthy part of our democracy, and every citizen should have the right to voice their opposition to me or to any Member.

But what is a huge problem is the fact that nobody knows who is behind these ads, making it easier for any wealthy individual or corporation to pour an unlimited amount of money into a race behind completely false attacks. Because the donor is often in the dark, there is no way for the public to know who the claims are coming from or whether they are credible.

That is why in this Chamber folks in my caucus, Democrats, have repeatedly argued for our taking up and passing the DISCLOSE Act, which would require third-party ads to say who funded them so that citizens can reach their own conclusions.

This is an increasingly difficult problem for our country. In the 2010 election cycle, super PACs spent more than $62 million nationally. Through the 2012 cycle, outside groups spent an incredible $457 million on House and Senate races. So far in this cycle they have already raised and spent more than $200 million.

The result is that every campaign has to do more and more fundraising so they have the resources to rebut the claims made in these negative ads with concealed donors. That means more time on the phone or at fundraisers, traveling around the country, organizing and carrying out fundraising activities rather than engaging with our constituents and diving into details of policy. It is even worse in the House where the daily demands in their 2-year cycle are even more difficult.

Let me offer one brief statistic. In the average winning Senate race in 2012, it cost $10 million, which means the winning Senator had to raise $4,600 every single day over a 6-year term.

That is time not spent on solving the real issues facing our country. That is an unbelievable amount of time dedicated to fundraising, and it just doesn't end, whether the term is 2 or 6 years.

I know I have it relatively easy, little to complain about. Compared to my colleagues I come from a small State. The very modest amount we have to raise in a competitive race in Delaware pales in comparison to much larger States with much more expensive media markets, but it is a problem for this entire body and this entire country.

Let me offer one last example of concretely why this matters. As we debate in the Senate, the other party complains about the absence of opportunities to offer amendments and the lack of a robust and open amendment process. One of the reasons we often do not take to the floor and vote on competitive, compelling amendments is the concern that they will then become the subject of last-minute, aggressive, targeted campaign ads funded by undisclosed donors. Rather than being a Chamber of honest, open, and free debate, the shadow of secret money turns policymaking into a beacon of risk aversion. Policymaking gets paralyzed and this serves no one.

Although it is not an example of corruption in the quid pro quo sense that the Supreme Court so narrowly focuses on, money does corrode the public trust and steadily corrupts this system in a thousand different ways. The irony of this all is that we badly need an honest discussion about the impact of big spending and fundraising on our political system. At this point I believe we badly need fundamental changes to redirect the decisions and the attention of the Supreme Court.

Buckley v. Valeo, the 1976 decision by the Court that equated political contributions and money with speech, in my view needs to be revisited. Senator UDALL of New Mexico has introduced a constitutional amendment that, in my view, restores the balance of that original law and decision, and it is one that I strongly support. By bending backward to declare anything that corporations or the ultrawealthy wish to do with their money the equivalent of speech, today's Court, in my view, rather than strengthening speech, has weakened it for the millions of Americans who cannot afford to play in this new system.

At a time of growing economic inequality, that concerns me more and more because this new political inequality threatens the very foundations of our democracy.

Noting the presence of two other colleagues, I would ask if I might have the forbearance of two brief speeches recognizing Delawareans.

I appreciate the forbearance of my colleagues and would like to take a few minutes to recognize two great Delawareans.

TRIBUTE TO HARRY GRAVELL

I wish to recognize Harry Gravell.

Right now in Wilmington, DE, friends will be coming to celebrate Harry, who is retiring from his long leadership role of the Delaware Building Trades Council after a lifetime dedicated to workers and our Nation.

I first got to know him in my service on the county council in New Castle County, where he gave me very helpful, very insightful advice, and was a constant source of encouragement and support.

Don't get me wrong. He didn't always agree with me. He didn't always support me. With Harry you got a straight shot. You got exactly what he thought and nothing less. You always knew

where he stood even if he disagreed with you. He is transparent, he is honest, and you know why he believes what he believes.

He is not only a great friend but a great father. We were both honored in 2012 by the Delaware chapter of the American Diabetes Association as fathers of the year. Harry is the proud father of two: Jayme and Dee, and grandfather of three: Makayla, Avery, and Lily.

Harry's life story is one of determination and service. He never gives up, especially when he puts his mind to something. From an early age he knew the value of hard work. For high school he went to the Salesianum School, a great school in our community, and worked his way through school to make sure he could afford a great education.

A Vietnam veteran, he served our country in wartime. Since he came home, he has never stopped fighting for working families and veterans, and I was particularly proud to work with him in his role in the Sprinkler Fitters Union, then on the Building Trades Council on Helmets to Hardhats, on offering training and real job opportunities to returning veterans.

If you know Harry, you have seen his drive up close. You have seen him fight through thick and thin for his workers, his family, and our community.

But perhaps the greatest example of his sheer will was his most recent fight. He suffered a stroke a few months ago. Doctors read him a long list of things he was never going to do. Harry scoffed. Digging in, as he has his entire life, he finished his physical and occupation therapy faster than doctors thought he could. He has just finished building a house in Lewes. Everyone who knows him I believe will agree with me that he deserves the years he will now get to spend on the beautiful beaches of Delaware.

REMEMBERING JAMES WILCOX BROWN

Let me last briefly offer a tribute to a lifelong friend and mentor, James Wilcox Brown of Newark, DE. He set sail on April 24 at the age of 65. The gentle determination and unconditional kindness with which he lived his life inspired all around him, including his family, his friends, and this junior Senator from Delaware.

Jim graduated from Salesianum School, the University of Delaware, and the Washington and Lee University School of Law. He worked as legal counsel for W.L. Gore & Associates for 36 years. He served as a member of the U.S. Army Judge Advocate General Corps for 26 years, retiring as colonel.

His tireless community service was broad and deeply felt. I was proud to be able to appoint him to the Delaware Service Academy Selection Board.

He is survived by his wife Peggy and their four wonderful children: Genevieve, Hilary, William, Mary Ellen, and six grandchildren. I simply wanted to add my voice to so many who will deeply miss this patriot, this great lawyer, this centered, thoughtful, kind man, and this personal friend who helped teach me the importance of humility and of a commitment to excellence.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

ARKANSAS STORM

Mr. PRYOR. I come to the floor with a psalm and a story. The psalm I want to read is one of the most famous passages in all of Scripture. In times such as this that Arkansas has been through, a lot of people go to Ecclesiastes or one of the gospels, but I want to read Psalms 23—and I will tell you why in a moment.

The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want.

He maketh me to lie down in green pastures: he leadeth me beside the still waters.

He restoreth my soul: he leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for his name's sake.

Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff they comfort me.

Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies; thou anointest my head with oil; my cup runneth over.

Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life, and I will dwell in the house of the Lord forever.

Madam President, on Sunday, April 27, 2014, at about 7:06 p.m., a tornado touched down right on the Saline and Pulaski County lines, just west of Little Rock. It stayed on the ground for about an hour, crossed the Arkansas River, crossed right near a little town called Mayflower. The weather service now tells us it was an EF–4. That means it had a wind speed of up to 190 miles per hour—190 miles per hour. We lost 15 Arkansans, and we will never forget them. We love them and their families, and we will miss them. It is a great loss to each and every Arkansan and really each and every American: Paula Blakemore of El Paso; Mark Bradley of Mayflower; Jamye Collins of Vilonia; Helen Greer of Mayflower; Jeffrey Hunter of Vilonia; Dennis Lavergne of Vilonia; Glenna Lavergne of Vilonia; David Mallory of Vilonia; Robert Oliver of Mayflower; Cameron Smith of Vilonia; Tyler Smith of Vilonia; Rob Tittle of Paron; Rebekah Tittle of Paron; Tori Tittle of Paron; and Daniel Wassom of Vilonia. As you can see and hear from those names, a lot of these were family members and obviously members of a few communities in my State.

I wish to thank my colleagues first because many called and reached out in various ways. Some covered meetings for me. In fact, Senator JACK REED of Rhode Island actually covered a military promotion ceremony, which was really special for me—and for him to do—and special for everyone involved. So I thank him for that. Many of my colleagues have offered to help.

We also had people from outside Arkansas who reached out. I know our Governor fielded calls from a number of other Governors from around the country. Our emergency management people have been contacted by other emergency management folks.

Another phenomenon that has happened in our State—we neighbor several States that have gone through this before. One of those is Missouri, and I see my colleague from Missouri here in the Chamber today. People from Missouri came down to help. People from Oklahoma came down and helped. Of course, we helped those States in their time of need, so it was reassuring and so appreciated that those folks, those previous storm victims came to Arkansas and helped us. We really do mean that, and we appreciate it very much.

Federal officials reached out. I was in the car with our Governor Mike Beebe when President Obama called him. That meant a lot. They were able to work through some of those Federal-State issues immediately, right there on the phone. That was great. Of course, Secretary Jay Johnson called the Governor, and I talked to him actually that same day. He is trying to come to Arkansas in the next few days, and I hope he will be able to make it. Craig Fugate, Director of FEMA, came in the very next day, and we appreciate Director Fugate and the resources FEMA brings and the attention to our State.

One of the things we recognize is that the work is just beginning. I see my colleague from Louisiana, and I don't know of anyone in this Chamber who better understands about recovering from a widespread disaster.

I thank and acknowledge the thousands of Arkansans who made a difference.

One of the underappreciated groups I want to mention—they probably don't get enough notoriety, even though this may sound kind of silly—is the TV weather people. As soon as the storms were in the area, they broke from their normal broadcasting and they went with wall-to-wall coverage. I talked to so many folks in Mayflower, Vilonia, and other areas who said: Hey, we watched on TV, and we could see exactly where that storm was, and that is what saved us because we knew it was coming.

The sirens were going. I was at a dinner with some friends of mine in Little Rock, and we heard the sirens, we heard the weather radio go off, and sure enough we turned on the television and we watched it too, just like everyone else.

The Department of Emergency Management has been off-the-charts good. There is a man there named David Maxwell who unfortunately has a lot of experience with this, but ADEM has been phenomenal. We have a system in Arkansas called Code Red, and that got activated and worked very well. The various elected officials—the county judges, et cetera—all came together.

We also, obviously, had first responders who rolled in immediately, and that was great. General Wofford of the Arkansas National Guard activated 54 guardsmen. They showed up and did their duty. And it is so reassuring to the communities when they see those

men and women in uniform. First, they know they have a lot of training and a lot of experience, and it stabilizes things.

The other thing I noticed when I pulled up was that there were police cars and firetrucks and everything from what seemed like every jurisdiction in Arkansas. So it was really great to see that.

Some of the unsung heroes in this are just everyday, ordinary Arkansans, just everyday citizens. They came and brought their chainsaws. They checked their kids out of school to go help, and they rolled out and really streamed in to help.

There are really too many other folks to mention from some of the State agencies that are really underappreciated—the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission; the Forestry Commission, which had people there clearing the way and knocking down things; the highway department; the utilities. As always, the utilities sprung into action. Even though power was down for a pretty good while—I think we had about 35,000 customers or so without power for a little while, but the utilities people got that taken care of. They got their folks from other States to come in, as we do. Entergy is our largest single electric utility in the State, and they brought people in from other States and got their contractors going.

I noticed also the churches. The churches really are prepared for this. It is part of their mission. I did notice the State Baptist Convention has what they call a mobile mass feeding unit. In the first 3 days they fed 4,300 hot meals in Vilonia alone. I don't know what else they were doing in other places, but it was great for the volunteers who were helping and also the families there to be able to go and get a hot meal. Of course, the Salvation Army and Red Cross—all of them really rolled out and helped.

Again, these two Senators who are here in the Chamber with me today have been through these tragedies before. They know the insurance industry rolls out and sets up temporary units. I saw lots of insurance folks with clipboards and cameras and all the things they needed.

The wireless companies came and put up temporary towers because a lot of those were knocked down. There were charging stations for folks.

Walmart is the largest company based in Arkansas, and they came with truckloads of water, diapers, snacks, various kinds of donations, baby wipes, batteries, and flashlights. Whatever people needed, it seemed as though Walmart was there with a truck to offload and really help people do what they needed to do.

Tyson Foods is another of our great Arkansas companies. They have a program they call Meals that Matter, and they do three meals a day. I saw their trucks at the Mayflower school where they were set up. I saw this big Tyson truck just sitting there, and I knew everybody was scurrying around doing other things at other trucks, and I asked: What is that one for? And I heard that one was just full of ice. They have learned through these tragedies and other places they go that ice is in very short supply, and they know that keeping things cold and giving people something cool to drink is very important.

I could talk about this for a long time, seeing those people and seeing what they have gone through. I was there the next morning with the Governor and the attorney general and a number of others, and it was very emotional. You talk to some folks, and they are grieving for the loss of their loved one or their next-door neighbor in one case. I talked to a man who had lost his mother. At the same time, others are rejoicing to be safe and to have their lives and the lives of their children.

One man I talked to—I never even got his name, but I think he was stationed at Little Rock Air Force Base—said he looked out his front door and saw the storm bearing down on the house and there wasn't any way to avoid it. He grabbed his kids, threw them in the bathtub, got some blankets, covered them all up—including himself—in the bathtub. He said that for about 45 seconds it sounded as if they had an F–16 in their house. When it finally stopped, he took the blankets off, and at that point they weren't in the bathroom anymore, they were in the garage. The roof had collapsed and they couldn't get out. Before long, they heard some neighbors calling for them, and they were able to dig a tunnel and get those three girls out and then he got out. They came out of it with just scratches, but it is an amazing story of perseverance.

There is a little hardware store in Mayflower called H&B True Value Hardware, and that building was really shaken to its foundation. It is a total wreck, but the merchandise was good. This man's entire career, his entire working life is right there in that building, that local hardware store he is going to turn over to his daughter one day. His daughter was there with her children, and they were getting their merchandise out and trying to get it into some sort of storage so it could be safe while they rebuild. That is a real-life matter for them, so we tried to help there.

I remember standing out by the curb in front of what used to be a home. It was just a pile of rubble. At first, when you look at that, all you see is debris. Your eyes can't even focus on it. You don't even know what you are looking at. But when you sit and take a moment and look—I looked down and saw a ceiling fan motor. The blades were all gone, but there was a ceiling fan motor. And, gosh, right there I saw Legos mixed in the yard. There was an upside-down sink right there on the pavement. There was a family portrait—whether it was from this family, that family, or a family from a mile away, who knows, but nonetheless a family portrait, just a color photo lying there in the middle of the street.

Another of the things I saw as I stood there looking at what used to be a house—there was the front door, the doorframe, the brick, and sort of a stoop with the steps going up to the house, but there was no house there. All that was left was that doorframe. You think about that. Think about those people, and their house is completely gone. They have to rebuild.

I did hear a story—I didn't talk to the people, but a story was going around among some of the volunteers who were working about a family who survived and their dog survived. The way the dog survived is that as the tornado was hitting their home, they actually grabbed the dog by the collar. He was about to fly out the window or what was left of the house, and not only were they holding on for dear life, but they held on to the dog, and they all made it.

A lot of times you would go up to where a house was and it would be just a concrete slab. That is all there was. You just look at that and think, how did anybody survive that? But they did, in most cases.

I went to the farm of a friend of mine, a guy named Preston Scroggins, whom I have known a long time. He is a pillar-of-the-community kind of person there in Vilonia. I went to his home and saw that he had lost everything. He lost his home, lost all of his vehicles. He had a big farm shop—what we call a shop—which is a metal building with steel girders in it. And I have never seen this before with a tornado. When they built that metal building, of course they build these girders to hold it up, and then there is the siding type of stuff on the sides, the roofing, which is all metal. Of course the steel was twisted, and that is pretty bad, and it takes a lot of force to twist steel like that. But what I had never seen before is that the footings of the building, which were these huge concrete balls—they dug a hole, filled it with concrete, and stuck the steel girders in them to create the footings—these balls of concrete were actually picked up out of the Earth by that tornado. They were actually picked up and set down a few feet away from the big hole in the ground. That is an amazing amount of force, and that is what an EF–4 does. This tornado didn't just knock down buildings; it obliterated them.

The beautiful thing about our people is that it did not obliterate their dreams. We talked to one woman who said: This was my dream house. But the amazing thing was—and a new phrase has been created out of this—we heard people saying over and over that they were Ark strong because people in our State are resilient. They are strong people. They are scrappers. And part of being strong is to pull yourself up by your bootstraps and dust yourself off

and go out and do more that day to improve what you have and work for your family.

But another element of being strong is neighbor helping neighbor, and we saw that in abundance in Arkansas. To sit there in your front yard with no worldly possessions left—your truck looks as though it has been beaten by 20 men coming at it with hammers and beating on it, your house is in ruins and there is nothing left—and then to look at me and say, ''Well, it is just stuff,'' it takes a strong person to do that. That is someone who has the right perspective.

I saw the bravery, the selflessness, and the generosity, and now you know why I am so very proud to be the Senator for these amazing people.

I am also proud of the Senate because it wasn't too long ago we voted for disaster relief in this body. We now have money sufficient to cover this and other disasters. I wish I could say this is going to be the last one for the year, but everyone knows it will not be.

I will close with a psalm.

The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want. He makes me to lie down in green pastures.

There are green pastures as part of this, and our people have found those and will continue to be finding those as we go through this.

He leads me beside the still waters.

It is a very comforting thing, and they need to be comforted right now.

He restores my soul.

One thing I looked up is the definition of ''soul.'' According to Webster's, it is a nonphysical aspect of a person. It is a person's emotional and moral nature, where the most private thoughts and feelings are hidden, the complex of human attributes that manifest as consciousness, thought, feeling, and will.

He restores my soul; he leads me in the paths of righteousness for his name's sake. Even though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death—

I can guarantee those people in Arkansas know they have walked through the valley of the shadow of death—

I will fear no evil; for you are with me. Your rod and your staff, they comfort me. You prepare a table before me in the presence of my enemies. You anoint my head with oil; my cup overflows.

The attitude of the people in my State is, even though it has been a difficult week, their cup is overflowing and those blessings continue to come.

Surely, your goodness and mercy will follow me all the days of my life, and I shall dwell in the house of the Lord forever.

Having that eternal perspective is going to get people through.

I thank the Presiding Officer and my colleagues for all the best wishes and the willingness to help and offers of assistance and all that makes up the Senate family.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

CURRENT EVENTS

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I wish to respond to my good friend from Arkansas. Where he lives and where I live we know way more about tornadoes than we would like to know. Our friend from Louisiana knows about tornadoes and hurricanes both.

We had a massive tornado in Joplin, MO, not too far away from these tornadoes in the last week, in fact, in Baxter Springs and Quapaw, along with tornados in Arkansas and Mississippi, but that tornado was 3 years ago, I believe next week, and there was massive destruction. But the first responders were your neighbors. Before anybody else can get there, your neighbors are there, thinking of getting that man out of the garage with his three little girls and your neighbors beginning to help you collect those few things that are left—that may just be stuff, but it is your stuff. It is pictures and things that can't be replaced, but what can't be replaced are the lives which are saved, and what can't be replaced are the lives which are lost—and people will live with that strategy. No matter how resilient, that is a tragedy that lasts forever. For all those families affected this week, the ones Mr. PRYOR has talked to and others have talked to—in the hometown of two of our colleagues from Mississippi, Tupelo hit by a tornado—these are tragic moments when communities and families and neighbors come together. That and faith, as Senator PRYOR said, are what help people get through this.

CARING FOR AMERICA'S HEROES ACT

Madam President, this is National Mental Health Awareness Month. It just started today.

Senator STABENOW and I have introduced some legislation this week, Caring for America's Heroes Act, that would look at what we are doing in the military. We are looking carefully at the military as it relates to what we are doing to help our veterans and to help those who serve.

I was at Fort Leonard Wood, in Waynessville, MO, just a few days ago, talking to the hospital personnel there about mental health issues as they relate to the many new inductees who come there and as to the full-time force and the retirees who come there.

The act Senator STABENOW and I are introducing this week would treat mental health conditions like other health conditions for spouses, dependents, and for retirees who now have a limit on what can be done and how many hospital days they can stay for mental health that is not the same limit for anything else. There is no justifiable reason for it not to be the same limit. I think we are going to have good support from the Defense Department as we work to try to get this done, to just simply ensure that military dependents and retirees who were covered under TRICARE, for instance, are treated in the same manner for inpatient mental health services as they would be for any other injury or any other kind of health issue. Bringing those to par with others is important.

The National Institutes of Health estimates that one out of four adults in American has a behavioral health problem and if diagnosed can almost always be treated. I asked the Surgeon General of the Army at a hearing just a few days ago if that one out of four would relate to the military as well. Her view was as follows: Yes, we recruit from the general population. We don't have any reason to believe those numbers aren't reflected in our population as well.

So as we move forward, we need to be sure, in Mental Health Awareness Month—and in a month where, as in every month, we should be always mindful of our veterans and retirees—that we are pursuing those solutions for them as we are for the country generally. Hopefully, we will be able to work with the Defense Department and get this one gap closed in the very near future.

HEALTH CARE

I wish to speak about where we are on health care. I know there was an attempt in recent days to take a victory lap, and maybe again today, over the number of people to sign up.

I will say one more time, I don't think that is the way you can measure this. I said when the Web site wouldn't work, we can't measure this by whether the Web site works because surely the Web site will eventually work. Frankly, we shouldn't measure this by how many people sign up because the people who sign up don't have any other option. Their option is to not sign up at all or to sign up. That is not much of a choice for most people. I am going to talk in a minute about a couple people who decided they don't have a reasonable choice, so they are not signing up for anything.

We need to be sure this government does what is necessary to create access to what has been the best health care system in the world. We all want people to have access to that system. The question truly is, Are we doing that the right way?

Polling clearly shows that people don't think we are doing that the right way. The President's numbers reflect that. The Kaiser Family Foundation poll shows that just 38 percent of people think the law is working as intended; 57 percent say it is not working the way the White House had hoped.

I would think 100 percent would think it is not working the way the White House had hoped. Surely, the rollout, the signup—we can talk all we want about how many people sign up. There is a debate going on right now over in the House of Representatives this week about they signed up, but did they pay.

According to the House Commerce Committee, insurers tell them that only two-thirds of the people who have signed up have paid. If they don't pay, they are not signed up and they don't have coverage. I don't think any insurance works that way.

That same committee's report said only 25 percent of paid enrollees are within the crucial age range, which is 18 to 34.

For this to work, we have to have people who are young and healthy sign up as well. Why isn't that happening? The original estimate was we need 40 percent. We appear to have 25 percent. What do we need to do?

Why is it the fact that insurance costs more relative to everybody else insured for young people than it ever has before by the law? That would maybe explain why young people aren't signing up. Prior to January 1 of this year, if someone were young and healthy, they might pay 20 percent of what the person at the other end of the spectrum was paying. Now they have to pay at least 33 percent. Maybe that is why those people aren't signing up.

Of course, the workforce impact of people who have part-time jobs because full-time jobs are covered, jobs of more than 30 hours—the House recently passed the Save America Workers Act to help increase these wages by saying: No, it is not a 30-hour standard. It should be a 40-hour standard. I am a cosponsor of the Senate bill that would do that same thing Senator COLLINS has been advocating for months now.

The unintended consequences in the workplace are not fair to American families. They are not fair to American workers. We could do something about one of those unintended consequences by just saying: Wait a minute. The 40-hour workweek that we have always said was full-time work should still be the 40-hour workweek, not the new 30-hour workweek.

The emergency contractor hired to repair the Web site said it is going to cost $121 million to repair the Web site, which is a whole lot more than the $94 million already spent to create the Web site. I wonder what would have happened if we had taken that many millions of dollars and bought insurance for the people we were trying to move from uninsured to insured.

I will give about three more examples. My time is limited on the floor today, and I have this down to a handful of examples of people we have heard from in the last few days about families who are dramatically impacted. Surely, there is a good story out there to tell, but there are lots of stories, and no matter what anybody says, these stories over and over turn out to be tragedies for families.

Randy and his wife from Mexico, MO, had a plan they liked, but they received a cancellation notice in October of last year. He went on to the exchange but found on the exchange he would have to pay over $600 a month more in premiums and face deductibles that were $3,500 higher than they had been in the past—so a $600 increase in premiums and $3,500 higher deductibles.

The cheapest plan available to Randy and his wife would have them paying $14,000 in premiums a year and they would have an $11,000 deductible before the insurance would pay anything—$25,000.

Randy and his wife decided: That is not insurance at all, so we are not going to have insurance. They found the best thing he could find, found what was available, and decided it clearly wouldn't work. And that wouldn't work for any us either. If it was going to cost $25,000 annually before a single thing was covered, we wouldn't think that was insurance, and that was the best thing Randy from Mexico, MO, could find.

Neal lost his job 2 years ago and decided to go back—Neal is from Raymore, MO. He decided to go back to school full time. He has nerve damage in his back and takes several medications. His doctor prescribed 120 pills a month, but his insurance plan will only pay for 100 pills a month.

Neal said not only does he have pain he didn't have before, but he says: There is nothing I can do about it. He says: Nobody wants to help. The doctor says I need 120 pills a month. The insurance says they are not going to let me have more than 100. I think he wishes this was between him and his doctor instead of between him and his insurance company.

Myron from Hannibal, MO, and his family have annual premiums that went from $2,200 to $6,500—a $4,300 increase. He found his doctor is no longer in the network. He doesn't want to have a new doctor. He liked his old insurance, but it was canceled, and he can't get to the doctors he used to use with his new insurance.

Campus problems: A young healthy son on campus. His insurance was $550 a semester last semester. This year it is $770 a semester so he can have the same insurance that in all likelihood he will not use because he is, after all, young and healthy, but the 40-percent increase is an increase the law almost requires. The law went from five different categories of people to be insured to three, and the top one can't pay more than three times what the bottom pays.

One final story. Dennis is from Dexter, MO, near Missouri's bootheel. He is an insurance broker. He says he has lots of stories he could tell, but the one that came to mind that he told us about this week was people who had a nationwide network of doctors in a plan he used to sell now are transitioned to a network that is much smaller and it only works in the State you reside in.

Missouri has many States that touch it. As many as eight States touch our State, so almost everybody in our State lives on or near a border. If you live on or near the border in the exchange, you cannot go to the doctor or hospital, in all likelihood, that may be 10 miles from where you are because it is not in your State. When I was first told that, I simply didn't believe it, and the more we checked into it the more we found out that is what people were finding over and over. The policies they could get did not allow them to go a reasonable distance if they had to cross a border.

So we have work to do. I hope we can do it. I think there are ways we can work together, but the real thing we have to solve is better health care for families and affordable health care and health insurance for families. It is not happening right now. I hope we move to a better place.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). The Senator from Louisiana.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. VITTER. Thank you, Madam President.

I come to the floor again to urge consideration and a vote, and a positive vote, on my no-Washington exemption from ObamaCare proposal.

I think the first rule of American democracy should be that whatever Congress chooses to impose on America it lives by itself; whatever laws Washington passes, it lives by itself. That should be the rule across the board, and that should certainly include health care and ObamaCare. But that is not the case.

That is not the case at all, because there is a Washington exemption from ObamaCare. There are special-interest Washington subsidies under ObamaCare that the average American doesn't get in any way, shape, or form. As it relates to health care and ObamaCare, I think the rule should be simple: The baseline plan, the fallback position for all Americans is what we live by. Under ObamaCare that was first during the debate called the public option, but then it came to be known as the exchanges. That should be the plan we all live by and our staff live by and the White House and top members of the administration live by—no special exemption, no special deal, no special subsidy, no special treatment.

That was the intent of an amendment, and that is actually the clear language of an amendment that actually passed this body and passed the process and became part of ObamaCare, thanks to the leadership of Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY and others, and I certainly strongly supported the amendment. There was a clear amendment added to ObamaCare in the Senate that said every Member of Congress, all of our staff, have to go to the so-called exchanges for our health care. The problem is on the way to implementing that, after passage of the bill, folks around here understood what that meant and so they watered down and amended that language through the back door by administrative fiat in an illegal way.

They got the President and his administration to issue a special rule that took all of the sting out of that amendment. That rule did two things: First of all, it came up with a mechanism whereby a lot of congressional staff don't even have to go to the exchanges at all; and secondly, this illegal rule gave Members of Congress a special subsidy to go to the exchanges that no other American gets at comparable income levels, no one else gets, completely unique.

In addition, the administration, top members of the administration, such as Cabinet officials and top White House aides, have never been subjected to anything like the same rule.

Again, I think we should come back to what almost all Americans feel should be the first rule of American democracy: What is good for America has to be good for Washington. What is imposed on America needs to be imposed first and foremost on Washington, with no special exemptions, no special subsidies, no special carve-outs, no special deals, and that is what my no-Washington exemption from ObamaCare proposal is about. Every Member of Congress, our staff, and the White House and top administration officials should go to the exchanges for our health care, with no special deal, no special exemption, no special subsidies.

I have been fighting for simply a full debate and vote on this for 6 months now, and unfortunately have been completely shut out of any vote. This started as soon as the administration announced its special illegal rule to get around this provision of ObamaCare late last year, and as soon as that was announced, I said: This is wrong. We need to address this. We need to stop this. I proposed my clarifying language, and I brought up that language as an amendment on the floor as soon as I could. It was in September of last year on the Portman-Shaheen bill which is back on the floor now, and after a lot of back and forth, the majority leader finally agreed: Fine, we will have a vote on the Vitter amendment on this subject. In fact, Senator REID was quoted in The Hill on September 17 of last year: ''What I said I will do is we'll vote on Vitter,'' meaning my no-Washington-exemption language, '' . . . as senseless as that is.''

I appreciate that endorsement of the proposal.

''I mean, we'll go ahead and do that.''

So he agreed to that vote on Portman-Shaheen. That was reported the same day by Bloomberg on September 17:

> Reid said on the Senate floor that a vote would be allowed on the Vitter proposal as long as Republicans agreed to consider a yet-to-be unveiled Democratic counterproposal that would be offered as a side-by-side or second-degree amendment.

And also that same day in CQ:

> Reid said Tuesday he was willing to give Senator David Vitter, R-LA, a vote on his proposal to force more government workers onto health care exchanges and to pay the premiums themselves . . .

In addition, at the same time the next day, September 18, and the day following, September 19, Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN said the same thing. Senator SHAHEEN was on the Senate floor September 18 saying: Great, we will give Senator VITTER his vote. I have no problem with that. Senator PORTMAN, September 19, the same thing.

> My understanding is that there has been a general agreement to have a vote on the Vitter amendment. That is something I have heard on the floor from leadership.

Well, as we all know, that agreement never materialized, was never honored. I have never gotten that vote. It is now 6 months later, and I am simply asking for a full debate and a fair up-or-down vote on this important issue.

Look, it is a free country. People don't have to agree with me, but let's have a vote. We voted yesterday on something that we have voted and revoted multiple times at the majority leader's insistence.

I am asking for one vote on this important issue that the American people care about. We voted and revoted on things multiple times. I am asking for one clear vote on this issue. After the majority leader agreed to a vote on this amendment that I never got in September, a couple months later when I was revisiting the issue, he said: Okay. Well, you can have a vote, but it has to be the only vote in this Congress.

Well, I resisted that at the time, but I will take that one vote. Can we have one vote on this important issue this Congress? Can we have a modicum of free expression and open debate and an open amendment process on the Senate floor? Can we have one vote on this issue that the American people certainly care about? That is what I am asking. I am asking for the majority leader to honor his commitment. That is what I am pushing for. That is what I will continue to push for, which is why I am filing the amendment to the Portman-Shaheen bill. And again, I am filing it to this bill for one clear reason: That is the context in our previous consideration of Portman-Shaheen where I was told we agreed to having a vote on this issue. We will have the vote. I am simply asking for that commitment to be honored.

I also care deeply about other important issues, including energy issues, moving forward with a very important jobs project for America, the Keystone XL Pipeline; and because of that, when I saw the majority leader's recent proposal that we move ahead on Portman-Shaheen with five energy-related votes, one of which would clearly be the Keystone XL Pipeline, I certainly took that very seriously. That is also an important issue and it deserves a vote. It has had votes in the past, but that needs to be addressed. So as soon as I saw that—and again, this is an offer by the majority leader—a hotline request that we now consider the Portman-Shaheen bill and limit considerations to five energy-related amendments, that would be chosen by the Republican leaders—as soon as I saw that hotline and that offer, I called the Republican leader to make sure of two points—two points that I care about quite a bit—No. 1, that one of those amendments would be a very substantive amendment on the Keystone Pipeline, not general, vague, sense-of-the-Senate language, but binding language that would approve, without the President's involvement, this very important jobs project; and No. 2, that at least one of the other amendments was an important matter within the jurisdiction of the EPW Committee on which I serve as ranking member.

The Republican leader absolutely agreed that was the case. Yes, absolutely, once we lock in this unanimous consent request by Leader REID, one of those votes would absolutely be a binding proposal about the Keystone Pipeline. Another would clearly be an important matter from the jurisdiction of the committee on which I serve as ranking member on EPW. So those are important matters and those are significant votes.

So I will set aside temporarily my pursuit of this no-Washington-exemption vote. I promise I will be back to it. I promise I will use every reasonable opportunity to get that vote which was promised to me last September, 6 months ago and counting; but I believe we should move forward with Majority Leader REID's proposal that he made as a hotline request this morning.

I offer that as a unanimous consent agreement, so we can lock it down and move forward, and move forward with this Keystone vote, move forward with these other energy votes, and then move forward beyond that, hopefully to a vote on the no-Washington-exemption language very soon. So I make as a unanimous consent request Majority Leader REID's own proposal, that there be a unanimous consent agreement on S. 2262, the energy efficiency bill; that we move to its immediate consideration; that the only amendments in order be five amendments to be offered by the Republican leader or his designee related to energy policy, with a 60-vote threshold on adoption of each amendment; and that following the disposition of these amendments, the Senate will proceed to a vote on passage of the bill as amended, if amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes in response to the Senator from Louisiana after I have responded to his unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I would only ask for the opportunity to respond to the response to the unanimous consent request before the assistant majority leader proceeds, but I have no objection otherwise to his speaking after that for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader.

Mr. MCCAIN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. What is the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, first, reserving the right to object, what the Senator from Louisiana has characterized as the majority leader's position on the pending legislation, S. 2262, has not been stated by the majority leader, and I suggest that the Senator from Louisiana speak to his leadership and work with the majority leader to resolve differences on amendments. I object.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, reclaiming the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, let me read the exact text of the hotline. A hotline is a message that goes out to all Senators.

The Majority Leader in consultation with the Republican Leader would like to enter into a unanimous consent agreement on S. 2262, the Energy Efficiency bill. The only amendments in order would be 5 amendments to be offered by the Republican Leader or his designee, related to energy policy, with a 60 vote threshold on adoption of each amendment. Following the disposition of these amendments, the Senate will proceed to a vote on passage of the bill, as amended, if amended.

That is clearly an expression of the majority leader's proposal in consultation with the Republican leader. That is what was sent to all Members of the Senate—at least on our side—after a personal discussion between the majority leader and the Republican leader.

Just to be crystal clear, my unanimous consent right now is that hotline request that has been clearly characterized as the request of the majority leader in consultation with the Republican leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I know the Senator from Arizona is waiting to take the floor. I have waited for the Senator from Louisiana to finish his lengthy statement about several issues.

I ask unanimous consent to speak for only 5 minutes—and maybe less—and then I will leave and turn the floor over to the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I would like 2 minutes to respond. I don't mean to delay the Senator from Arizona, but I would like 2 minutes to respond.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the Senator from Louisiana's request?

Mr. VITTER. There is an objection, and I propose an alternative unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois speak for up to 5 minutes followed by me for up to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, reserving the right to object—and I will not object—but I ask unanimous consent that following the completion of what was just discussed that the Senator from South Carolina and I be allowed 20 minutes for time to speak.

Mr. DURBIN. Reserving the right to object, I think there is a vote scheduled at 1:45 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is correct; there is a vote scheduled at 1:45 p.m.

Is there objection to the request from the Senator from Louisiana?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, because my friend from Arizona has waited patiently, I will turn the 5 minutes into 3 minutes.

The question is health insurance for Members of the Senate and their staff. The Senator from Louisiana said that we should not be treated any differently than anyone else, and he is right. It turns out that Members of the Senate and their staff go to get their health insurance through the insurance exchanges, just like 8 million other Americans, and we buy our health insurance not from a special little company but from the same list—in my case—of 100 different policies available to anyone working in the District of Columbia.

My wife and I chose Blue Cross Blue Shield; that was our choice. We are paying a monthly premium. Our employer, the Federal Government, is contributing toward that premium like every other family in America where the employer makes a contribution, in this case the Federal Government, and the employee makes a contribution, in this case the Senator and his wife. We are being treated like everyone else.

Now he wants to take away the employer contribution not just for the Members of the Senate but also for our staffers. All these poor hard-working people want is health insurance like every other family. The Senator from Louisiana is going to make a statement of principle here: They shouldn't get employer contribution for their health insurance. What a noble and courageous position.

The question is whether he is going to turn back any Federal subsidy for his health insurance. I don't know if does or not. It would be a show of good faith if he did.

I will stand here and fight for the right of Members of Congress to be treated like everybody else—buying health insurance on the exchanges from private insurance companies from policies that are available to everyone else with an employer contribution. I will fight for staffers—Democrats and Republicans—to have that same right.

The Senator from Louisiana has held up a bill on the floor of the Senate all week because he wants to call that amendment. Isn't it about time we get to the business of the Senate and do something? We will leave today and come back next week. I hope he will have some second thoughts about holding up the Senate for another week.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I had the feeling I would need to respond to whatever was said, and I was certainly right.

I have a couple of points to make in order to set the facts right. First of all, my proposal does mean Washington is treated like all other Americans with regard to ObamaCare. That is not going on now. Many members of our staff don't have to go to the exchange. All others and Members of Congress get a huge taxpayer-funded subsidy that no other American at the same income level gets—no other American. And the Obama administration—White House officials—doesn't fall under that requirement at all to go to the exchange. That is No. 1.

No. 2, I don't take that subsidy. The assistant majority leader is a little late to the game. I made that decision months ago and announced it, so I do not take a subsidy.

No. 3, the assistant majority leader has just rejected a proposal of the majority leader in consultation with the Republican leader. I don't know why they can't take yes for an answer. They are complaining about my holding up a bill that is not on the floor yet, and I am asking for unanimous consent, which they initiated, with regard to energy amendments.

I will read the exact text of the hotline again.

The Majority Leader in consultation with the Republican Leader would like to enter into a unanimous consent agreement on S. 2262, the Energy Efficiency bill. The only amendments in order would be 5 amendments to be offered by the Republican Leader or his designee, related to energy policy, with a 60 vote threshold on adoption of each amendment. Following the disposition of these amendments, the Senate will proceed to a vote on passage of the bill, as amended, if amended.

I don't know why we can't take yes for an answer here. I'm holding up the bill? The bill is not on the Senate floor yet. I am asking for a unanimous consent that was a discussion and an idea of the majority leader in consultation with the Republican leader and now that is being objected to by the same sources who proposed it. This is silly.

Let's get on with the important votes. Let's get on with this important Keystone vote—a binding Keystone vote—and then in the future let's get on with important ObamaCare votes, which certainly includes my no-Washington-exemption proposal.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, how much time is remaining before the vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eight and a half minutes.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the votes Senator GRAHAM and I be allowed 20 minutes to speak as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF THEODORE DAVID CHUANG TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND—Continued

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays, and I yield back any remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Theodore David Chuang, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland?

The yeas and nays are ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 127 Ex.]

YEAS—53

Baldwin	Harkin	Murray
Begich	Heinrich	Nelson
Bennet	Heitkamp	Pryor
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reed
Booker	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Boxer	Kaine	Rockefeller
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Landrieu	Shaheen
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Levin	Udall (CO)
Coons	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	Markey	Walsh
Durbin	McCaskill	Warner
Feinstein	Menendez	Warren
Franken	Merkley	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Mikulski	Wyden
Hagan	Murphy	

NAYS—42

Alexander	Collins	Grassley
Ayotte	Corker	Hatch
Barrasso	Cornyn	Heller
Blunt	Crapo	Hoeven
Burr	Cruz	Inhofe
Chambliss	Enzi	Isakson
Coats	Fischer	Johanns
Coburn	Flake	Johnson (WI)
Cochran	Graham	Kirk
Lee	Portman	Shelby
McCain	Risch	Thune
McConnell	Roberts	Toomey
Murkowski	Scott	Vitter
Paul	Sessions	Wicker

NOT VOTING—5

Boozman	Rubio	Tester
Moran	Sanders	

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, earlier today, I voted against confirmation for Theodore David Chuang to be U.S. district judge for the District of Maryland because of his involvement in the State Department's response to Congressional inquiries into the attack on the U.S. Embassy in Benghazi, Libya. The State Department refused to comply with a subpoena from the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee without citing any valid privilege. I cannot support any nominee who played a part in stonewalling attempts by Congress to uncover the truth surrounding the events in Benghazi on September 11, 2012.

NOMINATION OF GEORGE JARROD HAZEL TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on the Hazel nomination.

Does anyone yield back their time?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I yield back the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of George Jarrod Hazel, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland?

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 95, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 128 Ex.]

YEAS—95

Alexander	Brown	Collins
Ayotte	Burr	Coons
Baldwin	Cantwell	Corker
Barrasso	Cardin	Cornyn
Begich	Carper	Crapo
Bennet	Casey	Cruz
Blumenthal	Chambliss	Donnelly
Blunt	Coats	Durbin
Booker	Coburn	Enzi
Boxer	Cochran	Feinstein
Fischer	Klobuchar	Roberts
Flake	Landrieu	Rockefeller
Franken	Leahy	Rubio
Gillibrand	Lee	Sanders
Graham	Manchin	Schatz
Grassley	Markey	Schumer
Hagan	McCain	Scott
Harkin	McCaskill	Sessions
Hatch	McConnell	Shaheen
Heinrich	Menendez	Shelby
Heitkamp	Merkley	Thune
Heller	Mikulski	Toomey
Hirono	Murkowski	Udall (CO)
Hoeven	Murphy	Udall (NM)
Inhofe	Murray	Vitter
Isakson	Nelson	Walsh
Johanns	Paul	Warner
Johnson (SD)	Portman	Warren
Johnson (WI)	Pryor	Whitehouse
Kaine	Reed	Wicker
King	Reid	Wyden
Kirk	Risch	

NOT VOTING—5

Boozman	Moran	Tester
Levin	Stabenow	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we are going to have one more recorded vote. The next vote will be on Monday at 5:30. We will have two votes at that time.

NOMINATION OF JANICE MARION SCHNEIDER TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will report the Schneider nomination.

The legislative clerk reported the nomination of Janice Marion Schneider, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on the nomination.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Janice Marion Schneider, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 32, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 129 Ex.]

YEAS—64

Alexander	Bennet	Brown
Ayotte	Blumenthal	Cantwell
Baldwin	Booker	Cardin
Begich	Boxer	Carper

Casey	Hirono	Pryor
Coats	Johnson (SD)	Reed
Collins	Kaine	Reid
Coons	King	Risch
Corker	Klobuchar	Rockefeller
Crapo	Landrieu	Sanders
Donnelly	Leahy	Schatz
Durbin	Levin	Schumer
Feinstein	Manchin	Shaheen
Flake	Markey	Udall (CO)
Franken	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Gillibrand	Menendez	Walsh
Hagan	Merkley	Warner
Harkin	Mikulski	Warren
Hatch	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Murphy	Wyden
Heitkamp	Murray	
Heller	Nelson	

NAYS—32

Barrasso	Grassley	Portman
Blunt	Hoeven	Roberts
Burr	Inhofe	Rubio
Chambliss	Isakson	Scott
Coburn	Johanns	Sessions
Cochran	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Cornyn	Kirk	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Toomey
Enzi	McCain	Vitter
Fischer	McConnell	Wicker
Graham	Paul	

NOT VOTING—4

Boozman	Stabenow
Moran	Tester

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF SUZAN G. LEVINE TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SWISS CONFEDERATION AND THE PRINCIPALITY OF LIECHTENSTEIN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will report the LeVine nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Suzan G. LeVine, of Washington, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Swiss Confederation, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Principality of Liechtenstein.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate prior to the vote on the LeVine nomination.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Suzan G. LeVine, of Washington, to be Ambassador of the United States of America to the Swiss Confederation, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Principality of Liechtenstein?

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.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

ENERGY SAVINGS AND INDUSTRIAL COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2014—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy with the Senator from South Carolina as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BENGHAZI

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, 19 months ago a terrible thing happened in Benghazi, Libya. Four brave Americans were murdered, and the issue has not only not been resolved but as each of the last 19 months has ensued, the issue of how and under what circumstances this heinous crime was committed continues. The Senator from South Carolina and I, the Senator from New Hampshire, and some others, have vowed we will never give up on this issue until the truth is known and the people who perpetrated it are brought to justice.

We have seen another page turn in this chapter of coverup and obfuscation by this administration by the belated—19 months later—release of the following emails. The first one we will not pay much attention to. This is from Benjamin Rhodes, who is supposed to be the public affairs officer for the National Security Council. In fact, he is obviously the propaganda organ. The goals, as he states them, are to underscore these protests are rooted in an Internet video and not a broader failure of policy.

I tell my colleagues that was not a fact. That was not a fact. There was no evidence these protests were rooted in an Internet video. In fact, the station chief before these talking points were made up sent a message that this is not—not—a spontaneous demonstration.

To show that we will be resolute in bringing people who bring harm to Americans to justice, and standing steadfast through these protests; to reinforce the President's strength and steadiness—that is all about the Presidential campaign. It is not about trying to find out who perpetrated this heinous crime. It is not about trying to respond to the people who committed these acts.

In fact, because of the coverup and the obfuscation and now 19-month delay, not a single person who was responsible for the murder of these four brave Americans has been brought to justice, as the President promised they would be.

Yesterday Mr. Carney said the release of this information had nothing to do with the attack on Benghazi. My friends, I have heard a lot of strange things in my time, but that has to be the most bizarre statement I have ever heard. This is all about a Presidential campaign. This is all about an effort to convince the American people the President of the United States had everything under control.

The next day, on the Sunday talk shows, Susan Rice said Al Qaeda had been decimated. False; that the embassy was safe and stable and secure. False. And of course the whole issue of blaming an Internet video lasted on and on for a couple of weeks when it was clear the evidence did not indicate that.

I yield to my friend from South Carolina on this issue, and then I will return.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank my colleague.

To remind the body of what we are talking about, this email was released as a result of a lawsuit, and not voluntarily by the White House. In August of last year, the House of Representatives and the committees of jurisdiction subpoenaed all documents related to Benghazi and basically were stiff-armed.

Senators MCCAIN, AYOTTE, and I have written enough letters to destroy a small forest to the White House with virtually nothing to show for it. A private organization called Judicial Watch sued under the Freedom of Information Act, and an independent judiciary—thank God for that—ordered this White House to disclose this email just days ago. Knowing the email was going to come out, the White House provided it to the Congress a few days ago.

What does that tell us? That tells us they did not want anyone to know about this email. They talk about 25,000 documents they have provided. It doesn't matter the number of documents they provided to the Congress. They could have provided us with the Benghazi phone book. It is the relevance of the documents and the significance of the documents. The reason they did not want anyone—me and anyone else—to know about this email is because it is the smoking gun that shows that people at the White House level—these are people who work at the White House for the administration—were very intent on shaping the story about Benghazi away from what they knew to be the truth.

Here is the problem for the White House. This was 7 weeks before an election. President Obama had said repeatedly: Bin Laden is dead, Al Qaeda is on the run, the war is receding, my foreign policy is working. Many of us were critical of President Obama's foreign policy, particularly in Libya, because after Qadhafi fell, we really did nothing to secure the country.

Senator MCCAIN, myself, and a couple of other Senators—RUBIO—went in 2011 to Libya. We said in an op-ed piece if we don't get rid of these militias, Libya is going to become a safe haven for terrorists.

You have to understand this about the Benghazi consulate. It had been previously attacked in April of 2012.

The British Ambassador had been attacked in June of 2012. The British closed their consulate. The Red Cross closed their office because they had been attacked. And we have email traffic coming from Libya to Washington at the State Department level saying on August 16: We cannot secure the Benghazi consulate from a coordinated terrorist attack, and Al Qaeda flags are flying all over Benghazi.

What they did not want you to know is that the consulate in Benghazi was very unsecure, that everyone else had left the town, and that the numerous requests for security enhancements going back for months had been denied. They didn't want you to know because it would make the American people mad that the facility was so unsecure in such a dangerous area and people in Washington constantly ignored requests for additional security.

Here is what they wanted you to know:

. . . to convey that the United States is doing everything we can to protect our people and facilities abroad . . .

That, to me, is the worst of the whole email because they are trying to convey to the American people and the families of the fallen that: These things happened, but we did all we could to protect your family and those who served this Nation.

Nothing could be more untruthful about Benghazi than this statement that they did everything they could to secure the facility.

The question as to whether this email relates to Benghazi was the most offensive thing coming out of the White House in quite a while. No one else died. There was an attack on our Embassy in Cairo with property damage.

What did we think Susan Rice was going to be asked about on Sunday, 16 September? Everybody in the Nation wanted to know how our Ambassador and three other brave Americans died. To suggest they weren't trying to prepare her to talk about the deaths of 4 Americans is insulting to our intelligence, but the document itself tells us it was directed toward explaining Benghazi.

To show that we will be resolute in bringing people who harm Americans to justice . . .

That was part of what they wanted her to convey. No one else was hurt other than in Benghazi. So within the document itself, they are talking about reinforcing the view that we will go after those who harmed Americans. The only people who were harmed—the four people killed—were in Benghazi. So that is just a bald-faced lie. That is insulting our intelligence, and it really is disrespectful to those who died in the line of duty to suggest this email—which they would not give us without a court order—had nothing to do with the death of four Americans.

Mr. MCCAIN. I might add that all of the emails were supposed to be given to the Congress in return for the confirmation of Mr. Brennan as head of the CIA. They didn't do that.

Mr. GRAHAM. The bottom line is the goals set out in this email are to try to convince the American people 7 weeks before an election: We had done everything possible to protect our people and facilities; ''to underscore that these protests are rooted in an Internet video, and not a broader failure of policy.''

I am here to tell you—and I dare anybody to show where I am wrong—there is no evidence of a protest outside the compound that led to an eventual attack.

I have talked to the man in charge of security at Benghazi—the only survivor I have been able to talk to. He told me that when the Ambassador went to bed shortly after 9, there was nobody outside the compound. They would not have let him go to bed if there had been protesters, and they would have reported a protest up the chain of command.

Mr. MCCAIN. And the next day the station chief sent a message that there was ''not-slash-not spontaneous demonstration.''

Mr. GRAHAM. That was the 15th. So this is in real-time that people are reporting a coordinated terrorist attack. There was no protest. The video had nothing to do with this because there was no protest. And why would they suggest that? They would be far less culpable in the eyes of the American people and myself if, in fact, this was caused by a video we had nothing to do with, a protest we could not see coming. The truth is that this was a coordinated terrorist attack that you could see coming for months, and it was the result of a broader failure of policy. Why didn't they want to admit that? They were 7 weeks out. It undercuts everything they were trying to tell the American people about their foreign policy.

This is the smoking gun that shows they were consciously trying to manipulate the evidence to steer the story away from a coordinated terrorist attack of an unsecured facility and toward the land of an Internet video causing a protest. That, to me, is unacceptable and is clear as the Sun rises in the east, for those who care.

I will end with this and turn it back over to Senator MCCAIN.

After this attack, President Obama said the following:

But everything that—every piece of information we get, as we got it, we laid it out for the American people.

I am here to tell you that statement has not borne scrutiny. The administration did not live up to this statement.

Here is another statement from Jay Carney:

I can tell you that the President believes that Ambassador Rice has done an excellent job as the United States Ambassador to the United Nations, and I believe that—and I know that he believes that everyone here working for him has been transparent in the way that we've tried to answer questions about what happened in Benghazi . . .

If they were trying to be transparent about what was happening in Benghazi, why would they fail to provide the relevant information?

The information that we provided was based on the available assessment at the time.

I am here to tell you, ladies and gentlemen, they have not provided the relevant information. Why? Because the relevant information crumbles the story Susan Rice told on 16 September, crumbles the story of the President himself when weeks later he talked about a protest caused by a video that never happened. The reason they haven't shared this with us is because it exposes the lie of Benghazi.

I will end with this thought. We would not know today about an email on 14 September setting goals for Susan Rice to meet on 16 September to change the whole narrative if it were not for an independent judiciary and a private organization.

This White House has stiffed the Congress. Mostly, the media has been AWOL. But the reason we haven't stopped is because we met the families.

To any Member of the Congress who thinks Benghazi is a Republican conspiracy designed to help LINDSEY GRAHAM or anyone else get elected, why don't you go to the family members and explain to them what happened. Why don't you tell the family members that the government was up front and honest and see if they believe you.

This email that came from a court requiring the White House to disclose is devastating. It is devastating because it shows that 3 days after the attack, their goal was not to inform the American people of what happened but to shape the story to help the President get reelected. I hope and pray that matters to the American people, and I believe it does. And I hope and pray our friends on the Democratic side will start taking a little bit of interest.

I can tell you this about Senator MCCAIN and myself: When President Bush's policies in Iraq were crumbling, we did not have enough troops, and JOHN MCCAIN, to his credit, said that publicly and asked for the resignation of President Bush's Secretary of Defense because of failed policy.

When we discovered the abuses at Guantanamo Bay and Abu Ghraib when it came to detainee policies, both of us said: The system failed. Don't believe it when they tell you this was a few bad apples.

Why did we do that? I have been a military lawyer for 31 years. It means a lot to me to adhere to the conventions we have signed up to.

Senator MCCAIN—if there were ever an American hero in the Senate, it is he. He has lived through a country that practices torture, and he did not want us to go down that road.

When we did those things, we were ''great Americans holding the system accountable and doing the country a service.'' Now, all of a sudden, we are ''just party hacks.''

I am here to say that what drove us then drives us now. When we ask people to serve in faraway places with strange-sounding names and to go out on the tip of the spear, we owe it to them to help them, to give them the best ability to survive. And if something bad happens, we owe their families the truth.

Just as in Iraq, they tried to shape the story in a fashion that did not bear scrutiny. It wasn't a few dead-enders; it was system failure that led to the collapse of Iraq. And thank God we changed tactics and we overcame our problems.

This Benghazi story is about a foreign policy choice called the light footprint that caught up with this administration. It is about an administration that said no to additional security requests because they didn't want to be like Bush. It is a story about an administration that is too stubborn to react to facts on the ground, that kept a consulate open when everybody else closed theirs, unsecured, believing that ignoring the problem would solve the problem.

We have now found evidence of their willingness and desire to change the narrative from a coordinated terrorist attack of an unsecured facility—something they really couldn't control, and they did the best they could 7 weeks before an election.

All I can say is if the shoe were on the other foot and this had been the Bush administration, it would be front-page news everywhere and our colleagues on the other side would be screaming. It is sad that it hasn't been news everywhere. It is sad that my Democratic colleagues in the House in particular have disdain for trying to find out what happened in Benghazi.

Mr. MCCAIN. And the fact is, I would say to my friend, the time has now come for a select committee. The time has now come because these talking points raise more questions than answers. It is time for a bipartisan, bicameral select committee to investigate the entire Benghazi fiasco and tragedy, and it needs to be done soon. The American people and the families of those brave ones who sacrificed their lives deserve nothing less.

My friend Senator GRAHAM mentioned the media. I would like to say thanks.

I would like to say thanks to FOX News. I would like to say thanks to some at CBS. I would like to say thanks to Charles Krauthammer and the handful of people who kept this alive when the ''mainstream media'' not only wanted to bury it but subjected, of course, as Senator GRAHAM just mentioned, him and me to ridicule.

I wish to go back for a second to this email. In response to questions yesterday by Mr. Carney, the White House Press spokesperson, if we look at this email and then look at what Mr. Carney said, it is an absolute falsehood. It is a total departure from reality. How does the President's spokesperson tell the American people something that is patently false?

The President's spokesperson, in regard to this email that says to show ''these protests are rooted in an Internet video, and not a broader failure of policy''—what was he talking about? He says Rhodes' email ''was explicitly not about Benghazi.'' Well, then what was it about?

Then he goes on to say:

> The fact of the matter is, there were protests in the region.
>
> The talking points cited protests at that facility.

They didn't. The talking points did not cite protests at that facility—i.e, Benghazi.

> The connection between protests and video—and the video turned out not to be the case—

It turned out not to be the case because it was never the case and no one ever believed it—

> but it was based on the best information that we had.

He had no information that there was a spontaneous demonstration sparked by a video. That was manufactured somewhere. The American people and we need to know where those talking points came from that Susan Rice gave.

He goes on to say:

> If you look at that document, that document that we're talking about today was about the overall environment in the Muslim world.

How could he say that and look at this email here? Talking about events in the Muslim world?

And of course he goes on to say, talking about Susan Rice:

> She relied on her—for her answers on Benghazi, on the document prepared by the CIA, as did members of Congress.

Mr. Morell, the deputy head of the CIA at that time, said he was astonished to hear that there was reference made on all five Sunday morning shows that there was a hateful video involved.

So Mr. Carney is saying things that are absolutely false. The American people deserve better than that from the President's spokesperson whom they rely on for accurate information. When the bodies came home, and it was a moving event—I was there—the then-Secretary of State told members of the family and told me: We will get these people who were responsible for the hateful video.

That was a number of days later when it was absolutely proven to anyone's satisfaction there was no hateful video, and of course we still don't know what the final version of the talking points was that Susan Rice used on all the morning talk shows, who was the final arbiter of it. We know now that Mr. Rhodes played a very key role in that, and we need to know who gave her those talking points because they are patently false. If someone gave her those talking points, then why in the world did that person manufacture out of whole cloth information that was told to the American people?

There are a lot of points here, and we can get into some of the details, but the fact is that this is a coverup of a situation which was politically motivated in order to further the Presidential ambitions of the President of the United States. That is what this is all about. That is why comments and instructions were given in this email, because the narrative was: The tide of war is receding, Osama bin Laden is dead.

Secretary Susan Rice said at the time: Al Qaeda is decimated and the Embassy is safe and secure. None of those facts were true. Most importantly, we have five Americans who were killed. It is very clear that should not have happened, would not have happened if proper actions had been taken.

Most important now or just as important now is the fact that for the last 19 months this White House has been engaged in a coverup. It calls for a select committee to examine all of the facts, and as always happens in these kinds of scandals, the coverup is equally or sometimes worse than the actual action itself. The American people deserve to know the truth.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Thank you, Mr. President.

I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business for up to 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here, as regular viewers of the C–SPAN network know, for the 65th time, every week that the Senate is in session, to ask my colleagues in the Senate to wake up to the realities of climate change that surround us.

Here is what we know: We know the oceans and atmosphere are warming. By the way, that is measurement, not theory. We know sea level is rising. Again, that is measurement, not theory. We know oceans are becoming more acidic—again, a simple measurement. The potential that these changes have to disrupt economic growth and to disrupt global commerce is the subject of my remarks today, and it is those changes that make investors and corporate executives take climate change seriously.

We may not take climate change seriously, but corporate executives do. A world of shifting seasons and extreme heat hurts their bottom line. The world of drought-stricken farms and flooded cities, of raging wildfires and migrating diseases is not good for business. A

recent article from the World Bank conveys the corporate outlook this way:

In corporate boardrooms and the offices of CEOs, climate change is a real and present danger. It threatens to disrupt the water supplies and supply chains of companies as diverse as Coca-Cola and ExxonMobil. Rising sea levels and more intense storms put their infrastructure at risk and the costs will only get worse.

Earlier this month executives from major American companies came to Washington for a roundtable discussion at the Bicameral Task Force on Climate Change, which I lead with Congressman WAXMAN. Each of the companies present had signed the climate declaration of the Business for Innovative Climate and Energy Policy or BICEP. They see a low-carbon economy as a smart way to create new jobs and stimulate economic growth. More than 750 companies, nameplate American corporations such as eBay, Gap, Levi's, Nike, Starbucks, and many others have signed BICEP's climate declaration.

Kevin Rabinovitch is global sustainability director at Virginia-based candy company Mars, Incorporated, makers of the famous M&Ms, among other things. At the roundtable he told us Mars has a goal of eliminating fossil fuel energy use and greenhouse gas emissions companywide by 2040. In fact, just yesterday Mars announced it will build a 200-megawatt wind farm in Texas that will generate enough energy to power all Mars operations in the United States. I applaud this exciting step for Mars and the bold vision it represents.

But Mr. Rabinovitch told the Bicameral Task Force on Climate Change:

. . . if other companies and governments don't adopt similar science based targets, our efforts will have limited effect on climate change. We cannot do it alone. This is why the business community needs Congress to get off the sidelines, to quit denying rudimentary science and abundant evidence. Improving energy efficiency reduces climate-altering carbon emissions, but it also—these businesses find—reduces operating costs.

Colin Dyer, the president and CEO of Jones Lang LaSalle, Incorporated, the second largest publicly traded commercial real estate brokerage firm in the world said:

Cost savings alone represent a compelling benefit of sustainable design, construction, and management. Jones Lang LaSalle put smart building management technology to work for the consumer goods giant Procter & Gamble.

According to Dyer:

P&G earned back its initial investment in the technology in three months and saw average energy cost savings of 10 percent annually. The program, which is being expanded, also improved building systems reliability, supported the company's broader sustainability programs, and actually increased employee productivity.

Smart executives also understand how much their customers care about this. Rob Olson, vice president and chief financial officer of IKEA, said this:

From talking to our customers, we know that Americans are increasingly concerned about climate change as they experience events like Hurricane Sandy and the drought in California. They want to reduce the amount of energy they use in their home and they care about reducing waste and using less water.

This is not a new message from America's corporate sector. Last year the Bicameral Task Force on Climate Change wrote to over 300 businesses and organizations about carbon pollution and climate change. The response was encouraging. Coca-Cola, headquartered in Georgia, wrote:

We recognize climate change is a critical challenge facing our planet, with potential impacts on biodiversity, water resources, public health and agriculture. Beyond the effects on the communities we serve, we view climate change as a potential business risk, understanding that it could likely have direct and indirect effects on our business.

Walmart, founded and headquartered in Arkansas, wrote this: ''We're committed to reducing our carbon footprint and we're working with our suppliers to do the same.''

Here is what Walmart said in its 2009 sustainability report:

Climate change may not cause hurricanes, but warmer ocean water can make them more powerful. Climate change may not cause rainfall, but it can increase the frequency and severity of heavy flooding. Climate change may not cause droughts, but it can make droughts longer. Every company has a responsibility to reduce greenhouse gases as quickly as it can. Currently, we are investing in renewable energy, increasing efficiency in our buildings and trucks, working with suppliers to take carbon out of products and supporting legislation in the U.S. to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Serious business leaders are looking for serious answers to the looming economic crisis of climate change. An article last month in the Harvard Business Review entitled ''How to Survive Climate Change and Still Run a Thriving Business'' outlines recommendations for companies looking to strengthen their supply chains and better understand their consumers.

Serious business leaders are also fed up with the denial apparatus that is run by the big carbon polluters. Major utilities PG&E, the Public Service Company of New Mexico, and Exelon all quit the U.S. Chamber of Commerce after a chamber official called for putting climate science on trial similar to the Scopes Monkey Trial of 1925. Large tech companies such as Apple and Yahoo also left the chamber.

One of the companies that came in to the Bicameral Task Force was North Carolina-based VF Corporation. You may not have heard of VF Corporation, but you have sure heard of their major brands. They make Lee, Wrangler, Nautica, North Face, and many other name brands. Letitia Webster is their director of global corporate sustainability, and they have a global perspective on climate change. Their customers around the world are concerned about climate change, particularly their younger customers, and VF wants to meet those customers' expectations for good citizenship. VF also needs cotton for all their clothing and they are worried about climate disruption to the cotton supply chain. ''Research tells us that continued climate change will make it more and more difficult for farmers to manage cotton crops and for companies to manage their supply chains.''

VF also provides very high performance clothing and equipment to high-performance outdoor athletes who train and compete in places where climate changes are already evident. Those athletes see the same changes as the 100 winter Olympic competitors from 10 countries who signed a letter of warning about climate change. Letitia Webster mentioned in particular the Khumbu Icefall which has closed Mount Everest to climbers for the first time. She is not the only one.

John All, a climber, scientist, and professor of geography at Western Kentucky University told the Atlantic magazine:

I am at Everest Base Camp right now and things are dire because of climate change. . . . The ice is melting at unprecedented rates and [that] greatly increases the risk to climbers. You could say [that] climate change closed Mt. Everest this year.

Tim Rippel is a climbing guide, and he blogged from Everest's base camp:

As a professional member of the Canadian Avalanche Association, I have my educated concerns. The mountain has been deteriorating rapidly the past three years due [to] global warming and the breakdown in the Khumbu Icefall is dramatic.

Ms. Webster warned of the costs of inaction, saying, ''It's too expensive not to take action.'' This is a North Carolina company, and I hope its message gets through to elected officials who represent North Carolina.

Senator HAGAN has already spoken passionately about the need to act on climate change. She gets it, but her colleagues on the other side of the aisle remain silent.

I visited North Carolina over the recess as part of a tour of the effects of climate change along the southeast coast. I flew out to where sea level rise is gnawing away at North Carolina's Outer Banks.

I visited the marine science facility at Pivers Island, where scientists from Duke University, the University of North Carolina, North Carolina State, East Carolina University, and of course NOAA, are studying aspects of sea level rise in North Carolina and the effects of ocean acidification on microbes that form the basis of the food web.

These are some of the world's leading scientists. They all know that these changes are driven by carbon pollution. There is no doubt. Unless North Carolina's elected officials think that their own universities are part of the big hoax some of our colleagues talk about, they had better pay attention to what is happening on the North Carolina coast.

I met with the North Carolina Coastal Federation at their coastal education center in Wilmington, NC. It

was a bipartisan group joined together in concern over the exposure of their coastal communities to the rising seas. The ''North Carolina Sea-Level Rise Assessment Report'' prepared in 2010 by the North Carolina Coastal Resources Commission's Science Panel on Coastal Hazards says:

> The most likely scenario for 2100 AD is a rise of 0.4 meters to 1.4 meters (15 inches to 55 inches) above present.

By the way, that is what they call bathtub measures. That doesn't take into account what 55 inches of extra sea will do when it is heaped against the shore by a storm surge from a big tropical storm or hurricane.

I hope their congressional delegation in Congress is listening.

The biggest power producer in North Carolina is Charlotte-based Duke Energy. Duke worked through the U.S. Climate Action Partnership for climate change legislation. Duke actually pulled out of the National Association of Manufacturers because of that organization's denial of climate change. Duke's then-chief executive officer Jim Rogers said:

> We are not renewing our membership in the NAM because in tough times, we want to invest in associations that are pulling in the same direction we are.

He said that NAM, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and Republicans ''ought to roll up their sleeves and get to work on a climate bill. . . . '' Duke Energy might want to also consider whether North Carolina politicians are pulling in the same direction.

This is not complicated. Load up carbon dioxide concentrations in the atmosphere and you load up heat in the atmosphere. We have known that since Abraham Lincoln was President. This is not a new discovery. Load up the heat, and the oceans warm up. That is not some theory either. You can measure it—with thermometers. When liquid warms, it expands, unless my colleagues want to repeal the law of thermal expansion. As the ocean expands and ice melts, up goes the sea level. It is up 6 inches at the tide gauge in Wilmington, NC, since 1954.

If my colleagues want to deny the 6-inch increase in the tide gauge in Wilmington, NC, let me explain to them what the North Carolina assessment says about how you measure sea level rise:

> [Sea-level rise] can be directly measured in a straightforward way. The longest record of direct measurement of sea level comes from tide gauges. A tide gauge is a device built to measure water level variations due to tides and weather, and to eliminate effects due to waves. A tide gauge can be as simple as a long ruler nailed to a post on a dock. More sophisticated instruments, like those used by NOAA, are usually placed in a stilling well, or a pipe, that protects a float connected to a recording device from waves. As tides rise and fall, the float's motion is recorded.

It is not complicated. Good luck denying that. When you fly over the North Carolina coast, you see lots of investment along the seashore. There are lots of houses, lots of hotels, condominiums, restaurants—an entire seafront economy that the larger North Carolina economy very much depends on.

What are my colleagues from North Carolina going to tell them about climate change: Don't worry. It is not real? Good luck with that. They are already measuring the sea level rise.

Those small businesses in North Carolina want to protect their storefronts from sea level rise just as VF Corporation wants to protect its cotton supply from drought. These North Carolina companies get the economic threat that climate change presents.

The frustrating thing here is that we can strengthen our economies and businesses by tackling the problem of climate change and sea level rise head-on, and we can leave things better, not worse, for the generations that will follow us—perhaps the simplest obligation that we hold, and one, by the way, at which we are presently failing. But if we are going to stop failing at that obligation and tackle this problem head-on, we have to wake up to reality. We have to put aside, once and for all, the toxic polluter-paid politics that infect Washington.

The denial campaign that is run by these polluters is as poisonous to our democracy as carbon pollution is to our atmosphere and oceans. America is suffering as a result of Congress being tangled in a web of lies and surrounded by a barricade of special interests. We have to break through that. It is a matter of truth, it is a matter of honor, and it is a matter of being effective at these real problems.

I yield the floor and thank the Presiding Officer, and I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2265

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, it is often said that foreign aid from America is to project American power and what America believes in. Unfortunately, over decades, the only thing consistent about foreign aid is that the money continues to flow regardless of the behavior of the recipients. This is extraordinary, and we have seen this decade after decade.

Studies will often show that 75 percent of foreign aid throughout many continents is simply stolen, taken in graft. The Mubarak family in Egypt is an example.

The point I would like to make today is if we are going to project what America stands for, if we want our money to go to people who are supporting activities that America is for, we should write that into the law. We have made attempts at this in the past.

Several years ago Senator LEAHY attached an amendment to foreign aid that says that countries need to be evolving towards democracy or showing an ability to go forward towards democracy. The problem is that every time we have restrictions on foreign aid, they are evaded. We always give an out. The President always has an out.

This week in Egypt, 683 people were condemned to death in one trial. Yet your money still flows to Egypt without interruption.

We have another contingency that says: If a country has a military takeover—if you have an election and then you have a military junta or a military takeover of the government—our aid should end. It didn't happen in Egypt when there was a military takeover.

The only consistency about foreign aid is that it flows to all countries regardless of behavior. It is the opposite of what many of the proponents say. Many of the proponents say that we do this so we can modulate behavior and try to improve and make things better around the world. Yet they steadfastly oppose restrictions on foreign aid.

I have a bill that I am going to ask—in a few minutes—for the Senate to unanimously approve. This is a bill that should be an easy lift for most Senators. This is a bill to support our ally Israel and to say to the Palestinian Authority that if you wish to continue to take American money—and many people don't realize this, but the American taxpayer gives hundreds of millions of dollars every year to the Palestinian Authority, and we supposedly have restrictions, but there is always an out. Guess what. They always get their money regardless of behavior.

What have I have been saying is, let's have some restrictions. If we are going to give money to the Palestinian Authority, shouldn't they agree to recognize the State of Israel? Shouldn't that be part of what goes on with this?

We now have a problem—and the reason this has become a more pertinent issue and something that has come to the forefront—because Hamas, a terrorist group in Gaza, is now aligning them with Fatah, the people who run the Palestinian Authority.

My question is: Are we now going to send money to a unity government? Part of the charter of Hamas is not only not to recognize Israel, but they are actually for the destruction of Israel.

This is what I would ask Americans and those who will object to the bill—because there will be an objection to my bill: How can you object to something that calls for the recognition of Israel as a state? How can you object to this and how can you continue to allow the flow of money to a group that calls for the destruction of Israel? They will say: Well, we have contingencies for that or we will stop it if they become part of or control the West Bank.

When I was in Israel a year ago, I asked everybody that question. I met

with the Prime Minister of Israel, the President of Israel, the King of Jordan, and with the leader of the West Bank, Abbas. I met with all of these people and asked them: Can there be a separate peace? Can there be peace with the West Bank and peace with Gaza—a separate peace?

They all said: No, it has to be one peace.

I said to the Israeli side: If they are unified, will you negotiate with Hamas?

They said: No. They lob missiles at us. They are at war with us. They don't recognize our right to exist as a state. Not only that, they openly advocate for the destruction of Israel.

Realize that in the objection you will hear today, you will hear an objection that despite arguments to the contrary we will allow money to go to a unity government that will include Hamas.

I am simply asking that if we are going to send good money after bad—frankly, it is money we don't have. We have $1 trillion in debt. We have bridges falling down in our own country, and your government is sending hundreds of millions of dollars to the Palestinian Authority—which is now going to be unified with Hamas, without restrictions or with restrictions that have a hole so big you can drive a truck through them. This always happens.

Every contingency and every limitation on foreign aid that you think would be practical and reasonable always has an exception for the President to overcome. The President always does it so the only thing consistent about foreign aid is that money continues to flow.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we pass my bill, S. 2265, Stand With Israel. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged from further consideration of S. 2265 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I further ask that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Reserving the right to object to Senator PAUL's request to discharge S. 2265 in the committee, this legislation Senator PAUL has been referring to has not been considered by the committee. It was just introduced in the last day or so, I think.

As chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and on behalf of the Republican ranking member, Senator CORKER, who had to depart to return to Tennessee but otherwise would have joined me in making remarks, I come to the floor to express our opposition to an effort to circumvent the normal legislative process and deprive the members of our committee of the opportunity to decide whether to take up this legislation. The authorization to provide or cut U.S. assistance to the Palestinian Authority is clearly within the purview of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and it should have its members decide if it is appropriate, and it should be fully and openly considered by the committee.

This bill is a blunt-force instrument that would risk the collapse of the Palestinian economy in the West Bank. That is not in Israel's interests and it is not in our interests either. The bill would shift the burden of dealing with a failed state on its borders to Israel. That is certainly not my goal, and I hope it is not the goal of Senator PAUL either. Our goal should be to get back to a process and a negotiation toward a two-state solution that will allow Israel to live in peace and security.

We need to allow the parties—and particularly Mr. Abbas—the time to steer back toward a productive path to peace. To be clear, his time is limited. I am in agreement with Senator PAUL that President Abbas must ultimately choose between a future that envisions two States living side by side in peace and security or a destructive unity pact with a terrorist organization whose stated objective is to make sure there is no two-State solution.

A unity government—not a unity announcement but a unity government—between Fatah and Hamas has consequences that are clear under existing U.S. law. If Mr. Abbas definitely opens the door to Hamas exercising influence in the Palestinian Authority, I will encourage my colleagues to stand with me in exercising the existing legal authority to halt assistance to a government that includes parties that reject Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state and continues to support terrorism.

For those reasons, I must object to the Senator's request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Vermont.

DIFFERENCES OF OPINION

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, there has been a lot of criticism waged at the majority leader of the Senate, HARRY REID, for his discussion about the Koch brothers. That criticism of Senator REID is unfortunate. I think what Senator REID is trying to do is educate the American people about the disastrous Citizens United Supreme Court decision and what it has done by allowing billionaire families, such as the Koch brothers and Sheldon Adelson and others, to pump hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars into the political process in order to elect candidates in the House, in the Senate, and in the White House, who are working overtime against the best interests of the middle class and working families of this country and, at the same time, are working to provide even more tax breaks to millionaires and billionaires and large profitable corporations.

I think it is important, when we talk about the Koch brothers, not to make this discussion personal. It is not a personal discussion. It is a discussion about what the most powerful political family in this country believes. If they are spending hundreds of millions of dollars—and this is a family worth $80 billion, and they may end up spending, in fact, billions of dollars on campaigns—what is it they want? What do they believe? What do folks such as Sheldon Adelson believe, when they invite potential Republican candidates for President to come to Las Vegas for what has been called the Adelson primary, where he will listen to them and decide who he might support and spend hundreds of millions of dollars on in a Presidential campaign?

So I think it is important we know what the Koch brothers believe. Here is the best information I have. In 1980, as it turns out, David Koch, one of the two brothers, ran for Vice President of the United States on the Libertarian Party platform. What is interesting to me is to what degree the platform he ran on—which in 1980 got him 1 percent of the vote on the Libertarian ticket—to what degree that extremist set of positions has now become mainstream Republican today.

I want to take a few minutes to quote exactly what was in that 1980 platform so the American people can recognize to what degree ideas that at one point were considered extremist are now mainstream Republican. This is what was in the 1980 Libertarian Party platform upon which David Koch ran for Vice President:

> We urge the repeal of federal campaign finance laws, and the immediate abolition of the despotic Federal Election Commission.

What that means is the Koch brothers, and increasingly the Republican Party, now believe there should be no campaign finance laws, that Citizens United did not go far enough, and that the Koch brothers should be able to spend millions of dollars by giving that money directly to individual candidates. That is what the Koch brothers said in 1980. That is what many Republicans believe today.

Let me state an exact quote from the platform:

> We favor the repeal of the fraudulent, virtually bankrupt, and increasingly oppressive Social Security system.

There are many Republicans today who not only want to see cuts in Social Security but who ultimately want to privatize Social Security who believe it is unconstitutional for the U.S. Government to be involved in retirement benefits for seniors.

Libertarian Party platform, 1980:

> We oppose—

Listen to this one. This is really quite incredible:

> We oppose all personal and corporate income taxation, including capital gains taxes. We support the eventual repeal of all taxation.

Repeal of all taxation? That is the government. Basically, what they are saying, very boldly, straightforwardly—we have to respect their honesty—is they don't believe in government.

I have not heard any of my Republican colleagues say they want to abolish all taxation. That is not what they say and that is not what they believe. But on the other hand, it is important to note that the Ryan budget, just passed in mid-April in the House, provides a $5 trillion tax break over a 10-year period, mainly by cutting the top individual and corporate income tax rates significantly. In other words, at a time when the wealthiest people are doing phenomenally well at the same time as the middle class disappears and more and more people live in poverty, what my Republican colleagues believe is we should give more tax breaks to millionaires and billionaires.

The Koch brothers' position in 1980 was that they support—Libertarian Party platform:

> We support repeal of all laws which impede the ability of any person to find employment, such as minimum wage laws.

What does that mean?

Yesterday, we had a vote on the floor of the Senate which said that a $7.25 an hour minimum wage is a poverty wage; that people who are working 40 hours a week and are making $7.25 an hour are living in poverty; that they cannot bring up and raise families on those wages; and that if we raise the minimum wage to $10.10 an hour, we could increase the salaries of approximately 28 million Americans. On that vote to overcome a Republican filibuster, one Republican voted with members of the Democratic caucus, and we lost that vote.

What is interesting, it is not simply that almost every Republican voted against raising the minimum wage; what is more significant is that many Republicans believe we should abolish the concept of the minimum wage.

Many of us know Senator TOM COBURN of Oklahoma to be an honest and straightforward guy. He tells it the way he sees it. This morning on the ''Morning Joe'' television show, this is what Senator COBURN said, and I quote from the transcript:

> I don't believe you ought to interfere in the market. If there's to be a minimum wage—my theory is I don't believe there ought to be a national minimum wage. That's my position.

In other words, what Senator COBURN is saying today and, in fact, what many Republicans agree with him about, is we should abolish the concept of the minimum wage—something the Koch brothers were talking about 34 years ago.

What are the implications of that if we do as Senator COBURN suggested and just let the market work and don't have government interfere by establishing a minimum wage American workers should receive? What it means, quite simply, when we let the free market work, is that if people are in a high unemployment area and there are many workers competing for few jobs, an employer will say to a potential employee: I am prepared to hire you, good news, and I am going to pay $4.

The worker says: I can't live on $4 an hour. That is a starvation wage.

The employer says: That is OK, because I have 20 other workers who are prepared to accept that wage.

That is what happens when we abolish the concept of the minimum wage.

Many of us—and I think the vast majority of the American people—have a very different vision of where our country should go. We don't believe we should be abolishing the minimum wage. We don't believe we should be cutting or privatizing Social Security or transforming Medicare into a voucher program or making horrendous cuts to Medicaid.

What, in fact, the American people want is the Federal Government to start standing up for working families rather than millionaires and billionaires. In poll after poll, what the American people have said is they want us to invest in rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure and create millions of decent-paying jobs. That is what the American people want. They do not want tax breaks for billionaires but the creation of millions of jobs for rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure.

The American people, despite what Senator COBURN and others may believe, want us to raise the minimum wage. Poll after poll suggests the American people want us to raise the minimum wage to at least $10.10 an hour.

The American people do not want us to cut Social Security. In fact, more and more Americans want us to expand Social Security, to make sure when elderly people reach retirement age, they can live and retire with dignity.

I think there has perhaps never been a time in the modern history of this country where the political lines have been drawn as clearly as they are right now. If you listen to the Koch brothers, if you read the Republican Ryan budget in the House, their positions are quite clear: Tax breaks for millionaires and billionaires and significant cuts in the programs that are life and death for the middle-class and working families of this country.

That is not what the American people want, and it is time we began to listen to the American people. It is time we took on those people, those billionaires who are spending huge amounts of money electing candidates who represent their interests. And it is time we listen to the working families of this country, who are struggling to survive.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of my friend from Vermont, who I know is in a hurry to leave the premises, as most Senators have already done. Perhaps he could relax and go out and have a Coke. Bad pun.

(The remarks of Mr. ROBERTS pertaining to the introduction of S. 2282 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise today to point out to my colleagues that more than 300 days have passed since we in the Senate passed bipartisan legislation that would secure our borders, hold employers accountable for hiring illegal workers, grow our economy, and provide a chance for people currently here illegally to get right with the law and earn legal status. But the House has failed to do anything to fix our broken immigration system—more than 300 days after we in the Senate passed bipartisan legislation.

To be clear, the problem is not that there is a difference of opinion between a House bill and a Senate bill on immigration that cannot be reconciled. The problem is that House Republicans have completely abdicated their responsibility to address important issues, such as fixing our broken immigration system.

Again, the problem is not that the House has passed laws that the Senate disagrees with. The problem is that the House will not put any immigration bills up for a vote, no matter what is in those bills. Now, why is that?

It is not because our immigration system is not broken. There is no Member of Congress who will stand and say: Our immigration system is great. Leave it alone. What is all the fuss about?

No one is happy with the present system. Finding a Member of Congress anywhere who will say we do not need to reform our broken immigration system is impossible.

The reason the House has done nothing on immigration is because House Republicans have handed the gavel of leadership on immigration to far-right extremists such as Congressman STEVE KING.

Congressman KING is not a mainstream Republican on this issue. You cannot even call him a conservative on this issue. He is an extreme outlier on the issue of immigration reform.

Every time any Republican has raised the possibility of action on immigration reform in the House, STEVE KING is there, in his own words, ''manning the watchtowers 24/7'' to make sure nothing can be passed to fix our broken immigration system.

When Republicans such as ERIC CANTOR, hardly a flaming liberal, talked early in 2013 about introducing a bill called the KIDS Act which would allow minors brought here through no fault of their own to earn legal status if they served in the military or obtained a college degree, KING said, ''For every child who's a valedictorian, there's another 100 out there who weigh 130 pounds and they've got calves the size of cantaloupes because they're hauling

75 pounds of marijuana across the desert.''

The rhetoric of STEVE KING is beyond the pale. I am certain that the majority of Republicans in the House have their stomachs churn when they see STEVEN KING spew that kind of rhetoric. But rather than stand up to him, they give him the keys to the kingdom of immigration reform. Just look at what happened after KING protested. There was no KIDS Act introduced. Go look for the text of the KIDS Act on line. It does not exist. There is no bill. Not only was the KIDS Act never introduced, but House Republicans actually voted, nearly unanimously, to resume deporting minor children who had committed no crimes.

Another Republican, JEFF DENHAM, a Republican from California, who is also an Air Force reservist, recently proposed to let young people who came here illegally earn status by enlisting in the military. They love America so they would enlist in the military and risk their lives for this country. Here is what DENHAM said—paraphrasing him. He said: I know many of us do not want to vote on immigration. But we can at least tweak the Defense authorization bill to allow young people who were brought here illegally as minors through no fault of their own to serve in the military when they love this country and this is the only country they know.

To be clear, this measure is far short of comprehensive legislation that is needed to fix our broken system. This slight tweak is not even a drop of water in the Grand Canyon. Even for the small microscopic measure known as the ENLIST Act, STEVE KING responded, saying, ''Don't do it.'' And the Republicans did not.

Here is what KING said:

> As soon as they raise their hand and say I'm unlawfully present in the U.S., we are not going to take your oath into the military, but we're going to take your deposition and we have a bus for you to Tijuana.

What happened when KING said this? He won. The ENLIST Act was stricken from the Defense authorization bill. So not only are Republicans catering to the views of KING and others on the far, far, extreme right on immigration by refusing to vote on any immigration reform, they actively promote anti-immigrant viewpoints by having passed a bill called the ENFORCE Act. You see, STEVE KING and his little group of far-right Members of Congress on immigration want to sue the Federal Government to require them to deport minor children, parents of U.S. citizens, and agricultural workers, rather than use all of its resources to focus on immigrants who are criminals, terrorists, and recent border crossers.

But Members of Congress, as most everyone knows, do not have standing to sue the Federal Government, because under our Constitution, Congressmen are not allowed to sue every time they disagree with a decision of the executive branch. Instead of thinking it was probably a good idea to focus our immigration enforcement resources on criminals, terrorists, and border crossers, once again STEVE KING said: Jump. And the Republican mainstream in the House said: How high? Republicans overwhelmingly voted to give KING and others the ability to sue the Federal Government every single time a decision on immigration enforcement is made with which they disagree.

There are Republican colleagues in the House who do not have the views of STEVE KING. We know that. They can offer other excuses they want for failing to do anything on immigration. For instance, they tried to blame the President. They say the President is to blame because he will not enforce the law. The record shows that he does enforce the law. In fact, many of the more liberal people, many of the immigration groups, are angry with him because they think he is enforcing the law too much.

But let's say you believe he is not enforcing the law. So we have said to them: Good. Pass a bill now and say it does not take effect, all of the enforcement and any of the rest of it, until 2017. We will have a new President. If Republicans cannot agree to pass a bill that goes into effect after the President's term, then we know that mistrust of the President is nothing but a straw man.

They say they really want to pass immigration legislation in their heart, but they are only one Member and it is not up to them. They can even have their leadership blame other Republicans for not holding a vote. But Bill Parcells, who used to coach for both the New York Giants and New York Jets, was famous for saying, ''You are what your record shows you are.''

What does the record show? The record on Republican immigration reform is clear. STEVE KING, a far-right, way-out-of-the-mainstream outlier, does not just spew hatred, he calls the shots. They listen to him. The Republican Party, the party of Abraham Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt and Dwight Eisenhower and Ronald Reagan and George Bush, all of whom had much different views on immigration than STEVE KING, is following STEVE KING on immigration.

Let me say, they are following STEVE KING over the cliff. Because not only are they hurting America, but because they are so afraid to buck this extremist—and he is extreme on immigration—they are going to make it certain that they will lose the 2016 Presidential election, that they will make sure that the Senate remains Democratic in 2016 and that the House turns Democratic.

It is amazing. The Republican record on immigration reform is clear. STEVE KING has three wins. The rest of the Republican Party and the rest of America is winless. Good for him. Terrible for us. Since House Republicans will not stand up to STEVE KING, KING is in the driver's seat on immigration reform. As long as he sits there, things will continue to be stuck in a rut.

America is growing weary of Republicans talking a good game on immigration while high-tech businesses cannot get the labor they need to grow and create American jobs. We are growing weary of all the talk while crops go unpicked because farmers cannot find labor. We are growing weary while Republicans talk and immigrants continue to come into our country illegally.

STEVE KING is calling the shots of the entire House Republicans on immigration. That is a shame. That is a disgrace. That is a singular lack of courage that we see in our dear colleagues across the way on the Republican side of the aisle. KING is not satisfied. He is warning that his colleagues have to man the watchtowers 24/7 to make sure nothing happens to fix our broken immigration system.

Where are the people in the Republican Party in the House of Representatives with the courage to stand up to STEVE KING and the far right? They know he is wrong. We know they know he is wrong. Where are the people in the Republican Party to stand up to STEVE KING and say: Enough is enough. We will not let our party or our country be hijacked by extremists whose xenophobia causes them to prefer maintaining our broken immigration system over achieving a tough, fair, and practical long-term solution.

If Republicans continue to kowtow to STEVE KING and the hard right on immigration, they will consign themselves to being the minority party for more than a decade or they can show some courage and say the STEVE KINGS in the world can say whatever they want, but they have no place in the modern Republican Party. They can move their party into the light by passing a bill that secures borders, holds employers accountable, grows our economy, reduces our debt, and heals broken families. The choice is theirs.

Speaker BOEHNER has occasionally said he wants to pass reform. Where are the rank-and-file Republicans who know STEVE KING is wrong to encourage Speaker BOEHNER? Where are they? I hope that for our sakes, the majority of Republicans in the House Republican caucus make the right choice.

But I will tell them this: For the country, no matter what choice they make, the ultimate outcome is undeniable. Immigration reform will pass this year with bipartisan support and a bipartisan imprint or it will pass in future years with only Democratic support and Democratic imprints, because Democrats will control the Congress and the White House. The right thing will ultimately be done. But hopefully Winston Churchill will not be right in saying that it will only be done after everything else is tried.

Republicans in the House, stand up to STEVE KING. You know he is wrong. You know you cringe when he says

what he says. Do not let him dictate policy.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. The Republican-led filibuster of the minimum wage bill—which would raise the Federal minimum wage from $7.75 per hour to $10.10 per hour—means that an estimated 27.8 million Americans, including 91,000 Rhode Islanders, will not get a raise. It also means, according to estimates from the Economic Policy Institute, that our economy will miss out on a GDP boost of $22 billion by 2016, which would have supported over 84,000 additional full-time jobs.

Those 27.8 million workers who would have received a raise would have spent it at local businesses, helping their local communities and spurring economic growth. Typically, minimum wage workers are those who, when they receive an increase in their paychecks, go out and buy things that are necessary. They are the ones who really provide the kind of local stimulus we need to grow the economy.

The Federal minimum wage has not been increased since 2009. Today an individual who works 40 hours per week 52 weeks a year at the Federal minimum wage earns $15,080 per year, and that is nearly $5,000 below the Federal poverty level for a family of three and almost $9,000 below the poverty level for a family of four. That means we have hard-working Americans putting in full-time work every week for the entire year and yet still living in poverty. That is not fair to these families who are just looking for a fair shot.

People who work hard for a living shouldn't have to live in poverty. That was not the case in the sixties when the minimum wage was such that it would lift you out of poverty, and that is what we have to do today.

When Congress last passed legislation to raise the minimum wage in 2007, it was a bipartisan undertaking, and 44 Republican Senators joined Democrats to send President Bush a bill that raised the minimum wage to its current level. That bipartisan effort should be emulated today in this Senate. In fact, one could argue that the needs are more pressing; that American workers have fallen further behind; and that the same logic that compelled President Bush to sign this bill and a bipartisan Congress to send it to him is even more compelling today.

Our constituents sent us here to work together to grow the economy and create jobs. It is disappointing that this bill to provide millions of hard-working Americans a raise—a raise they deserve through their own efforts—has been filibustered.

I hope my colleagues on the other side would find a way to work with us on this issue and come together to strengthen our economic recovery. I was particularly gratified, working with my colleagues on emergency unemployment insurance, that we did get bipartisan support to pass sensible and fiscally responsible legislation. Unfortunately, now it is in the House and it is not moving there. I hope it does.

But we have to do more of that, focus on what will actually help Americans individually and collectively move and grow our economy. We have worked together on emergency unemployment insurance and other issues, such as immigration reform. We can work together on this issue, and we must.

Again, I am at this point very disappointed that same bipartisan effort has not been translated into action by the House of Representatives when it comes to restoring emergency unemployment insurance. Speaker BOEHNER could call up our bill, which is fully paid for and which will affect, at this point, about 2.6 million Americans—and their families, so it is many more Americans who will benefit—and under the rules of the House could quickly have a vote within probably 24 hours. I am convinced and so is my colleague Senator HELLER of Nevada, who is my chief cosponsor, that bill would pass in the House today on a bipartisan basis. We have had Republican Representatives who have written to the Speaker and said: Bring it up for a vote. That would help. It would help not only 2.6 million Americans—and that grows each day—but it would also help our economy.

So, again, in a similar vein, we need bipartisan action on raising the minimum wage in the Senate, emulating the bipartisan action we took with respect to emergency unemployment insurance, and then we need that same bipartisanship in the House of Representatives to move these measures to the President for his signature.

Raising the minimum wage and restoring jobless benefits are the right things to do for the American people and for the American economy. I hope these policies, which traditionally have enjoyed strong bipartisan support, will eventually prevail in both the Senate and the House and be signed into law by the President of the United States.

Once again, I think it is important to emphasize that the last time we raised the minimum wage, it was a bipartisan effort signed by a Republican President. This is not an issue or should not be an issue of political ideology or political posturing. This should be an issue of what helps the American worker make his or her way through a very difficult economy. Viewed in that logic, it is clear to me that we should pass this legislation, not filibuster it, and that the House should pass quickly the emergency unemployment insurance compensation bill.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. HOEVEN. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. HOEVEN pertaining to the introduction of S. 2280 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). The Senator from Connecticut.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I wish to tell the story of a 57-year-old man from Boyertown, PA. His name is Dean Angstadt.

Dean is a self-employed, self-sufficient logger. He is the kind of guy, similar to a lot of Americans out there, who has sort of grown up to believe he could do everything for himself; that he didn't need a lot of help from people around him in order to make a living, in order to provide for his family, in order to keep himself healthy.

He has been uninsured since 2009, and he had some particular thoughts about the Affordable Care Act. He knew he didn't want anything to do with ObamaCare.

In 2011 Dean had a pacemaker and a defibrillator implanted to help his ailing heart pump more efficiently. Not long after he got these two implants, the 6-foot, 285-pound guy was back out in the woods, but last summer his health worsened again. It was taking him about 10 minutes just to catch his breath after he felled a tree, and by the fall he was winded just traveling the 50 feet between his house and his truck. He said:

> I knew that I was really sick. I figured the doctors were going to have to operate, so I tried to work as long as I could to save money for the surgery. But it got to the point where I couldn't work.

So he called his friend Bob who is a 55-year-old retired firefighter and nurse, and talked about the fact that he was having trouble. Bob said: Why don't you check out the Affordable Care Act? But every time he made that suggestion, Dean refused. Dean said:

> We argued about it for months. I didn't trust this ObamaCare. One of the big reasons is it sounded too good to be true.

January came, and Dean's health continued to get worse. His doctor made it clear he urgently needed valve replacement surgery, and he was facing a choice: He either had to find a way to get health care or he was going to die. That was his choice, find a way to pay for health care or perish.

Luckily, his friend Bob finally convinced Dean to come over and at least

take a look at the Affordable Care plans available to Dean. So he came over to his house, and in less than an hour the two of them had finished the application. One day later Dean signed up for the Highmark Blue Cross Silver PPO plan and paid his first monthly premium of $26.11.

All of a sudden, I'm getting notification from Highmark, and I got my card, and it was actually all legitimate. I could have done backflips if I were in better shape.

His plan kicked in on March 1, just in time to get the surgery he couldn't have afforded otherwise, that he couldn't have put off any longer. On March 31, after his surgery, he said without that surgery:

I probably would have ended up falling over dead. Not only did it save my life, it's going to give me a better quality of life.

For me, this isn't about politics. I'm trying to help other people who are like me, stubborn and bullheaded, who refused to even look. From my own experience, the ACA is everything it's supposed to be and, in fact, better than it's made out to be.

Dean's story is one of 8 million stories that can be told all across the country. Eight million people have enrolled in private health care plans under the Affordable Care Act. Why? Because there is a simple premise embedded at the foundation of the Affordable Care Act; that is, that you shouldn't get sick—in Dean's case, you shouldn't face death—simply because you don't have the money to afford surgery.

Dean was working. Dean was a logger, a salt-of-the-Earth kind of guy who was playing by the rules, obeying the law, had a job, but he just didn't have the money to afford that expensive surgery. He gets to live and he gets access to health care because of the Affordable Care Act—not because of a government handout but because of our collective decision to give Dean a discount on private health care, 1 of 8 million people all across the country.

That is just the number of people who have been insured on these private exchanges. Three million young people under the age of 26 have been able to stay on their parents' plans because the Affordable Care Act allows for that to occur. New numbers this week suggest more than 4.8 million people have enrolled in Medicaid and CHIP plans between October 2013 and March of 2014. Another approximately 1 million individuals gained coverage through an early expansion of Medicaid that happened in States before January 1, 2014.

Put that all together: Eight million people on exchanges, 3 million young people covered through their parents' plan, 5.8 million people on Medicaid. That is 16 million, 17 million people in this country who have health care who didn't have it before.

In my State the numbers are even more remarkable. We had a goal of signing up about 100,000 people, and we went out there and did everything we could to get the word out about the Affordable Care Act. We didn't sign up 100,000 people; we signed up 200,000 people. To be exact, we signed up 208,301 people in Connecticut. On the last day alone, on March 31, 5,900 people signed up in Connecticut. Connecticut is a small State. We only have a handful of 1 million people who live in our entire State, and we increased those who have insurance by 200,000 in a State of only a few million. That is probably why—the fact that in States such as Connecticut 200,000 people now have insurance, 15 million-plus across the country have insurance—the polling is starting to fundamentally change. A Washington Post poll from a few weeks ago showed that for the first time a majority of Americans support the Affordable Care Act. A new poll in battleground congressional districts shows that 52 percent of respondents want to implement and fix the Affordable Care Act, which is about 10 percent more than those people who want to repeal and replace the bill. That 52 percent number has increased beyond what the poll showed last December. The 42 percent number of those who want to repeal and replace is much less than the number from last December. People are starting to figure out that all the Republican spin and rhetoric about the Affordable Care Act is just that, spin and rhetoric, and the reality is that 15 million people have access to health care. The stories such as Dean's can be multiplied all over the country in every corner of this great Nation.

But here is the even better news: We are not only enrolling more people but we are saving money. We are enrolling people and saving money. Medicare spending growth is down. Medicare per capita spending is growing at historically low rates. In April, for the fifth straight year, CBO reduced its projections for Medicare spending over the next 10 years. This time they reduced it by another $106 billion.

This is what we always said was the problem with the American health care system. We always said we don't insure enough people. We still leave 30 million people without access to health care and we spend twice as much money as our other competitor first-world nations—less people insured, much greater cost. We all came down to the floor, the Senate and the House, and said the Affordable Care Act will tackle both problems, and now a few months into the full implementation of the law that is exactly what is happening.

It is actually costing less than we thought. The projections are that the Affordable Care Act is going to reduce the deficit by $1.7 trillion over the next two decades. Let me say that again. The Affordable Care Act will reduce the deficit by $1.7 trillion, meaning if you repeal the Affordable Care Act, as so many still want to do—as the House has tried to do 50 different times—you would increase the deficit by $1.7 trillion and the overall cost of the program is 15 percent less than what the initial projections were.

Insurers are starting to weigh in as well. The second biggest U.S. health insurer, WellPoint, increased its profit forecast after the ACA enrollment numbers boosted their quarterly results. Their chief executive officer said:

The risk pool and the product selection seem to be coming in the manner that we hoped it would. It's very encouraging right now.

UnitedHealthcare, which had a pretty small footprint in these exchanges, has now changed its bias to increase the participation in exchanges in 2015 because it said it saw a positive response from consumers who enrolled in the plans they did offer in limited States in greater than expected numbers. Fifteen million people, including eight million people on private insurance plans, enrolled, saving money for taxpayers and for insurance companies. That is the real story of the Affordable Care Act.

Let me finish by sharing with you a couple more stories from Connecticut, and I am going to share them through the eyes of the enrollers because enrollers and assisters are the heroes of these last several months.

There was an embarrassing rollout of the Affordable Care Act in the fall of last year, a Web site that should have been working on day one that wasn't. But the fact is that thousands of people all across this country working in community health centers and emergency rooms, at nonprofits, decided to make this thing work in red States and in blue States and went out and enrolled in record numbers, shattering expectations for people on affordable health care. I had a few of these assisters together in Connecticut. They started telling me stories and I will finish with two of them.

Michael, who is an assister in Danielson, CT, tells this story, and he said: I recall a husband and wife who came into our health center and didn't have health insurance mainly because they indicated their employer's insurance plan was way too expensive. As I went along asking questions during the application the husband mostly complained about ObamaCare. He kept saying our government is making it so no one can afford insurance and that he and his wife heard that insurance plans were still too high, even after going through the exchange. After completing the application and showing them the plans that were offered, they were totally surprised by the minimal cost of the premiums as well as the deductible rates. I also helped them understand how certain plans were structured and what services the deductible applied to. They left that day choosing a plan that was right for them. Needless to say, they went home from our meeting feeling more confident about their choice, more educated about health insurance and less resentful of the Affordable Care Act.

Sean, who is an assister from Norwich, tells this story: I met one middle-aged man. He hadn't had insurance for over 5 years because all the plans were so high and unaffordable and he was

over the income for the State Medicaid insurance program. He had a few prescriptions and had to pay out-of-pocket around $150 to $200 every month. We successfully completed an ACA application and selected an Anthem Blue Cross and Blue Shield plan with tax credits. The plan's monthly premium was only a fraction of what he would have paid every month for prescriptions and medical care, and the prescription drug copay was only about $10. This man was ecstatic, and he said he would have to go home to figure out a way to spend all of the money that he would save every month with his new plan.

There are stories similar to his and Dean's all over the country, 8 million of them just when it comes to the people who have signed up for private health care, but for the rest of us who have health care, the news is good as well: $1.7 trillion off of the deficit, a program that is costing 15 percent less than we had expected, an overall Medicare inflation rate for taxpayers that is coming down, and for many of us the ability to sleep a little bit better at night because we know that the most affluent, most powerful country in the world has committed itself to the idea that somebody like Dean—a logger, going out and working the land—doesn't have to die simply because he doesn't have the money to pay for surgery. In so many ways the Affordable Care Act is working.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

CAMPAIGN SPENDING

Mr. KING. Madam President, there is an ominous tide rising in this country. It is not water. It is not oil. It is not any kind of substance. It is dollars. It is cash. It is a tide of dark money that is flowing in and threatens to dominate our political system.

Yesterday we had a very interesting hearing in the Rules Committee on the subject of disclosure and the rise of outside money in campaigns. We have developed a kind of parallel universe of campaign financing, where the candidates, you and I and other Members of this body, work hard to raise money from supporters so we can fund our campaigns. By the way, all of that money that is raised has to be under certain limits. There are limitations. There are disclosure requirements. If you get a contribution, it has to be disclosed who paid it and what do they do for a living and what is their address. All of that is public.

Yet on the other side is this parallel universe, as I mentioned, where a multimillionaire can come into your State or my State or anybody's State and put in an enormous amount of money, essentially unregulated and often totally anonymous. I think this is a danger to our country. I started the hearing off yesterday by saying I fear for my country. I fear for our democracy.

There are several basic points I wish to make. This isn't an evolutionary change. This isn't, OK, we are spending a few more dollars this year than we did last year and it is a little more of the same and it is no big deal. This is what is happening: This is nonparty outside spending starting back in the early nineties, and we see what happened in 2012. Now we don't have the numbers in 2012. Of course, 2012 was a Presidential year. What we see is it started to go up, the Presidential year in 2004, and then down. It goes up in 2008 in the Presidential year, down—but not so much—and then way up in 2012, and this gives the context of what is happening. This isn't evolutionary change; this is revolutionary change. This is a fundamental change.

I asked one of our witnesses yesterday at the hearing: Is this a very significant, great change that is going on? He said: Senator, it is an explosion.

It is an explosion. Here is what it looks like. This is nonparty spending, cycle to date, and the day was the day before yesterday. In other words, it is the outside party spending, the so-called independent expenditures comparing apples to apples as of April 29 of each year.

So here again, 2004 Presidential year, then it drops way down in 2006 midterms, again jumps up in 2008, down in 2010, big jump for 2012. But look where we are as of this date in 2014. Look at the comparison between this and the last midterm year. It is almost 10 times as much. This is a threat that is growing and it is going to overwhelm us.

Some of my colleagues have said we are bound for a scandal. Indeed, that is what has driven campaign finance reform throughout our history. The first major campaign finance reform was in 1907. It resulted from the Presidential campaigns in the late 1890s and the turn of the century, where Mark Hanna, a political operative, called the major corporations of America and said: You will give us this—and that is how the money was raised for those campaigns. We then passed the first campaign finance law under the leadership of Teddy Roosevelt in 1907 because he saw a scandal coming.

So this is nonparty outside spending. This is both disclosed and undisclosed, but look at this. This is spending by nondisclosure groups, cycle to date. Look where we are. This is the money that nobody knows where it comes from. If we start back in here, 2012, this is a Presidential year to date and here we are in 2014. It is an explosion, and nobody knows where that money is coming from. It is secret money.

What we have is the development of organizations and institutions engaged in what I call identity laundering. I am not going to attempt to explain this chart, but this is a chart that traces in 2012 one set of funds. It is about $400 million from three large organizations that go through all of these different entities and the whole purpose is to keep the names of the donors secret. So the public doesn't know who is trying to influence their vote. This isn't insignificant money. Fifty million dollars this line represents to something called the American Future Fund. They create these entities—and there is also the wonderful nomenclature here—there are even entities entitled ''undesignated'' or ''disregarded''—and the whole purpose of this is to hide the identity of the people who are supporting it.

I don't think that is consistent with the First Amendment. It is not consistent with our political traditions. It is not consistent with the whole idea of conveying information. If somebody wants to come and buy ads in Pennsylvania or North Dakota or New York or California, that is fine. They have a right to do that, at least under the current Supreme Court rulings, but they also ought to tell us who they are. That is part of the information the voters should have in assessing the validity of the message that is being delivered to them.

In Maine you cannot go to a town meeting with a bag over your head. If you are going to make a speech, if you are going to take your position on an issue, you tell who you are, and people can assess the validity of your views based upon in part who they know you are, what your interest is, what your stake is in this process, and we are denying the people of America the opportunity to know that.

It is important to realize in this whole area of campaign finance, which is unbelievably complicated, that the Supreme Court has significantly narrowed our ability in Congress or in the States to regulate campaign finance. They have essentially said that money is speech and that it can't be limited—at least in the aggregate, that is the McCutcheon decision. Under the Citizens United decision, the corporations are also people and have a right to free speech and can spend as much money as they want.

When you go back and read those key opinions—Citizens United and McCutcheon, which was just decided about a month ago—the Supreme Court said: We are going to strike down these limitations because they are limitations on free speech, but the basic reason we feel comfortable doing so is because the public still has disclosure and they will know who is talking, and that is our bulwark against abuse and corrosion of our system.

The problem with that reasoning is the bulwark doesn't exist, and clever campaign operatives have created this elaborate system which is designed to disguise who the contributors are, and that is the problem with our system.

The problem right now is that one party may think they are advantaged by the current system, but 2 years from now that advantage could disappear. Indeed, data we received just before our hearing indicates that 2 years ago 88 percent of the outside money was conservative. Indeed, this year—so far in 2012—it is closer to being balanced. It

is 60–40 conservative over more liberal messages. I submit that once it gets to be 50–50, everybody on both sides of the aisle will say that maybe we need to do something about it. I am suggesting we do something about it sooner rather than later.

The Supreme Court has invited us to do something about disclosure. I think it is the tool we know we have. There is discussion about a constitutional amendment, which is fine, and I am a supporter. That is a long-term solution. That could take 4, 5, 6 years, assuming the support could be achieved in the Congress and in the States. In the meantime, disclosure is something we could do next week, and it is something we should do. We owe it to the American people to allow them to know who it is that is trying to influence their vote.

Occasionally, there is an argument that people who make these kinds of contributions will be subjected to some kind of intimidation—crank phone calls, threats, and those kinds of things. Well, Justice Scalia—the Supreme Court Justice whom I used to know in law school—recently said: ''Requiring people to stand up in public for their political acts fosters civic courage, without which democracy is doomed.''

If people are willing to spend millions of dollars attacking someone else's character, integrity, and career, they ought to at least be willing to stand up and say: Here am I. I am making these statements.

They should not be allowed to hide behind something created by an army of accountants and lawyers to disguise their identity. I think this is something—and based upon the hearing we had yesterday and the work we did in preparing for it—we really need to attend to.

When I first got into this subject last year, I thought it was bad. Well, what I have learned over the last several months is that it is a lot worse than I thought. It is happening fast. It is a tidal wave, and it is going to engulf our system. Why do we care? Because it is corrosive and it undermines the confidence citizens have in us as their political leaders.

In the 1970s and 1980s, people had a perception that money was corrupting around here, even if it wasn't. But, boy, when we start to have unidentified, outside dark money and nobody knows where it is coming from, what could be more calculating to undermine public confidence in their leadership than a system like that? It is corrosive. It undermines the trust of our people. It is wrong, and I think it is something we should attend to. It is something we can do. We know we can do it constitutionally. We had an 8-to-1 majority vote. McCutcheon and Citizens United invited us to do this. I think we should be able to find a bipartisan solution to this subject because it will benefit this whole country, and I think it will be a great benefit to the institution of democracy itself. This is not what the Framers envisioned, and we have it within our power to do something about it so we can improve this situation and the flow of information—including the source of that information—to the people of America.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

UKRAINE

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I take this time on the floor as the Chair of the U.S. Helsinki Commission. The Helsinki Commission is the operating arm of the U.S. participation in the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the OSCE. It has been in the press recently because of the circumstances in Ukraine, which is what I am going to talk about.

First, I will remind my colleagues that the United States, along with all the countries of Europe and Canada, formed the commission on security and cooperation in Europe in 1975. It was founded on the principle that in order to have a stable country, you need to deal not just with the direct security needs—the military needs—of a country and not just with its economic and environmental agenda, but you also need to deal with its human rights and its good governance, and all three of these are related.

Commitments were made by all the signatories to the OSCE about respecting the jurisdictions of the member states and dealing with the rights of your neighbors and dealing with the rights of your own citizens. The Soviet Union was a member of the OSCE, and now all of the countries of the former Soviet Union are members, including Russia and the countries of central Asia.

I am increasingly alarmed at the deterioration of the situation in Eastern UKraine, particularly in the Donetsk region, where Moscow-controlled pro-Russian separatists have seized 19 buildings and 14 cities and towns.

Late last week seven members of the German-led OSCE Vienna Document inspection team, charged with observing unusual military activities, along with five of their Ukrainian escorts, were kidnapped by pro-Russian militants. One observer has been freed, and the rest continue to be held hostage. Russia, an OSCE member, has not lifted a finger to secure their release. There is no doubt in my mind that if Mr. Putin gave the word, this hostage situation would cease to exist.

This hostage-taking of unarmed international monitors must continue to be condemned in the strongest possible terms, and everything possible must be done to secure their release.

In addition to the OSCE observers, 40 people—journalists, activists, police officers, and politicians—are reportedly being held captive in makeshift jails in Slovyansk.

Meanwhile, the violence in Eastern Ukraine continues. On Monday, several thousand peaceful protesters marching in favor of Ukraine's unity were attacked by pro-Russian thugs wielding clubs and whips, resulting in 15 seriously injured. That same day, Gennady Kernes, the mayor of Ukraine's second largest city, Kharkiv, was shot, underwent emergency surgery, and remains in serious condition. He is now in Israel for further medical treatment.

Furthermore, I am deeply dismayed at other flagrant violations of human rights by pro-Russian militants in Eastern Ukraine and in Russia's annexed Crimea. These include attacks and threats against minority groups, particularly Jews and Roma as well as Crimean Tatars and ethnic Ukrainians in Crimea. Supporters of a united Ukraine have been targeted as well, including a local politician and university student whose tortured bodies were found dumped in a river near Slovyansk.

The joint statement on Ukraine signed in Geneva on April 17 by the EU, the United States, Russia, and Ukraine calls on all sides to lay down their arms, vacate buildings, and begin the process of dialogue and de-escalation. That was signed just 2 weeks ago. That agreement provided a basis for de-escalation. Yet, over the course of the last days and weeks, we have not seen the Russians follow through on urging separatists to stand down in Eastern Ukraine. What have we seen? Kyiv, on the one hand, is taking concrete steps and making good-faith efforts to live up to the Geneva agreement, including vacating buildings and offering dialogue. Russia has done nothing. Instead of working to de-escalate the conflict, it is doing the opposite—fueling escalation. Russia continues to violate the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine and flagrantly flaunts its commitments under the Geneva agreement.

The Geneva agreement also calls upon the parties to refrain from any violence, intimidation, or provocative actions and condemns and rejects all expressions of extremism, racism, religious intolerance, including anti-Semitism. Clearly, both the spirit and the letter of this agreement have been breached by Russia.

In recent days we have seen troubling manifestations against ethnic and religious minority communities. The distribution of flyers in Donetsk calling for Jews to register their religion and property is a chilling reminder of an especially dark period in European history. While the perpetrators of this onerous action have not been determined, one thing is clear: Moscow, which controls the pro-Russian separatists in Eastern Ukraine, is using anti-Semitism as an ingredient in its anti-Ukrainian campaign. Perhaps even worse, among the Russian special forces and agitators operating in Ukraine are members of the neo-Nazi and other anti-Semitic groups.

Jewish communities in parts of Eastern Ukraine are not the only ones that have reason to be worried. In

Slovyansk, armed separatists have invaded Romani homes and beaten and robbed men, women, and children. Ukrainian speakers—including Ukrainian-speaking journalists—have reportedly experienced intimidation in the largely Russian-speaking Donetsk area.

At the same time in Crimea, which Russia forcibly annexed, Crimean Tatars continue to be threatened with deportation and attacked for speaking their own language in their ancestral homeland. Moreover, the longtime leader of the Crimean Tatar community and former Soviet political prisoner Mustafa Dzhemilev has been banned from returning to Crimea.

It is important to underscore that Crimea is the ancestral home of the Crimean Tatars, who in 1944 were forcibly and brutally evicted by Stalin to central Asia and only allowed to return to their home in the early 1990s.

Additionally, the separatist Crimean authorities have gone after the Ukrainian community, announcing that Ukrainian literature and history will no longer be offered in Crimean schools.

These attacks and threats underscore the importance of the OSCE Special Monitoring Mission and other OSCE institutions in Ukraine in assessing the situation on the ground and helping to de-escalate tensions. They need to be permitted to operate unhindered—and most certainly not held hostage—in Eastern Ukraine and to be allowed access into Crimea, which Russia continues to block.

The actions against pro-Ukrainian activists and minorities are the direct result of Russia's unfounded and illegal aggression against Ukraine—first in Crimea and then in Eastern Ukraine. There is no doubt as to who pulls the strings. The Kremlin has been relentlessly flaunting their Geneva promises and has done nothing to rein in the militants they control. Mr. Putin needs to get Russian soldiers and other assorted military and intelligence operatives out of Ukraine.

We must not forget Crimea. We must never recognize Russia's forcible, illegal annexation of the Ukrainian territory, which violates every single one of the 10 core OSCE Helsinki principles. We must build on the punitive measures already undertaken against the Russian and Ukrainian individuals who so blatantly violated the international agreements in the Ukrainian and Crimean Constitutions. Violations of another nation's territorial integrity and sovereignty must not be tolerated. Russia's flagrant land grab of Crimea has set a horrible precedent for those countries harboring illegal territorial ambitions around the globe.

I welcome the President's stepping up of economic sanctions on seven Russian officials, including members of President Putin's inner circle and 17 companies linked to Mr. Putin. I also welcome the State Department and Commerce Department tightening policy to deny export license applications for any high-technology items that could contribute to Russia's military capabilities. I am confident Russia will feel the impact of these sanctions. These, along with the further targeted sanctions announced by the EU earlier this week, will only continue to have a growing impact.

Nevertheless, if the situation in eastern Ukraine continues to deteriorate, or even should the status quo persist, the United States needs to ratchet up these sanctions, and soon, including several sectoral sanctions against Russia's industries such as banking, mining, energy, and defense.

Of equal importance, we need to remain steadfast in helping Ukraine become a stronger democratic state and foster its political and economic stability. The millions of men, women, and children who demonstrated for months for human rights and human dignity spoke loudly and clearly, expressing the wishes of the vast majority of the Ukrainian citizens. The interim government has been working hard under exceedingly difficult circumstances to move Ukraine further on the path of economic and political reforms. We and our international partners need to keep making this progress our focal point. Ukraine needs a lot of help after the devastation wreaked on their economy by the incredibly corrupt and dysfunctional Yanukovych regime.

Ukraine has so many pressing needs. Among the most important are stabilizing the economy and preparing for the most important May 25 Presidential elections. Others include judicial reform, reform of the police and military, seeking justice and rehabilitation for the victims of the violence, including those suffering now at the hands of the pro-Russian militants, helping internally displaced people who are fleeing Crimea, and working to recover the billions in assets stolen by the previous regime.

I am pleased Ukraine's civil society, including Western-educated young people, is firmly committed to the rule of law and democracy and is playing a critical role in helping the Ukrainian Government work toward these ends. NGOs and think tanks have worked with the Parliament to pass a law on the independence of public broadcasting, a bill on public procurement, and one on how judges are appointed—all critical in fighting the scourge of corruption.

The United States is providing concrete assistance through a U.S. crisis support package for Ukraine, which includes support for the integrity of the May elections and constitutional reform, substantial economic assistance, energy security technical expertise, help to recover proceeds of corruptions stolen by the former regime, and other anticorruption assistance, and fostering greater people-to-people contacts. We need to be willing to provide more resources to the Ukrainians as they actively work to fulfill their aspirations.

Ultimately, these choices will lead to a more secure, democratic, and peaceful world, and that is something that reflects both American interests and American values.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARNER). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Ms. LANDRIEU pertaining to the introduction of S. 2280 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Ms. LANDRIEU. I yield the floor and suggest 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 order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the motion to proceed to S. 2262 is now pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The leader is correct.

Mr. REID. I have a cloture motion that I would ask to be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 368, S. 2262, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Jeanne Shaheen, Michael F. Bennet, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher A. Coons, Bill Nelson, Tom Harkin, Martin Heinrich, Patrick J. Leahy, Richard Blumenthal, Tim Kaine, Patty Murray, Tom Udall, Joe Manchin III, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Angus S. King, Jr., Mark R. Warner.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the mandatory quorum required under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO GLENN POSHARD

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I want to thank Dr. Glenn Poshard for his years of public service to Illinois.

Today, Dr. Poshard will be stepping down as president of Southern Illinois University, a position he has held with honor and distinction for more than 7 years. Under his leadership, Southern Illinois University has been able to keep tuition costs low and the university's finances sound, despite financial problems that have plagued the State.

Dr. Poshard has dedicated his life to working for the people of southern Illinois. In 1984, he was appointed to the Illinois State Senate until the people of the 22nd Congressional District sent him to the United States House of Representatives in 1989. I was fortunate to serve with Dr. Poshard for 8 years in the House of Representatives, where he was a strong proponent of campaign finance reform. Due to his commitment to reform, he limited individual donations to his gubernatorial campaign in 1998 and refused to accept contributions from political action committees.

Following his tenure in Congress, Dr. Poshard and his wife, Jo, founded the Poshard Foundation for Abused Children. For the last 14 years, the Poshard Foundation has worked to help abused, abandoned, and neglected children in southern Illinois.

After a 40 year affiliation with Southern Illinois University, Dr. Poshard is leaving his alma mater in good shape. He retires as the second longest-serving president in the history of the Southern Illinois University system, an experience he calls ''the greatest honor of my life.''

I congratulate Glenn on his outstanding career and thank him for his dedicated service to the people of Illinois. I wish him and his family all the best.

AFGHANISTAN AND UKRAINE SECURITY

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I just returned from a trip to Afghanistan and Ukraine where I reviewed the security situation in each country as chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

In each country, I met with military leaders and with civilian leaders and representatives of civilian society. The overwhelming impression I came away with is that American leadership remains critical, that others who are struggling for democracy and freedom see us as an essential friend and ally, and support for those who share those values must remain a cornerstone of our foreign policy and as essential to our own security.

In Afghanistan, I met with senior leaders of both our military and the Afghan military, including General Dunford, the commander of U.S. and coalition forces, and Afghan Minister of Defense Mohammedi. They reported that the transition of security responsibility to the Afghanistan National Security Forces—ANSF—has gone even better than we had hoped, with no significant loss of security in the country despite the withdrawal of tens of thousands of American and coalition troops. U.S. and Afghan leaders alike expressed satisfaction with the ability of the newly built and much larger ANSF to successfully protect the Afghan people, to defeat Taliban forces in combat, and to secure a series of major public events, culminating in the April 5 Afghan presidential election.

Our military commanders emphasized that while these gains reflect the growing confidence of the Afghan security forces in their ability to provide security to the Afghan people, the challenge ahead is to put in place the final pieces needed to make the progress of the last decade sustainable. This includes logistics, maintenance, airlift, and building the institutions of the Afghan Army and police. Fundamental to any long-term effort on our part in Afghanistan will be the signing of the Bilateral Security Agreement as soon as possible with a new Afghan president. While President Karzai remains unreliable and his rhetoric offensive, all the major Afghan presidential candidates, including the two winners of the first round, support what we have done so far and look forward to signing the BSA promptly if elected.

In addition to meeting with the three leading presidential candidates, I met with Afghan government officials and with several groups of representatives of Afghan civil society. The Afghans I met with came from different backgrounds and spoke with different voices, but they shared a common message of pride in the achievement of their country as it has rebuilt and recovered from the devastation of decades of civil war and Taliban rule. They pointed to the revival of Afghanistan's education and health systems, the dramatic improvement in the role of women in the country, and the new life that the last 10 years have brought to the country's economy.

They also spoke of their frustration with the exceedingly negative picture of events in Afghanistan depicted in the U.S. press. A leading national paper writes about a ''deepening resentment'' of the American presence and a ''growing alienation'' between Afghanistan and the United States. But the Afghans I met and large majorities of Afghans, according to public opinion polls, are grateful for the sacrifices we have made on their behalf and are convinced they can continue to transform their country with our continued support. Their polls show that 64 percent of the Afgan people believe there has been significant progress in security. U.S. polls show the opposite, the product of an unbalanced, negative view in our media.

The Afghans I met spoke with pride of the election they held on April 5, in which 7 million Afghans braved threats and violence to get to the polls, voting at a higher rate than we achieve in our own elections. According to preliminary counts, more than 35 percent of the voters were women. This record vote was the culmination of a campaign in which the leading candidates held huge rallies, attended by tens of thousands of Afghans all over the country—including in areas that much of our press reports are controlled by the Taliban. All of the security for these events, and for the vote itself, was provided by Afghan forces. And every Afghan I spoke with said that he—or she—feels more secure today than a few years ago, in part because Afghan forces are providing security in Afghan cities and towns.

Although the vote was divided among a number of candidates and a run-off between Dr. Abdullah and Dr. Ghani will occur, Afghans say the act of voting itself sent a message that Afghans reject the Taliban and what it stands for. Our intelligence sources indicate that the Taliban leadership is concerned by its inability to disrupt the election and prevent Afghans from getting to the polls.

So, far from what we may read in much of our press, the Afghan people conveyed to me their optimism regarding their country's significant progress, their desire for democracy, and their gratitude for the assistance of the United States over the past decade.

In Ukraine, I met with Acting President Turchinov, Prime Minister Yatsenyuk, Defense Minister Koval, National Security and Defense Council Head Parubiy, and numerous other government officials, activists, and participants in the political process. Ukrainians faced down the heavily-armed security forces of a corrupt, repressive regime on the Maidan—their Independence Square—while they themselves armed with little more than rocks, tires, and sandbags. Now they face an even greater challenge in the form of tens of thousands of Russian troops massed on their borders. Already, the Russians have annexed Crimea and Russian Special Operations forces have organized sympathizers to occupy buildings in a number of Eastern Ukrainian cities and towns in an effort to disrupt and destabilize the government, make an election on May 25 difficult to organize, and establish a basis for Russian occupation or a Russian-oriented breakaway State.

In the face of these challenges, the Ukrainians I met expressed gratitude for the solidarity and support our country has shown through the dark days of the Yanukovich regime and into the challenges they face today. They expressed their support for our values and their strong desire to be a part of the democratic West, rather than the authoritarian sphere of Putin's Russia and its allies. And they asked for our support in their effort to stabilize their country, fend off the Russian challenge, and hold free and fair elections as scheduled.

The Ukrainian people earned our support when they put their lives on the line at the Maidan and turned to face the Russian threat with both toughness and restraint. We should stand with the Ukrainian government and the Ukrainian people because they share our democratic values, and because Russia's effort to dismember their country through the threat of force, if allowed to succeed, could undermine decades of stability and a peaceful, democratic, and united Europe.

Ukrainians understand there will not be American ''boots on the ground'' in their country. But there are a number of important steps we can take to support the Ukrainians in their struggle.

First, we must expedite the aid we have already promised them—including both financial assistance and nonlethal military equipment—to make sure it arrives as quickly as possible.

Second, we should provide additional support, including body armor and fuel, that the Ukrainians need to protect themselves. We should provide the Ukrainians with firearms and ammunition if they need them—but it appears that at this point they do not.

Third, we should make more robust use of the powers established in Executive order 13661, which authorizes sanctions against the Russian financial, energy, metals, mining, engineering, and defense sectors, to ensure that the Putin regime pays a heavy price for its illegal actions. President Obama's action to sanction more wealthy individuals in Putin's circle, as well as businesses they own, is a wise one, but we can do more.

Fourth, we should ensure that Russian banks are subject to the significant tax penalties imposed on noncompliant banks by the Foreign Account Tax Compliance Act, or FATCA, the antitax evasion law set to take effect in July. Russian banks and financial institutions that fail to register with the Internal Revenue Service and obtain the required identification number by July 1 of this year will be noncompliant with FATCA and become subject to a 30-percent withholding tax on any U.S. investment earnings. We should not negotiate with either Russia or certain Russian banks on measures to provide relief from FATCA's sanctions until Russia honors its diplomatic commitments and takes steps to diffuse tensions in Crimea and eastern Ukraine, including by withdrawing Russian troops from the border region.

Finally, we should use the existing authorities to take on Russia's manipulation of energy prices and supplies which it has used to coerce not only Ukraine but also many of its neighbors. To be most effective, these actions should be taken in close coordination with our friends and allies in Europe, many of whom are directly affected by Russia's abuses and threatened by its actions. We must take concrete steps toward substituting energy from other sources for the countries that would be impacted by a reduction of Russian energy. We must actively become involved in energy development, diversification, and conservation, even if it means paying higher prices for fuel, to break Russia's iron grip on this market, and to prevent future acts of attempted political extortion by Russia from being effective.

The people of Ukraine are proud of their fight for freedom at the Maidan, as are the people of Afghanistan of the courage they showed, when they voted in record numbers to reject the Taliban in their April 5 election. Both countries are struggling for values that we, as a Nation, have always shared. They both deserve our support, and we should continue to give it to them.

THE MINIMUM WAGE

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to voice my disappointment over yesterday's vote to increase the Federal minimum wage. It is vitally important that working families receive a long-overdue pay increase, but once again the Senate failed to move forward on a crucial piece of legislation.

At $7.25 per hour, today's Federal minimum wage fails to provide a living wage for many Americans. Working a standard 40-hour week, 52 weeks a year, with no time off and no sick days, the minimum wage pays just over $15,000 a year.

In many parts of the country, including California, that salary is nowhere near enough for an individual to subsist, let alone a family.

It is difficult to fathom how a single mother working a minimum wage job—or jobs—can survive. These are the Americans who would benefit from this bill.

To get a better idea of what the standard 40-hour-a-week worker must earn to meet basic necessities, I had my staff look at the cost-of-living in various California cities.

In San Francisco, a single adult with no children would need to earn over $12 an hour to meet basic necessities.

In Los Angeles, they would need to make over $11 dollars an hour. The same goes for San Diego. That amount only increases for families.

By one measure, a single mother with two children living in San Francisco would have to earn almost $30 an hour just to meet basic necessities.

I would add that we aren't debating an exorbitant increase. Moving from $7.25 to $10.10 would still leave many low-income working families well short of a living wage. But it is a start, and it would benefit millions of low-income working Americans.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, the proposed minimum wage increase would increase incomes for 16.5 million low-wage workers; 97 percent of the low-wage working population would benefit from this increase; 900,000 low-wage workers would move above the poverty line; and the increase in the federal minimum wage could reduce demands on other Federal assistance programs.

A lot of attention has been given to CBO's estimate that increasing the minimum wage would lead to 500,000 job losses for low wage workers. It is important to note that CBO's estimate is the median in a wide range of estimates on the employment effects of increases in the minimum wage.

When you study the report, you find that most estimates of job losses related to increases in the minimum wage are clustered around zero, which means that most studies have found that increasing the minimum wage has a negligible effect on employment.

This isn't to say businesses won't have to make some adjustments. Some will have to raise prices, some might see slightly reduced profits, and some might slow hiring or choose to reduce their workforce.

But the effects will not be devastating, as opponents of the minimum wage increase suggest. In fact, cities and States throughout the country are natural experiments for the effects of a minimum wage increase on jobs.

The minimum wage in San Francisco is currently $10.79 per hour. Far from an economic catastrophe, San Francisco is enjoying a sustained period of economic growth and employment. San Jose, which has a similar minimum wage, also has a robust labor market.

Bloomberg has also researched the effects of minimum wage increases on employment and found that employment effects are negligible and, in general, States that have recently raised the minimum wage are actually creating more jobs than those that haven't.

Washington State increased its minimum wage in 1998 and tied the wage to increases in inflation. The minimum wage is currently the highest in the country.

Since that time, annual job growth in Washington has outpaced the rest of the country, and the service industry has added thousands of jobs. There are many other examples of localities that exceed the Federal minimum wage and continue to experience sustained job growth.

It is clear to me that businesses are capable of adjusting for an increase in the minimum wage in a way that will allow them to thrive.

And a minimum wage increase would not only alleviate some of the burdens and obstacles facing the low wage work force, it would also put more than $30 billion in the pockets of workers struggling to get by, those most in need of a pay raise.

According to many economists, that additional income could spur local economies, more than offsetting any negative effects from a minimum wage increase.

In a time of nearly unprecedented income inequality—during which the wealthy have actually made even more money—it is vitally important that Congress enacts laws to allow all

Americans to benefit from economic advancement.

Increasing the minimum wage is certainly not the only option. Congress should be looking elsewhere to do even more to ensure that children born into low income families aren't locked into a life of poverty. But increasing the minimum wage would be a step toward that goal. It would also serve as an indication that Congress appreciates the daunting challenges posed by income inequality and is willing to confront them.

Mr. President, I fully support an increase in the minimum wage and I hope that we can come together to find a way to reconsider the minimum wage bill and move it forward.

FORD ADMINISTRATION'S 40TH ANNIVERSARY

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, this year marks the 40th anniversary of Gerald R. Ford taking the oath of office and becoming the 38th President of the United States. The Gerald R. Ford Museum in Grand Rapids, MI will be commemorating this significant anniversary throughout 2014 by highlighting the impact of his service to our country.

Gerald Ford took the oath of office on August 9, 1974, in the aftermath of the Watergate scandal, the Vietnam war, and President Nixon's resignation, a very tumultuous time in our Nation's history. He reflected this when he stated:

> I assume the Presidency under extraordinary circumstances . . . . This is an hour of history that troubles our minds and hurts our hearts.

Although he was born in Omaha, NE, his family made Grand Rapids, MI, their home very soon after his birth. After high school, he attended the University of Michigan and played football for the Wolverines, earning the designation of Most Valuable Player. Choosing to attend law school instead of pursuing a professional football career, he completed his law degree at Yale University and then returned to Michigan, where he started a law practice.

After serving with the U.S. Navy during World War II, he returned to his home State where he became a partner in a Grand Rapids law firm and involved in the political scene. His experiences in the war led him to reject his previously isolationist leanings and adopt an outlook of internationalism. As a result, at the age of 35, he challenged the isolationist incumbent for Michigan's Fifth Congressional District in Congress and won.

He served his district, our State, and the Nation honorably. He was reelected 12 times, each with more than 60 percent of the vote. As a new Congressman, he quickly established a reputation for personal integrity, hard work, and the ability to deal effectively with both Republicans and Democrats, qualities that would define his entire political career. During his time in Congress, he was appointed to the Appropriations Committee and rose to prominence on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. He was well respected by his colleagues and was a leader in the Republican Party, serving as the minority leader for 8 years.

After the resignation of Vice President Spiro Agnew, Ford was nominated by President Nixon and confirmed by Congress to fill the vacancy. Less than a year later, Nixon resigned and Ford became President, making him the first President who was not elected to either the Presidency or Vice Presidency.

As President, Gerald Ford was confronted with the challenges of dealing with inflation, reviving a depressed economy, solving chronic energy shortages, and trying to ensure world peace. He described himself as a moderate in domestic affairs, an internationalist in foreign affairs, and a conservative in fiscal policy. Respected for his integrity and openness, he worked to restore our country's trust and confidence in the Presidency.

One of his first acts as President was to pardon Richard Nixon before criminal charges were brought against him. Despite strong negative public reaction and political backlash, Ford maintained that this was the right thing to do for the good of the country, and history has borne this out. When the new President, Jimmy Carter, took the oath of office, President Carter summed up the sentiment expressed by many about Ford's Presidency by saying, ''For myself and for our Nation, I want to thank my predecessor for all he has done to heal our land.''

Gerald Ford and his wife Betty continued to be active in the political process after leaving office. We are proud that Gerald Ford was from Michigan and an important part of the Ford legacy lives on through the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library in Ann Arbor, MI, and the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Museum in Grand Rapids.

I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing our 38th President and his outstanding contributions to our country on the 40th anniversary of his Presidency.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

PLYMOUTH COUNTY, IOWA

• Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, the strength of my State of Iowa lies in its vibrant local communities, where citizens come together to foster economic development, make smart investments to expand opportunity, and take the initiative to improve the health and well-being of residents. Over the decades, I have witnessed the growth and revitalization of so many communities across my State, and it has been deeply gratifying to see how my work in Congress has supported these local efforts.

I have always believed in accountability for public officials, and this, my final year in the Senate, is an appropriate time to give an accounting of my work across four decades representing Iowa in Congress. I take pride in accomplishments that have been national in scope—for instance, passing the Americans with Disabilities Act and spearheading successful farm bills. But I take a very special pride in projects that have made a big difference in local communities across my State.

Today, I would like to give an accounting of my work with leaders and residents of Plymouth County to build a legacy of a stronger local economy, better schools and educational opportunities, and a healthier, safer community.

Between 2001 and 2013, the creative leadership in your community has worked with me to secure funding in Plymouth County worth over $11 million and successfully acquired financial assistance from programs I have fought hard to support, which have provided more than $1 million to the local economy.

Of course my favorite memories of working together have to include working with community leaders on the renovation of the American Legion building in LeMars. The funding allowed for a new glass block window and improvements to the existing front door to meet code on the first floor and the replacement of windows, repainting, and new signage on the second floor.

Among the highlights:

Main Street Iowa: One of the greatest challenges we face—in Iowa and all across America—is preserving the character and vitality of our small towns and rural communities. This isn't just about economics; It is also about maintaining our identity as Iowans.

Main Street Iowa helps preserve Iowa's heart and soul by providing funds to revitalize downtown business districts. This program has allowed towns like LeMars to use that money to leverage other investments to jump-start change and renewal. I am so pleased that Plymouth County has earned $30,000 through this program. These grants build much more than buildings; they build up the spirit and morale of people in our small towns and local communities.

Investing in Iowa's economic development through targeted community projects: In Western Iowa, we have worked together to grow the economy by making targeted investments in important economic development projects including improved roads and bridges, modernized sewer and water systems, and better housing options for residents of Plymouth County. In many cases, I have secured Federal funding that has leveraged local investments and served as a catalyst for a whole ripple effect of positive, creative changes. For example, working with mayors, city council members, and local economic development officials in Plymouth County, I have fought for

funding for Head Start, school construction, and dialysis center projects worth more than $1 million, helping to create jobs and expand economic opportunities.

School grants: Every child in Iowa deserves to be educated in a classroom that is safe, accessible, and modern. That is why, for the past decade and a half, I have secured funding for the innovative Iowa Demonstration Construction Grant Program—better known among educators in Iowa as Harkin grants—for public schools construction and renovation. Across 15 years, Harkin grants worth more than $132 million have helped school districts to fund a range of renovation and repair efforts—everything from updating fire safety systems to building new schools. In many cases, these Federal dollars have served as the needed incentive to leverage local public and private dollars, so it often has a tremendous multiplier effect within a school district. Over the years, Plymouth County has received $462,349 in Harkin Grants.

Agricultural and rural development: Because I grew up in a small town in rural Iowa, I have always been a loyal friend and fierce advocate for family farmers and rural communities. I have been a member of the House or Senate Agriculture Committee for 40 years—including more than 10 years as chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee. Across the decades, I have championed farm policies for Iowans that include effective farm income protection and commodity programs; strong, progressive conservation assistance for agricultural producers; renewable energy opportunities; and robust economic development in our rural communities. Since 1991, through various programs authorized through the farm bill, Plymouth County has received more than $3.4 million from a variety of farm bill programs.

Keeping Iowa communities safe: I also firmly believe that our first responders need to be appropriately trained and equipped, able to respond to both local emergencies and to statewide challenges such as, for instance, the methamphetamine epidemic. Since 2001, Plymouth County's fire departments have received over $325,229 for firefighter safety and operations equipment.

Disability rights: Growing up, I loved and admired my brother Frank, who was deaf. But I was deeply disturbed by the discrimination and obstacles he faced every day. That is why I have always been a passionate advocate for full equality for people with disabilities. As the primary author of the Americans with Disabilities Act, ADA, and the ADA Amendments Act, I have had four guiding goals for our fellow citizens with disabilities: equal opportunity, full participation, independent living, and economic self-sufficiency. Nearly a quarter century since passage of the ADA, I see remarkable changes in communities everywhere I go in Iowa—not just in curb cuts or closed captioned television but in the full participation of people with disabilities in our society and economy, folks who at long last have the opportunity to contribute their talents and to be fully included. These changes have increased economic opportunities for all citizens of Plymouth County, both those with and without disabilities, and they make us proud to be a part of a community and country that respects the worth and civil rights of all of our citizens.

This is at least a partial accounting of my work on behalf of Iowa, and specifically Plymouth County, during my time in Congress. In every case, this work has been about partnerships, cooperation, and empowering folks at the State and local level, including in Plymouth County, to fulfill their own dreams and initiatives. And, of course, this work is never complete. Even after I retire from the Senate, I have no intention of retiring from the fight for a better, fairer, richer Iowa. I will always be profoundly grateful for the opportunity to serve the people of Iowa as their Senator.●

LYON COUNTY, IOWA

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, the strength of my State of Iowa lies in its vibrant local communities, where citizens come together to foster economic development, make smart investments to expand opportunity, and take the initiative to improve the health and well-being of residents. Over the decades, I have witnessed the growth and revitalization of so many communities across my State. It has been deeply gratifying to see how my work in Congress has supported these local efforts.

I have always believed in accountability for public officials, and this, my final year in the Senate, is an appropriate time to give an accounting of my work across four decades representing Iowa in Congress. I take pride in accomplishments that have been national in scope—for instance, passing the Americans with Disabilities Act and spearheading successful farm bills. But I take a very special pride in projects that have made a big difference in local communities across my State.

Today, I would like to give an accounting of my work with leaders and residents of Lyon County to build a legacy of a stronger local economy, better schools and educational opportunities, and a healthier, safer community.

Between 2001 and 2013, the creative leadership in your community has worked with me to secure funding in Lyon County worth over $1.2 million and successfully acquired financial assistance from programs I have fought hard to support, which have provided more than $6.2 million to the local economy.

Of course my favorite memory of working together has to be our shared commitment to school construction and modernization. Iowa students cannot learn in buildings that are falling apart. Working together with State and local communities, this funding has ensured Iowa students are learning in schools that are safe and modern. It was an investment in Iowa communities and its kids, and I look forward to learning about the renovations made possible in Lyon County.

Among the highlights:

School grants: Every child in Iowa deserves to be educated in a classroom that is safe, accessible, and modern. That is why, for the past decade and a half, I have secured funding for the innovative Iowa Demonstration Construction Grant Program—better known among educators in Iowa as Harkin grants for public schools construction and renovation. Across 15 years, Harkin Grants worth more than $132 million have helped school districts to fund a range of renovation and repair efforts—everything from updating fire safety systems to building new schools. In many cases, these Federal dollars have served as the needed incentive to leverage local public and private dollars, so it often has a tremendous multiplier effect within a school district. Over the years, Lyon County has received $1,197,251 in Harkin grants. Similarly, schools in Lyon County have received funds that I designated for Iowa Star Schools for technology totaling $34,181.

Agricultural and rural development: Because I grew up in a small town in rural Iowa, I have always been a loyal friend and fierce advocate for family farmers and rural communities. I have been a member of the House or Senate Agriculture Committee for 40 years—including more than 10 years as Chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee. Across the decades, I have championed farm policies for Iowans that include effective farm income protection and commodity programs; strong, progressive conservation assistance for agricultural producers; renewable energy opportunities; and robust economic development in our rural communities. Since 1991, through various programs authorized through the farm bill, Lyon County has received more than $299,000 from a variety of farm bill programs.

Keeping Iowa communities safe: I also firmly believe that our first responders need to be appropriately trained and equipped, able to respond to both local emergencies and to statewide challenges such as, for instance, the methamphetamine epidemic. Since 2001, Lyon County's fire departments have received over $397,392 for firefighter safety and operations equipment.

Wellness and health care: Improving the health and wellness of all Americans has been something I have been passionate about for decades. That is why I fought to dramatically increase funding for disease prevention, innovative medical research, and a whole

range of initiatives to improve the health of individuals and families not only at the doctor's office but also in our communities, schools, and workplaces. I am so proud that Americans have better access to clinical preventive services, nutritious food, smoke-free environments, safe places to engage in physical activity, and information to make healthy decisions for themselves and their families. These efforts not only save lives, they will also save money for generations to come thanks to the prevention of costly chronic diseases, which account for a whopping 75 percent of annual health care costs. I am pleased that Lyon County has recognized this important issue by securing $63,750 for wellness grants.

Disability rights: Growing up, I loved and admired my brother Frank, who was deaf. But I was deeply disturbed by the discrimination and obstacles he faced every day. That is why I have always been a passionate advocate for full equality for people with disabilities. As the primary author of the Americans with Disabilities Act, ADA, and the ADA Amendments Act, I have had four guiding goals for our fellow citizens with disabilities: equal opportunity, full participation, independent living, and economic self-sufficiency. Nearly a quarter century since passage of the ADA, I see remarkable changes in communities everywhere I go in Iowa—not just in curb cuts or closed captioned television, but in the full participation of people with disabilities in our society and economy, folks who at long last have the opportunity to contribute their talents and to be fully included. These changes have increased economic opportunities for all citizens of Lyon County, both those with and without disabilities. They make us proud to be a part of a community and country that respects the worth and civil rights of all of our citizens.

This is at least a partial accounting of my work on behalf of Iowa, and specifically Lyon County, during my time in Congress. In every case, this work has been about partnerships, cooperation, and empowering folks at the State and local level, including in Lyon County, to fulfill their own dreams and initiatives. Of course, this work is never complete. Even after I retire from the Senate, I have no intention of retiring from the fight for a better, fairer, richer Iowa. I will always be profoundly grateful for the opportunity to serve the people of Iowa as their Senator.●

RECOGNIZING BULLET TOOLS

● Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, thousands of American businesses stem from simple ideas that are born in the living rooms, backyards, and garages of ambitious entrepreneurs. From humble beginnings, businesses mature to reach new customers and broader regions. I wish to recognize Bullet Tools, a small family owned business from my home State of Idaho, whose originality and hard work grew into a global success in a distinctive market.

In 1998, Bullet Tools started as a family operated assembly line in Dalen and Mary Gunn's double-wide mobile home in Hayden, ID. The words, ''It can't be done,'' fueled Mr. Gunn's determination to work through any obstacle. Seeking to advance the construction industry, Mr. Gunn discovered an enhanced method of installing flooring without the challenges associated with electricity, dust and constantly moving in and out of buildings.

Today, Bullet Tools is recognized as a world leading expert in fixed-blade cutting tools for the construction industry. The company has earned a worldwide reputation and serves an international market with unique custom installation needs. Fifty percent of its sales are exported to markets abroad, including Australia, Canada, Germany, Japan, Russia and the United Kingdom with an expectation for further growth in other international markets.

Bullet Tools has grown more than 300 percent over the past 5 years. In 2012, Dalen and Mary Gunn's son-in-law, Ben Toews, became president of the company. Mr. Toews' business expertise has allowed Bullet Tools to streamline its product lines and build upon existing manufacturing relationships, while Mr. Gunn continues to focus his energy on researching and developing new products. Today, Bullet Tools boosts over 70 products that may be found both in store and online at Home Depot and other retail distributors across the globe.

Last week, I had the opportunity to meet with Mr. Gunn and Mr. Toews at their facility in Hayden, ID, with my colleague on the Small Business and Entrepreneurship Committee, chair MARIA CANTWELL. I was impressed by the company's strong commitment to its 25 employees and the greater Idaho community. Because of the team's dedication and the business's achievements, it is not surprising that the company has received various awards and endorsements. For example, Bullet Tools was selected as the recipient of the U.S. Small Business Administration's 2009 Northwest Small Business Administration Exporter of the Year Award, the 2010 Green Products Award by Building Products Magazine, the 2013 Pro Tool Innovation Award, and the Gold Hammer Award from Carpenter Magazine. In 2013, Ben Toews was individually recognized as one of North Idaho Business Journal's 30 Under 40 for his ongoing commitment to excellence as an executive setting the pace for outstanding achievement through his integrity and character.

Today, the Gunn's original mobile home continues to welcome visitors to the Bullet Tools' corporate office and manufacturing location, reminding us that with hard work and dedication, the American dream may be achieved in our own backyard. I congratulate the Gunn family and everyone at Bullet Tools on their continued prosperity, strong work ethic, and outstanding reputation for excellence. Bullet Tools epitomizes the finest characteristics of American innovation and is a tribute to both Idaho and the Nation.●

TRIBUTE TO STEPHANIE GRUBA

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Stephanie Gruba, a legislative aide in my Washington, DC, office, for the years of hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Stephanie is a native of Milbank, SD, and is a graduate from the University of South Dakota. Upon graduation from USD, Stephanie moved from Vermillion, SD, to Washington, DC, to become a member of my office staff. In her almost 3 years on my staff, Stephanie has served as a staff assistant, legislative correspondent, and as a legislative aide. Stephanie has worked tirelessly for my South Dakota constituents and as a loyal member of ''Team Thune.''

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Stephanie for her dedicated service in the Senate and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:36 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. 4486. An act making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 4486. An act making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 2280. A bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

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–5463. A communication from the Deputy Director, Directorate of Standards and Guidance, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Electric Power Generation, Transmission, and Distribution; Electrical Protective Equipment'' (RIN1218–AB67) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 22, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5464. A communication from the Chief Financial Officer, Corporation for National and Community Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the operations of the National Service Trust through September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5465. A communication from the Regulatory Coordinator, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standards to Prevent, Detect, and Respond to Sexual Abuse and Assault in Confinement Facilities'' (RIN1653–AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 23, 2014; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–5466. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict), Performing the Duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Policy), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report to Congress on the Activities of the National Guard Counterdrug Schools for Fiscal Year 2013''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–5467. A communication from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the amendments to the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–5468. A communication from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the amendments to the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–5469. A communication from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the amendments to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–5470. A communication from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the amendments to the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–5471. A communication from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the amendments to the Federal Rules of Evidence that have been adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–5472. A communication from the HR Specialist (Executive Resources), Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, Small Business Administration, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 22, 2014; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC–5473. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of Size Standards, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Small Business Size Standards: Construction'' (RIN3245–AG37) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 23, 2014; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC–5474. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of Government Contracting, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Acquisition Process: Task and Delivery Order Contracts, Bundling, Consolidation'' (RIN3245–AG20) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 23, 2014; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC–5475. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of Size Standards, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Small Business Size Standards: Utilities'' (RIN3245–AG25) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 23, 2014; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC–5476. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of Size Standards, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Surety Bond Guarantee Program'' (RIN3245–AG56) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 23, 2014; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC–5477. A communication from the HR Specialist (Executive Resources), Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, Small Business Administration, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 22, 2014; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC–5478. A communication from the General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Liquidity and Contingency Funding Plans'' (RIN3133–AD96) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5479. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fisheries; Amendment 14; Correction'' (RIN0648–AY26) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 17, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5480. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Modifications to Identification Markings on Fishing Gear Marker Buoys'' (RIN0648–BD66) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 23, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5481. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Prohibition Against Certain Flights Within the Tripoli Flight Information Region (FIR); Extension of Expiration Date'' ((RIN2120–AJ93) (Docket No. FAA–2011–0246)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5482. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment to Class B Airspace Area; Detroit, MI'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0079)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5483. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification, Revocation, and Establishment of Area Navigation (RNAV) Routes; Charlotte, NC'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0915)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5484. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0977)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5485. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (88); Amdt. No. 3581'' (RIN2120–AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5486. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (150); Amdt. No. 3582'' (RIN2120–AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5487. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation,

transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (62); Amdt. No. 3579'' (RIN2120–AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5488. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (121); Amdt. No. 3580'' (RIN2120–AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5489. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Qualification, Service, and Use of Crewmembers and Aircraft Dispatchers'' ((RIN2120–AJ00) (Docket No. FAA–2008–0677)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5490. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife; Final Rule To Revise the Code of Federal Regulations for Species Under the Jurisdiction of the National Marine Fisheries Service'' (RIN0648–XC659) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 23, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5491. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Part 95 Instrument Flight Rules; Miscellaneous Amendments (4); Amdt. No. 512'' (RIN2120–AA63) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5492. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of VOR Federal Airway V–625, Arizona'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0093)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5493. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Requirements for Chemical Oxygen Generators Installed on Transport Category Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AK36) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0812)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5494. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2011–1253)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5495. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0169)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5496. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; M7 Aerospace LLC Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–1057)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5497. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0326)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5498. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Regional Aircraft Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–1012)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5499. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of VOR Federal Airway V–626, Utah'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0094)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5500. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0171)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5501. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0835)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5502. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Type Certificate Previously Held By Eurocopter France) (Airbus Helicopters)'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0822)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5503. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0798)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5504. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0545)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5505. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Type Certificate Previously Held by Eurocopter France) (Airbus Helicopters)'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0872)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5506. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0555)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5507. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0642)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5508. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0554)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5509. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0789)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5510. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0689)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5511. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Type Certificate Previously Held By Eurocopter France)'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2011–1158)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5512. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Type Certificate Previously Held by Eurocopter France)'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0826)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5513. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Type Certificate Previously Held by Eurocopter France)'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0573)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5514. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Type Certificate Previously Held by Eurocopter France)'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0477)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5515. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0796)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5516. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–1023)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5517. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0331)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5518. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0089)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5519. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–1019)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5520. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; the Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0174)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5521. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0976)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5522. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; SOCATA Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–1019)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5523. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Rockwell Collins, Inc. Transponders'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0966)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5524. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turbofan Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–1015)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5525. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1318)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5526. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Continental Motors, Inc. Reciprocating Engines With Superior Air Parts, Inc. (SAP) Cylinder Assemblies Installed'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2007–0051)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5527. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0542)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5528. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0327)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5529. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0369)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5530. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Pratt and Whitney Turbofan Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0740)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5531. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Removal of Procedures for Closeout of Grants and Cooperative Agreements'' (RIN2700–AE06) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 17, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5532. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Using Pot Gear in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska'' (RIN0648–XD099) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5533. A communication from the Chief of the Policy and Rules Division, Office of Engineering and Technology, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled

''Revision of Part 15 of the Commission's Rules to Permit Unlicensed National Information Infrastructure (U–NII) Devices in the 5 GHz Band'' ((ET Docket No. 13–49) (FCC 14–30)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 23, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5534. A communication from the Trial Attorney, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Track Safety Standards; Improving Rail Integrity'' (RIN2130–AC28) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5535. A communication from the Trial Attorney, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Railroad Workplace Safety; Adjacent-Track On-Track Safety for Roadway Workers'' (RIN2130–AC37) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5536. A communication from the Trial Attorney, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revisions to Passenger Train Emergency Preparedness Regulations'' (RIN2130–AC33) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5537. A communication from the Director of the Office of Financial Reporting and Policy, Office of the Chief Financial Officer and Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''FY 2013 Agency Financial Report''; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5538. A communication from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Connect America Fund'' ((RIN3060–AF85) (FCC 14–5)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 15, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5539. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Seaway Regulations and Rules: Periodic Update, Various Categories'' (RIN2135–AA33) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5540. A communication from the Administrator, Rural Housing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Single Family Housing Loans and Grants'' (RIN0575–AC97) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5541. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Chronic Wasting Disease Herd Certification Program and Interstate Movement of Farmed or Captive Deer, Elk, and Moose'' (RIN0579–AB35) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5542. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Restrictions on Sales of Assets of a Covered Financial Company by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation'' (RIN3064–AE05) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 28, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5543. A communication from the Associate Director for Regulatory Affairs, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Syrian Sanctions Regulations'' (31 CFR Part 542) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5544. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Labeling of Pesticide Products and Devices for Export'' ((RIN2070–AJ53) (FRL No. 9908–82)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5545. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the situation in or in relation to the Democratic Republic of the Congo that was declared in Executive Order 13413 of October 27, 2006; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5546. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; Nitrogen Oxide Combustion Turbine Alternative Control Requirements for the Milwaukee-Racine Former Nonattainment Area'' (FRL No. 9908–93–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5547. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Control of Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Mondelez Global LLC, Inc.—Richmond Bakery located in Henrico County, Virginia'' (FRL No. 9910–04–Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5548. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Regional Haze State Implementation Plan'' (FRL No. 9910–06–Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5549. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plan Revisions; Revisions to the Air Pollution Control Rules; North Dakota'' (FRL No. 9909–86–Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 23, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5550. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Technical Amendments to Inadvertent Errors in Air Quality Designations for Fine Particles, Ozone, Lead, Nitrogen Dioxide and Sulfur Dioxide'' (FRL No. 9909–24–OAR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 23, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5551. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Idaho Amalgamated Sugar Company Nampa BART Alternative'' (FRL No. 9909–37–Region 10) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 23, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5552. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Colorado; Prevention of Significant Deterioration; Greenhouse Gas Tailoring Rule Revisions'' (FRL No. 9907–58–Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 23, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5553. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands; Prevention of Significant Deterioration; Special Exemptions from Requirements of the Clean Air Act'' (FRL No. 9909–18–Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 17, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5554. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; Redesignation of the Milwaukee-Racine 2006 24-Hour Fine Particle Nonattainment Area to Attainment'' (FRL No. 9909–50–Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 17, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5555. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Massachusetts; Revisions to Fossil Fuel Utilization Facilities and Source Registration Regulations and Industrial Performance Standards for Boilers'' (FRL No. 9800–2) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 17, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5556. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendments to Delegation of Authority Provisions in the Prevention of Significant Deterioration Program'' (FRL No. 9909–19–OAR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 17, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5557. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division,

Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Revision for GP Big Island, LLC'' (FRL No. 9909–60–Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 17, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5558. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New York State; Redesignation of Areas for 1997 Annual and 2006 24-Hour Fine Particulate Matter and Approval of the Associated Maintenance Plan'' (FRL No. 9909–65–Region 2) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 17, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5559. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan El Dorado County Air Quality Management District'' (FRL No. 9909–66–Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 17, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5560. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, the Secretary of the Army's report relative to the Walton County, Florida hurricane and storm damage reduction project; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5561. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revision of Department of Energy's Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Regulations'' (RIN1904–AA32) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 28, 2014; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–5562. 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 ''Extension of Notice 2012–45 Treatment of Income from Certain Government Bonds for Purposes of the Passive Foreign Investment Company Rules'' (Notice 2014–31) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5563. 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 ''Annual Price Inflation Adjustments for Contribution Limitations Made to a Health Savings Account Pursuant to Section 223 of the Internal Revenue Code'' (Rev. Proc. 2014–30) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5564. 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 ''Applicable Federal Rates—May 2014'' (Rev. Rul. 2014–13) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5565. 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 ''Revenue Procedure: Purchase Price Safe Harbors for sections 143 and 25'' (Rev. Proc. 2014–31) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5566. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''2013 Actuarial Report on the Financial Outlook for Medicaid''; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5567. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Interim Report to Congress on the Medicaid Health Home State Plan Option''; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5568. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting proposed legislation entitled the ''Generating Renewal, Opportunity, and Work with Accelerated Mobility, Efficiency, and Rebuilding of Infrastructure and Communities throughout America Act''; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5569. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; South Dakota; Prevention of Significant Deterioration; Greenhouse Gas Tailoring Rule Revisions'' (FRL No. 9909–08–Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 17, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5570. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; States of Arkansas and Louisiana; Clean Air Interstate Rule State Implementation Plan Revisions'' (FRL No. 9909–56–Region 6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 17, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5571. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Iran-Related Multilateral Sanctions Regime Efforts'' covering the period August 7, 2013 to February 6, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–5572. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report prepared by the Department of State on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period December 31, 2013 through January 31, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–5573. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report relative to the implementation of the Age Discrimination Act of 1975 for fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5574. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report of the Attorney General to the Congress of the United States on the Administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, for the six months ending June 30, 2013''; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–5575. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Linuron; Pesticide Tolerances; Technical Corrections'' (FRL No. 9908–83) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 17, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5576. A communication from the Counsel to the Inspector General, Office of Inspector General, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Inspector General, General Services Administration, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5577. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Financial Report of the United States Government for Fiscal Year 2013''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5578. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–307, ''Small and Certified Business Enterprise Development and Assistance Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5579. A communication from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to compliance by the United States courts of appeals and district courts with the time limitations established for deciding habeas corpus death penalty petitions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LEAHY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Elisebeth Collins Cook, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board for a term expiring January 29, 2020.

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.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 2275. A bill to expand project eligibility to certain public infrastructure projects under chapter 6 of title 23, United States Code; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 2276. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve access to mental health services under the TRICARE program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CORKER (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr.

HOEVEN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KIRK, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. COATS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. HATCH, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, and Mr. BURR):

S. 2277. A bill to prevent further Russian aggression toward Ukraine and other sovereign states in Europe and Eurasia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 2278. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act so as to eliminate the authority of the Secretary of Health and Human Services to limit the ability of medical providers to conduct lawful business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 2279. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to terminate certain energy tax subsidies and lower the corporate income tax rate; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. MCCONNELL, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. THUNE, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. ENZI, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. LEE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. COATS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. COBURN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. CORKER, Mr. HATCH, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. VITTER, Mr. RISCH, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BURR, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HELLER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. PRYOR, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. WARNER, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. WALSH, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. TESTER, and Mrs. HAGAN):

S. 2280. A bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; read the first time.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 2281. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to make technical improvements to the Net Price Calculator system so that prospective students may have a more accurate understanding of the true cost of college; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. ENZI, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MCCONNELL, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 2282. A bill to prohibit the provision of performance awards to employees of the Internal Revenue Service who owe back taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin (for himself and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 2283. A bill to encourage enhanced security cooperation with European allies and continued enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 2284. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to establish new standards for automobile hoods and bumpers to reduce pedestrian injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BEGICH, and Ms. LANDRIEU):

S. 2285. A bill to help small businesses access capital and create jobs by reauthorizing the successful State Small Business Credit Initiative; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2286. A bill to provide for greater oversight of Department of Defense service contracts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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:

S. Res. 432. A resolution recognizing the efforts of the National Park Service and others in restoring and repairing the Washington Monument; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COONS, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. Res. 433. A resolution condemning the abduction of female students by armed militants from the Government Girls Secondary School in the northeastern province of Borno in the Federal Republic of Nigeria; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 279

At the request of Mr. WALSH, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 279, a bill to promote the development of renewable energy on public land, and for other purposes.

S. 323

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 323, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for extended months of Medicare coverage of immunosuppressive drugs for kidney transplant patients and other renal dialysis provisions.

S. 375

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 375, a bill to require Senate candidates to file designations, statements, and reports in electronic form.

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 375, supra.

S. 526

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 526, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the special rule for contributions of qualified conservation contributions, and for other purposes.

S. 557

At the request of Mrs. HAGAN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) 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. 865

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 865, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission to Accelerate the End of Breast Cancer.

S. 896

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 896, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 1012

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1012, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve operations of recovery auditors under the Medicare integrity program, to increase transparency and accuracy in audits conducted by contractors, and for other purposes.

S. 1174

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1174, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 65th Infantry Regiment, known as the Borinqueneers.

S. 1349

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1349, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 1431

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1431, a bill to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act.

S. 1622

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) 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. 1695

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1695, a bill to designate a portion of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge as wilderness.

S. 1697

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1697, a bill to support early learning.

S. 1992

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1992, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide a standard definition of therapeutic foster care services in Medicaid.

S. 2091

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) 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. 2094

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2094, a bill to provide for the establishment of nationally uniform and environmentally sound standards governing discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel.

S. 2132

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2132, a bill to amend the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act of 2005, and for other purposes.

S. 2178

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2178, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act with respect to the timing of elections and pre-election hearings and the identification of pre-election issues, and to require that lists of employees eligible to vote in organizing elections be provided to the National Labor Relations Board.

S. 2182

At the request of Mr. WALSH, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2182, a bill to expand and improve care provided to veterans and members of the Armed Forces with mental health disorders or at risk of suicide, to review the terms or characterization of the discharge or separation of certain individuals from the Armed Forces, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 2192

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2192, a bill to amend the National Alzheimer's Project Act to require the Director of the National Institutes of Health to prepare and submit, directly to the President for review and transmittal to Congress, an annual budget estimate (including an estimate of the number and type of personnel needs for the Institutes) for the initiatives of the National Institutes of Health pursuant to such an Act.

S. 2223

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2223, 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. 2244

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2244, a bill to extend the termination date of the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes.

S. 2252

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) were added as cosponsors of S. 2252, a bill to reaffirm the importance of community banking and community banking regulatory experience on the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, to ensure that the Federal Reserve Board of Governors has a member who has previous experience in community banking or community banking supervision, and for other purposes.

S. 2255

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2255, a bill to remove the Kurdistan Democratic Party and the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan from treatment as terrorist organizations and for other purposes.

S. 2263

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2263, a bill to appropriately limit the authority to award bonuses to employees.

S. 2265

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2265, a bill to prohibit certain assistance to the Palestinian Authority.

S.J. RES. 19

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 19, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

S. RES. 364

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 364, a resolution expressing support for the internal rebuilding, resettlement, and reconciliation within Sri Lanka that are necessary to ensure a lasting peace.

S. RES. 421

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 421, a resolution expressing the gratitude and appreciation of the Senate for the acts of heroism and military achievement by the members of the United States Armed Forces who participated in the June 6, 1944, amphibious landing at Normandy, France, and commending them for leadership and valor in an operation that helped bring an end to World War II.

AMENDMENT NO. 2752

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2752 intended to be proposed to S. 1982, a bill to improve the provision of medical services and benefits to veterans, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. MCCONNELL, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. THUNE, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. ENZI, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. LEE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. COATS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. COBURN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. CORKER, Mr. HATCH, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. VITTER, Mr. RISCH, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BURR, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HELLER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. PRYOR, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. WARNER, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. WALSH, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. TESTER, and Mrs. HAGAN):

S. 2280. A bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; read the first time.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, today I filed an updated bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline project. That bill is at the desk. What this legislation does is it approves the project congressionally, which is authorized under the Constitution of the United States. Section 8 of article 1 of our Constitution expressly gives Congress the authority to regulate commerce with foreign nations. That is the determination we are looking for here from the President on this pipeline project. The decision is simply: Is the project in the national interest or is it not?

The President and his administration have been considering this project, and

this decision—is it in the national interest or not—for more than 5 years. We are now in the sixth year. It was our expectation the process would be completed on or about the first week in May. The final environmental impact statement came out at the end of January and, as the prior environmental impact statements had determined, this environmental impact statement said there is no significant environmental impact caused by the project. This is a study done over years by this administration's Department of State. For the fourth time the report came out with no significant environmental impact created by this project. So as I say, it was the expectation of this Senate and really of Americans across the country that sometime in May the President would make a decision because all along he said he was following the process, and once the process was completed he would make a decision. A little over a week ago, on the afternoon of Good Friday—a time that I believe was selected in order to minimize the news coverage—the President or the administration made the announcement they would now delay this project indefinitely—indefinitely. Not a statement of: We are just going to follow the process, which is what had been said before. Even though the President, in a meeting with me and our conference, came out and said we would have a decision before the end of 2013. That is what he told us. That didn't happen because then he changed it to: We are going to follow the process. Now it is not even going to follow the process. He is just going to delay a decision indefinitely.

The rationale for that is that there is litigation in Nebraska as to whether the public service commission in the State of Nebraska has the right to determine the route of the pipeline through Nebraska or whether in fact the legislature does.

Some time ago, right at the beginning of 2012, we had passed legislation in this body, which I sponsored, that required the President to make a decision on the project within 90 days. We passed that bill and, in fact, he then made a decision to decline the project based on the route in Nebraska. So Nebraska went through the work of rerouting the pipeline in the State, and that new route was approved by the legislature and it was approved by the Governor. But opponents of the project decided to sue on the basis that, no, the PSC should make a decision as to the route in Nebraska.

So be it. That can be adjudicated in Nebraska, as can any other issue that somebody may choose to file a lawsuit over. But that really has nothing to do with the decision the President needs to make. The decision the President needs to make is a very simple decision: Is this pipeline project in the interest of the United States or is it not? This is after his State Department has said there is no significant environmental impact created by the project not once, not twice, but four times. So it is a simple decision.

It is a decision of whether we should have more energy that we produce in our country and that is produced in Canada, our closest friend and ally, or whether we should keep getting energy from the Middle East. It is a decision about whether we should have more jobs. The State Department says 42,000 jobs are created in constructing the pipeline. It is a decision about economic activity. This creates economic activity, with hundreds of millions in tax revenue to help reduce the deficit and debt without spending one penny of Federal money.

That is the decision before the President. But he refuses to make it. So it is long past time—long past time, as we are now in year 6—for this body to step forward and make the decision. As I said just a minute ago, we have the authority to make the decision. Section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution of the United States gives Congress the authority to regulate commerce with foreign nations. So we need to make the decision. The time is long past when we can continue to wait.

How can we continue to wait when the President says it will be an indefinite time period before he will even consider making a decision?

So the bill we have put forward is a very simple, straightforward bill. As a matter of fact, I am going to take a couple minutes and read it because it is three pages. It is an updated bill to a bill I provided on a bipartisan basis earlier. We had 27 cosponsors of the earlier legislation. We now have 56 Republicans and Democrats on this bill, and we are working very hard to get 60 so there is no procedural way to stop this legislation, but I will take just a minute and read it because it is self-explanatory, it is simple, it is straightforward, and it is common sense.

A bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

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

SECTION 1. KEYSTONE XL APPROVAL.

IN GENERAL. TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, L.P. may construct, connect, operate, and maintain the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in the application filed on May 4, 2012, by TransCanada Corporation to the Department of State (including any subsequent revision to the pipeline route within the State of Nebraska required or authorized by the State of Nebraska).

So we have expressly put language in there to address the litigation. The litigation the President is concerned about we expressly address in the bill.

(b) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—The Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement issued by Secretary of State in January 2014, regarding the pipeline referred to in subsection (a), and the environmental analysis, consultation, and review described in that document (including appendices) shall be considered to fully satisfy—

(1) all requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 . . . and

(2) any other provision of law that requires Federal agency consultation or review (including the consultation or review required under section 7(a) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 . . . with respect to the pipeline and facilities referred to in subsection (a).

(c) PERMITS.—Any Federal permit or authorization issued before the date of enactment of this Act for the pipeline and cross-border facilities referred to in subsection (a) shall remain in effect.

(d) FEDERAL JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Any legal challenge to a Federal agency action regarding the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a), and the related facilities in the United States, that are approved by this Act, and any permit, right-of-way, or other action taken to construct or complete the project pursuant to Federal law, shall only be subject to judicial review on direct appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

(e) PRIVATE PROPERTY SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this Act alters any Federal, State, or local process or condition in effect on the date of enactment of this Act that is necessary to secure access from an owner of private property to construct the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a).

That is it. It is that simple. It is that simple.

So our President has been deliberating on this now for 6 years, and that is the decision. Are we going to produce energy in this country, are we going to work with Canada to get our energy, are we going to create jobs, are we going to generate economic activity or are we going to continue to rely on oil from the Middle East?

It is not as though there is no precedent to do it. Look at this chart. The red line is the Keystone Pipeline. I don't know how many people realize it, but we have already built the Keystone Pipeline—not the Keystone XL Pipeline for which we are seeking approval but the Keystone Pipeline. The project under consideration is a sister project to one that has already been built. It brings oil from Canada into the United States. That is the Keystone project. It has been permitted and built. It is in operation now.

The Keystone XL Pipeline, the sister project, brings oil from Canada into the United States; then North Dakota and Montana put light sweet Bakken and crude oil in it as well, and that oil goes to our refineries. Does it seem like a complicated decision, a difficult decision? Does it seem like something that requires 6 years of study?

The point is this body can approve it. That is what this is all about. We have 56 Senators—56 Senators, Republicans and Democrats—saying: Give us a vote. Give us a vote. Let this Senate do its job. Let's approve this project. It is a very straightforward decision.

Is this decision going to be made for special interest groups? Is this decision going to be blocked? Are we not going to get a vote because special interest groups are opposed to something the American people want? In the most recent poll, 70 percent of Americans want it built. What does it take?

One of the arguments I heard is: It is a pipeline. It has to be studied for 6

years because it is so complicated and difficult.

There are the pipelines we have in this country. We have millions of miles of pipeline, but it is so difficult to figure out whether we should build one more that produces energy and jobs for our country? A lot of these pipelines are old and we have millions of miles of pipelines all over this country. We can't decide whether we should build one more that is state-of-the-art?

What are we saying to our friends and neighbors in Canada? They very much want this project. They feel they have dealt with our country in good faith. What are we saying to Canada?

Some might say, if the pipeline isn't built, then that energy will not be produced from the oil sands area in Canada.

Really? Is that right? Then what is this pipeline moving? Oil from the oil sands in Canada. What is moving on our railroads all over this country?

If we don't build this pipeline, that oil is either going to China—and then we end up continuing to get our oil from the Middle East—or it is going to move by rail. If it moves by rail, that is 1,400 tanker cars a day on our railroads, 14-unit trains of 100 cars a day on our railroads. Does that seem like a better way to move it than a state-of-the-art pipeline? That is the decision.

I could put the decision in front of anybody in this country and I don't think it would take them 6 years to decide and I don't think it should take our President not only 6 years to decide, but now he said indefinitely—an indefinite delay.

It is time to vote on this important issue. I wish to thank the Senators who have stepped up and supported this legislation—certainly Senator LANDRIEU, who will be down here to talk about it in a minute, and Senator HEITKAMP, my fellow Senator in North Dakota, and many others on both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats.

It is not a partisan issue. It is an issue of whether we are going to make this decision for the people of this country and build an energy future for this country—energy security for this country—where we produce more energy in North America between the United States and Canada than we consume so we don't have to rely on energy from the Middle East or from Venezuela or other countries that may not share our beliefs, our views, and our interests. That is the decision or is this going to be a decision for special interest groups?

If the President refuses to make that decision, we in this body have a responsibility to do it, and we put forward a bill to approve it.

Again, I thank my colleagues for their hard work on this bill, and I ask others to join us. Let's make this decision, and let's make it for the American people.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I am going to speak very briefly this afternoon about a very timely and important subject. My colleague and partner, Senator HOEVEN, came to the floor earlier—I was unable to come at that time—to speak about a bill for which he has actually provided extraordinary leadership.

I wish to thank the Presiding Officer, and Senator HOEVEN for his leadership as well, to try to help bring to the floor of the Senate a vote to help construct the Keystone Pipeline. It is an issue a group of us have been working on now for quite some time. I wish to thank the Presiding Officer again. I wish to also thank the other Democratic leaders who have been so supportive and helpful to us in this effort: Senator PRYOR from Arkansas, Senator MCCASKILL from Missouri, Senator TESTER from Montana, who agreed to cosponsor the bill, Senator WARNER from Virginia, Senator HAGAN, Senator BEGICH, Senator MANCHIN, Senator DONNELLY, and Senator WALSH. I really want to thank them and other colleagues who have decided they may not want to cosponsor the bill that will be introduced later tonight, but they very well may vote for it, and I appreciate it.

I know this has been a very contentious issue for many, because people have very strong feelings about this particular pipeline called the Keystone XL Pipeline. Some of us who support it have a little trouble understanding why it is such a big deal, but I appreciate there are strong feelings on the other side of this issue. For those of us from States such as Louisiana and Texas and Oklahoma and North Dakota, particularly, that are affected by this pipeline, it is clear that the technology—and we should be proud of it—is extraordinary, it is exploding and, in some ways, unprecedented and unexpected. The technology is creating a real opportunity for America and for North America. That opportunity is for us to produce more oil and gas. The opportunity is to continue to maintain coal supplies that are clean and appropriate for the environment—or advanced coal technologies, I should say—and provide the kind of energy, including as well alternative energies that are emerging, such as wind and solar, and maintaining our nuclear and strategic advantage as part of our electric grid. It provides a real opportunity for us to go from a major country that was scrambling to plan where our energy was going to come from and really concerned about it—paying very high prices sometimes at the pump and through our electric grid—to now a country that gets to actually say, My gosh, look at the resources we have right here in America and the resources we potentially have with our partners and our allies. One of the strongest allies we have in the world is Canada, and an emerging ally—emerging in its relationship with us—is Mexico: The North American continent. I think there is so much potential for Canada, the United States, and Mexico—and others share my view—to become completely not only energy independent but an energy powerhouse for the world—a world in which the North American continent, at least, wants to promote freedom, democracy, and human rights. Senator CARDIN was just on the floor talking about how important that issue is for our Nation and world. He has given literally his life as an expert on human rights around the world and is leading the Helsinki Commission. He was just talking with us about the importance of this and what is happening in Ukraine and in Russia and in Europe recently.

So the issue of freedom and private enterprise and opportunity and education and energy self-sufficiency are goals we treasure and it is possible for the rest of the world and our allies around the world.

But what signal does it send if America is not willing to do its part when it comes to production right here in America and transporting oil and natural gas and other emerging fuels—alternative fuels, alternative sources of electricity—when we are not doing our very best?

I know it is contentious, but I come to the floor to talk about this issue. Senator HOEVEN gave an excellent defense of why the Keystone Pipeline is important. But I want to underscore that in terms of jobs and the economy. I want to underscore the process. Because there are a lot of Democrats and others in my caucus—friends and colleagues—who have said: Well, has the process been complete? Has the process been thorough?

I want to review for the record a couple of very interesting aspects. Before I start, I want to point out, again, this, shown on this map I have in the Chamber, is the Keystone XL Pipeline.

There is already a ''Keystone Pipeline'' that has been constructed and has been operating for quite some time. This is an existing pipeline that is operating from Canada down to the refineries in Texas technically, but very close to the Louisiana border. We are very proud of our industry in Texas and Louisiana—the refining capacity we have, the ability to generate resources this country and the world need. Hopefully, if we can open exports appropriately—which is happening, as we speak. Permits are being issued. The jobs that are created here, the opportunity for creating jobs in every one of our 50 States, including Hawaii and Alaska, and in our territories and in our first nations, as they are called, in our tribal territories, is almost without peer in the last several decades.

But this XL Pipeline is an alternative route, and it has been debated for quite some time. There have been these permits I am going to talk about in a minute that have been reviewed and will put that into the RECORD because there is some concern: Have we really reviewed what we need to do? Have the environmental studies been met?

So into the RECORD I want to put: On April 16, 2010, the Department of State

issued its Draft Environmental Impact Statement. It opened a 45-day comment period, which extended for additional days.

Then, a year later, on April 15, 2011, the Department of State issued a Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement and opened another 45-day comment period. At that time, there were 280,000 comments that were received. Those comments were read, responded to, and absorbed into the process.

On August 26 of that year—2011—the Department of State issued its Final Environmental Impact Statement and opened an additional 90-day review period. The agency continued to accept public comments.

Then, on March 1, 2013, the U.S. State Department issued its Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Keystone XL Presidential Permit application, which includes the proposed new route through Nebraska because there were some questions earlier in the process whether it should go through Nebraska.

Let me say, as strongly as I support the Keystone Pipeline, I also support States—whether it is Louisiana, Texas, Virginia, Nebraska, or North Dakota—to make determinations according to their own laws and their own constitutions about the takings of private property, which is sometimes required for projects such as this. Those processes cannot be shortchanged and they cannot be ignored.

One of the court cases right now in Nebraska is because—the courts have ruled this—the Governor there overstepped his bounds and he, according to the court in Nebraska, took actions that were contrary to the law in Nebraska and the constitution.

So these laws I am not dismissive of—the rules and regulations. Nebraska still has some issues that have to be resolved. But the rest of the pipeline to the south here has already been constructed. This part is being worked on. There are other parts of the pipeline that can be started while Nebraska finishes its very legitimate decisions between its courts, its public service commission, and its legislature about the issues in Nebraska—which, let me say, the landowners have valid concerns, and the courts have ruled so.

But, nevertheless, on January 31, 2014—this year—the State Department issued its Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the permit application, confirming that the project is safe and will have limited environmental impacts. The report reflects that TransCanada has agreed to incorporate 59 special safety conditions recommended by the pipeline safety commission.

So to my colleagues who say: Have we given ample time to review, I would say the answer is clearly yes. Is it time to build the pipeline? Yes. And should we get about a vote on the Senate floor to express strong support for a piece of America's infrastructure—North American infrastructure that is critical to the future growth of our economy and to the promise of opportunity, economic opportunity for our citizens? I think the answer to that is yes.

This group of Democrats—of which the Presiding Officer, Senator WARNER from Virginia, is a part—has been working on this now for several years.

One other point I would like to make: the comparison here of other pretty well-known and very large public works projects or private developments—some of them are public and some of them are private—that have been constructed.

The Hoover Dam—very well known—took 5 years to complete, from 1931 to 1936. From planning, design, to completion—5 years.

The Pentagon took 2 years to complete, from 1941 to 1943.

The Space Shuttle Discovery took 4 years to complete, from 1979 to 1983.

The Ambassador Bridge between the United States and Canada—3 years to complete. Design, build, and complete—from 1927 to 1929.

The Theodore Roosevelt—4 years to complete, from 1968 to 1972.

America and Canada: Together we have been building major projects for many years—complicated, tough projects that require tremendous cooperation between agencies, and dealing with environmental protection rules and regulations, and meeting citizens' concerns.

This is not anything new. We have been doing this in America for a long time. It is time to stop studying and stop waiting and start building this Keystone XL Pipeline.

Now, again, the legislation we have introduced today—Senator HOEVEN, Senator LANDRIEU, and 10 other Democrats, and several other Republicans—to build this pipeline would simply say it is time to stop studying; start building. With all due respect, the process is complete. We just acknowledged the process is done.

We also acknowledge there is still an outstanding issue in Nebraska. Nothing in this bill will affect the court decisions, the timeframe in Nebraska. But what it will send is a signal that this other section can start to be built and constructed. And then, of course, Nebraska will take—we do not know. It could be 6 months, it could be a year. We do not know when that process will finally be resolved.

But we can start now. It is going to take several years for this to be completed. If we wait another year, it is pushing this even further back for no good reason.

Let me mention a third argument.

I think some people are under the mistaken impression that this is maybe the first time we have built infrastructure with Canada. Nothing could be farther from the truth. There are 100 cross-border permits that have already been approved for oil and natural gas and electric transmission facilities crossing the U.S.-Mexico or the U.S.-Canadian border. Of these 100 are 21 oil pipelines crossing the border.

So this is such a basic, important point of building infrastructure between Canada, America, and Mexico that some of us who support these kinds of things fairly routinely are having difficulty understanding why 5 years and five permits and five reviews is not satisfactory to build something that has been basically built multiple times before.

Some people may say: Oh, but the difference is, this is connecting the oil sands. The oil sands in Canada are a very important resource, not just for Canada but for the United States. I am glad these oil sands are here as opposed to in Venezuela or I am glad the oil sands are here as opposed to in Cuba. I am glad the oil sands are here as opposed to in the middle of Russia with everything else they have.

I am happy Canada has resources. I am happy. They are a friend and a neighbor and close to us. I am also really impressed with Canada's environmental standards, which are, by my calculations—not in depth, but just a broad review, after speaking to so many industry and government leaders there—very rigorous. I do not think there is anyone in this Chamber who would counter that.

It is well known and understood that Canada has very high standards. They understand, accept climate change. They believe carbon is affecting the climate in a negative way. They believe they can reduce the amount of carbon coming out. They are sensitive to that. But they know what we know—that the world is going to need oil and gas for decades to come. It is not going to stop in 5 years or 10 years. We need oil and gas for decades. Why not use our own? Why not use the oil and gas from Canada, America, and Mexico—creating jobs right here at home, instead of importing it from places around the world that we do not even get along with or places around the world that do not share our values or places around the world that can use the price of oil or gas to hurt our economy. Why don't we take charge of our own economy?

So when some people complain about the oil sands in Canada, I am, frankly, glad they are there. I am glad we can tap into them with extraordinary new, cleaner technologies to have oil and gas and energy for this country that has a very bright future.

So with the reviews—five over 5 years—hundreds of thousands of comments from business, industry, citizens, environmental groups that have been taken into consideration, the Department of State has issued its final review, and that final review said it is safer and more environmentally in tune with our environmental rules and regulations to transport this oil through a pipeline than through rail or highway.

For those of us who live in places that do a lot of production, we always

say we are proud of the industry, and we are—the industry makes mistakes, and when they mess up, they have to clean up—but I also have to say, I am very conscious, as most Americans are, of the traffic on our highways, of the backups on our rail system. I hear complaints from businesses, manufacturers: We cannot get our products fast enough.

So here we have a chance to move a commodity under the ground, safely through a pipe, but know if we do not build this pipeline, it is going to move by rail or truck, which congests our highways, congests our rail lines, and causes even more impact on our environment.

I think the record is clear. I think the arguments are in. I think there is no question that this is right for the environment, right for the country, and clearly in the interests of the United States. This will benefit not just the gulf coast where the refineries are, but it is going to create jobs throughout our entire country. Suppliers to this project exist everywhere.

There is a terrific map that I have shown before where suppliers from all over the country are providing either labor or support for the construction of this pipeline and much other similar infrastructure in the Nation.

We already have 2.9 million miles of pipeline in America. This piece we are speaking about today is 1,000 miles. We already have 2.9 million miles of pipe. Yes, some of it needs to be upgraded. Yes, not every inch of it is safe. We are working on that. But this is probably going to be the safest pipeline ever built in the history of America. It has been reviewed so many times. I cannot wait to look at the details of what has been required. I am positive that it is going to be the safest pipeline ever built. It has taken 5 years to get it.

So that is what our bill does. I am going to end with again thanking the Democrats who have joined with me to support the Keystone XL Pipeline. I thank the caucus for at least the opportunity. Hopefully, we will introduce this bill tonight. Hopefully, we can get a vote on this bill. Let me say that the vote will be in connection with the energy efficiency bill that will also be brought to the floor. The reason, as chair of the energy committee, I think that is so important is that while neither one represents a comprehensive energy plan for the country, which I hope to develop with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle—I just stepped into this position in the last month—these are two important energy-related pieces that need resolution.

The energy efficiency bill has now been worked on by Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN—bipartisan—for 5 years, almost as long as the Keystone Pipeline has been under consideration by the administration. We have had an energy efficiency bill worked on by Republicans and Democrats that will create thousands of private sector jobs.

It is supported by the Business Roundtable, the Real Estate Roundtable, the Chamber of Commerce, labor leaders all over our country, building owners, and retail establishments. The energy efficiency bill is a terrific piece of legislation. Again, it came out of our committee 18 to 3. There are very few things that have come out of the energy committee that are that impactful. There are little bills that come out that really do not mean much to anybody. They may come out unanimously. It means a lot to the person who is sponsoring it, but it does not have national impact. This has national and international impact—all positive.

Senator SHAHEEN has been a champion of trying to bring this bill to the floor. We have been rebuffed and rebuffed and rebuffed by the Republican side for no reason because some of them are wanting to debate health care and some of them want to debate Iran sanctions. I said: Let's just talk about energy. It is important for the country to focus at least a few hours of the Senate's attention on energy.

America is focused on it. They want it to be affordable. They want it to be as clean as possible. They do not want to have to buy it from countries they do not share values with and do not appreciate. They want less imports to America, more domestic production of alternatives and oil and gas. So let's get about that business.

So efficiency is basically doing a lot more—a lot more with a lot less—saving taxpayers and saving huge sums of money. The example that everyone is becoming more familiar with is the Empire State Building in New York, an extraordinary private sector effort to take one of our most iconic buildings that we all know and which many millions of Americans have actually visited, and to take an old building that was constructed in the 1930s, retooling it with private money—not public grants, private money—and saving the building owners and the tenants of that building millions and millions of dollars as an example of what can be done in commercial buildings throughout this country.

That needs to be unleashed with the legislation of JEANNE SHAHEEN—that power, that promise, to do more of that is going to be unleashed by this bill that Senator PORTMAN and Senator SHAHEEN have carefully put together and Senator WYDEN also when he was chair, with Senator MURKOWSKI's help, and they got it out of the committee.

I committed when I stepped into the leadership of the committee to build on their good work and to do my very best to get that bill to the floor. We have an energy bill with Keystone. I thought the two of them, working together, Republicans and Democrats, we could get a good compromise by working on both of them at the same time. We are capable of doing it. They are clearly broadly supported. It will help create jobs in America.

We will begin with two important steps—not the only ones. There is more that can be done. People come to me and say: Senator, we should do this, we should do that. Yes, we can work on coal. We can work on propane. We had a hearing on propane today. We can work on additional rail for the country. We can work on pipeline safety. We can work on alternative fuels. We can work on strengthening our relationship with Israel and China. We can work on new kinds of automobiles.

But that is for another day. We cannot do all of it at one time. But what we can do is what is before us. We can do what is before us. We can do what is clearly timely. The energy efficiency bill, for 5 years, has been waiting for action by this Senate. The House has already passed an energy efficiency bill.

The pipeline has been waiting 5 years and has been reviewed five times. It is time to move forward on both and create the kinds of jobs for America that we need—high-paying, middle-class jobs—and to begin to help build America and North America as the energy powerhouse that it can be, doing it together. We can recognize the transport of oil and gas, and the production is important, but also alternative and focusing on efficiency and conservation, and many of our Democrats are very proud of the work in that area.

I am sorry to keep the Senate. I think I might be the last speaker of the evening. But I thank the leadership for providing the time, and again, I want to thank Senator HOEVEN for his leadership.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. ENZI, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MCCONNELL, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 2282. A bill to prohibit the provision of performance awards to employees of the Internal Revenue Service who owe back taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, this is a speech—these are some remarks—that I really should not have to make, but late this afternoon, I rise to discuss more amazing actions from our Nation's tax collector. This is, unfortunately, an agency that is fast becoming the gang that cannot shoot straight—the folks who brought us the partisan suppression of free speech, who piled onto that with proposed rules to shut down political action by groups with which they disagree or do not favor, and the same team that shares confidential taxpayer information with their allies outside of government. Obviously, I am talking about the Internal Revenue Service.

Here is a great deal: Break the law you are required to enforce and get a cash bonus and free time off.

What on Earth is this all about?

Well, last week, the Treasury Department's Inspector General for Tax Administration issued a report, which I have here, on the Internal Revenue Service bonuses that were awarded to

personnel who have violated the tax laws or who have been subject to serious infractions of employee policy.

This is a lot like hiring someone to work for you, and then they steel money from you or acted in ways that are very inappropriate. Would you give them a bonus? I do not think most businesspeople would do that. According to the inspector general, close to $3 million was awarded to staff with violations on their records, with about half of that amount going to people who had violated the Tax Code.

Other personnel at the IRS received cash bonuses or other awards despite being cited for—listen to this—drug use, making violent threats, fraudulently claiming unemployment benefits and misusing government credit cards. Still they got bonuses—up to $3 million.

In fact, the report indicates that close to 70 percent of IRS personnel receive some sort of performance award—70 percent of the IRS. That is rather remarkable when you think about the sorts of problems your average taxpayer has in getting help from that particular agency.

This is flatly outrageous—if not appalling or atrocious—and cannot be tolerated. It also makes me wonder what you have to do to be disqualified from an award.

More disturbing, these awards, even for people breaking the law, are perfectly acceptable under current IRS and government-wide guidelines. Let me repeat that. These awards, even for people breaking the law, are perfectly acceptable under current IRS and government-wide guidelines.

Indeed, the IG report makes it clear that under the terms of the collective bargaining agreement with the main union for IRS employees, these awards are appropriate and cannot be taken away because of such violations.

The distribution of these awards at a time when the IRS is under scrutiny for its actions concerning the political activity of conservative groups, when its performance of basic taxpayer service functions has drastically worsened, and when it is calling for additional funding, calls into question the agency's commitment to fair enforcement of our tax laws.

The IG report recognized that these awards—while not technically prohibited—appear to be in conflict with the IRS's charge of ''ensuring integrity of the system of tax administration.'' Well, no kidding. Thank goodness for the inspector general.

That is what we call an understatement—maybe the understatement of the year.

This is another fox in the henhouse story. Not only is the fox in the henhouse, but he is now being rewarded for eating the chickens.

These performance awards are just plain wrong and should not go to anyone who breaks the law, particularly the laws which the agency enforces.

These bonus awards weaken public confidence in the Nation's tax enforcement agency and are a sign that the agency has indeed run off the rails.

The inspector general report recommended that the IRS create a new policy to take disciplinary actions into account when awarding bonuses.

It seems to me we need to do more than set up a new policy or guideline. We need something more concrete and more immediate. That is why today I am joining with my friends—Senators ENZI, CORNYN, RUBIO, TOOMEY, THUNE, JOHANNS, ISAKSON, and Leader MCCONNELL—to introduce the No Bonuses for Delinquent IRS Employees Act—a bill that really should be unnecessary. I thank my colleagues for joining me and, more especially, Senator ENZI, who has done a great deal of work on this and helped expose this from the first.

Our bill is pretty simple. It will prohibit the IRS from providing any performance award to any IRS employee who owes an outstanding Federal tax debt for failing to pay their taxes.

Nobody likes to be audited. Nobody likes to get that phone call from the IRS. Nobody likes to see the taxman at the door. And then if the taxman says: I am sorry, you owe X for a violation of Y, and you find out this individual got a performance bonus even though he or she fails to meet the tax obligations they face, that is rather incredible.

Given what we know about recent IRS actions—and the growing discontent with the agency I hear from Kansans every day—continuing to award personnel bonuses to employees who have outstanding tax liabilities or have violated the tax laws is beyond comprehension and outrageous and should be stopped.

This is not a partisan issue. It is just plain common sense. The IRS should not be in the business of awarding bonuses to its agents who are unable or unwilling to abide by the tax laws they are directed to uphold—simple as that.

So I call upon all my colleagues to support the No Bonuses for Delinquent IRS Employees Act and will ask for its immediate consideration.

In closing, I would like to point out this issue has been well-documented in a 26-page report by the inspector general. I thank the inspector general for the work he has done. Right on the first page it says: ''The Awards Program Complied With Federal Regulations, but Some Employees With Tax and Conduct Issues Received Awards.'' Most IRS employees complied with Federal regulations, but some employees with tax and conduct issues still received awards. That is an oxymoron.

Then, if you skip to the back, there are some recommendations. The recommendation is for corrective action. This is what it says:

> The IRS Human Capital Officer—Daniel Riordan is the IRS Human Capital Officer—will conduct a feasibility study. But they do not have to take action right away. They just want to discuss the feasibility of a study—by June 30 of this year—just a couple months away—for the implementation of a policy requiring management to consider a policy change.

It does not say just to do it; it says just consider whether conduct issues resulting in disciplinary actions should be made part of the performance evaluation, especially the nonpayment of taxes owed to the Federal government, prior to awarding performance and discretionary awards.

Daniel Riordan has received marching orders from the Inspector General to conduct a feasibility study by June 30, to determine whether the IRS should even consider whether disciplinary actions, including the nonpayment of taxes owed to the Federal Government, should be part of the evaluation as to whether an employee should be eligible for a performance award.

We really do not need this legislation. We have introduced it to force action. The inspector general says: Let's have action. On 26 pages, he says: Let's have action.

So to Daniel Riordan, I have the following advice—before we get 60 people on this and pass a bill, why don't you just go ahead and do it. Do not conduct a feasibility study. We have all the evidence right here. If you would just change the current policy, it would remove yet another problem, another unfortunate asterisk when we think of the IRS.

I want to thank my colleagues for cosponsoring this legislation and again ask for its immediate consideration.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 432—RECOGNIZING THE EFFORTS OF THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE AND OTHERS IN RESTORING AND REPAIRING THE WASHINGTON MONUMENT

Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

S. RES. 432

Whereas the employees of the National Park Service work tirelessly to maintain the beauty of the 401 national parks of the United States, revitalize communities, preserve local history, celebrate local heritage, and create outdoor recreation for children and families;

Whereas the Washington Monument was built between 1848 and 1884 to commemorate George Washington, the commander-in-chief of the Continental Army during the American Revolutionary War and the first president of the United States;

Whereas the Washington Monument is a symbol of unity and freedom in the United States and is the distinguishing feature of the skyline in Washington, DC;

Whereas the Washington Monument is admired by more than 25,000,000 individuals who visit the National Mall each year;

Whereas the Washington Monument was closed for over 2½ years for necessary repairs after being damaged by an earthquake in 2011;

Whereas engineers examined each of the 9,040 marble stones on the exterior of the Washington Monument and many of the

more than 10,000 granite stones on the interior of the monument to ensure that the repair of the monument was sound and complete;

Whereas during the rehabilitation, the Washington Monument was covered with scaffolding, markedly altering its appearance;

Whereas although the Washington Monument was closed during rehabilitation, the 488 lights on the scaffolding of the monument illuminated the night sky of the United States capital and provided visitors and residents with a sight of unexpected beauty; and

Whereas the repair of the Washington Monument would not have been possible without the vision and dedication of the National Park Service, contractors of the National Park Service, and generous philanthropic support: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) pays tribute to the National Park Service, contractors of the National Park Service, and all individuals who contributed to the restoration of the Washington Monument; and

(2) calls on the people of the United States to recognize the hard work of the National Park Service in preserving the monuments of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 433—CONDEMNING THE ABDUCTION OF FEMALE STUDENTS BY ARMED MILITANTS FROM THE GOVERNMENT GIRLS SECONDARY SCHOOL IN THE NORTHEASTERN PROVINCE OF BORNO IN THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF NIGERIA

Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COONS, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 433

Whereas, on the night of April 14, 2014, as many as 234 female students, most of them between 16 and 18 years old, were abducted by armed militants from the Government Girls Secondary School, a boarding school located in the northeastern province of Borno in the Federal Republic of Nigeria;

Whereas the militants burned down several buildings before opening fire on soldiers and police who were guarding the school and forcing the students into trucks;

Whereas, according to local officials in Borno state, about 43 students were able to flee their captors, and the rest remain missing;

Whereas all public secondary schools in Borno state were closed in March 2014 because of increasing attacks in the past year that have killed hundreds of students, but the young women at the Government Girls Secondary School were recalled to take their final exams;

Whereas the group popularly known as ''Boko Haram'', which loosely translates from the Hausa language to ''Western education is sin'', is known to oppose the education of girls, has kidnapped girls in the past to use as cooks and sex slaves, and is thought to be responsible for the April 14th kidnapping in Borno state;

Whereas there are reports that the abducted girls have been sold as brides to Islamist militants for the equivalent of $12 each;

Whereas Boko Haram has targeted schools, mosques, churches, villages, and agricultural centers, as well as government facilities, in an armed campaign to create an Islamic state in northern Nigeria, prompting the president of Nigeria to declare a state of emergency in three of the country's northeastern states in May 2013;

Whereas, according to the Brookings Institution, Boko Haram burned down or destroyed 50 schools and killed approximately 30 teachers in Nigeria in 2013, leaving tens of thousands of children unable to attend school;

Whereas, on April 14, 2014, hours before the kidnapping in Borno state, Boko Haram bombed a bus station in Abuja, Nigeria, killing at least 75 people and wounding over 100, making it the deadliest attack ever in Nigeria's capital;

Whereas Amnesty International estimates that more than 1,500 people have been killed in attacks by Boko Haram or reprisals by Nigerian security forces this year alone, and the Council on Foreign Relations estimates that almost 4,000 people have been killed in Boko Haram attacks since 2011;

Whereas the Department of State designated Boko Haram as a Foreign Terrorist Organization in November 2013, recognizing the threat posed by the group's large-scale and indiscriminate attacks against women and children;

Whereas, according to the United Nations, girls' education is a major challenge in Nigeria;

Whereas, according to the United Nations Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF), some 4,700,000 children of primary school age are still not in school in Nigeria, with attendance rates lowest in the north;

Whereas a study conducted by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) found that school children in Nigeria, particularly those in the northern provinces, are at a disadvantage in their education, with 37 percent of primary-age girls in the rural northeast not attending school, and 30 percent of boys not attending school;

Whereas, according to the World Economic Forum's Global Gender Gap Index, Nigeria is ranked 106 out of 136 countries based on women's economic participation, educational attainment, and political empowerment;

Whereas, according to the United Nations, women held only 6.7 percent of the seats in Nigeria's parliament in 2013;

Whereas the advancement of women around the world is a foreign policy priority for the United States;

Whereas, according to the United States Agency for International Development, ''Broader, more equitable access to education encourages political participation, enhances governance, strengthens civil society, and promotes transparency and accountability.'';

Whereas a 100-country study by the World Bank shows that increasing the share of women with a secondary education by 1 percent boosts annual per capita income growth by 0.3 percentage points;

Whereas, according to UNICEF, adolescent girls that attend school are less likely to be married as children, ''are less vulnerable to disease including HIV and AIDS, and acquire information and skills that lead to increased earning power. Evidence shows that the return to a year of secondary education for girls correlates to a 25 percent increase in wages later in life.'';

Whereas, according to the World Bank, ''The benefits of women's education go beyond higher productivity for 50 percent of the population. More educated women also tend to be healthier, participate more in the formal labor market, earn more income,. . . and provide better health care and education to their children, all of which eventually improve the well-being of all individuals and lift households out of poverty. These benefits also transmit across generations, as well as to their communities at large.''; and

Whereas women and girls must be allowed to go to school without fear of violence and unjust treatment so that they can take their rightful place as equal citizens of and contributors to the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses its strong support for the people of Nigeria, especially the parents and families of the girls abducted by Boko Haram in Borno state, and calls for the immediate, safe return of the girls;

(2) condemns Boko Haram for its violent attacks on civilian targets, including schools, mosques, churches, villages, and agricultural centers in Nigeria;

(3) encourages the Government of Nigeria to strengthen efforts to protect the ability of children to obtain an education and to hold those who conduct such violent attacks accountable;

(4) encourages efforts by the United States Government to support the capacity of the Government of Nigeria to provide security for schools and to hold terrorist organizations, such as Boko Haram, accountable;

(5) urges timely civilian assistance from the United States and allied African nations in rescuing and reintegrating the abducted girls;

(6) recognizes that every individual, regardless of gender, should have the opportunity to pursue an education without fear of discrimination;

(7) reaffirms its commitment to ending discrimination and violence against women and girls, to ensuring the safety and welfare of women and girls, and to pursuing policies that guarantee the basic human rights of women and girls worldwide;

(8) recognizes that the empowerment of women is inextricably linked to the potential of countries to generate economic growth, sustainable democracy, and inclusive security; and

(9) encourages the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, and the Department of Defense to continue their support for initiatives that positively impact the ability of women and girls to fully access their human rights.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 1, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SR–328A of the Russell Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''The Importance of Regional Strategies in Rural Economic Development.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 1, 2014, at 2 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 1, 2014, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 1, 2014, at 11 a.m., in room SD–215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''President Obama's 2014 Trade Policy Agenda.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 1, 2014, at 10 a.m., in SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct an executive business meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 1, 2014, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that floor privileges be granted to Margot Hecht, a member of my legislative staff, during today's session of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2280

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I understand that S. 2280 introduced earlier today by Senators LANDRIEU and HOEVEN is at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the title of the bill for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2280) to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

Mr. REID. I ask for a second reading but object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MAY 5, 2014

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m. on Monday, May 5, 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; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until 5:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; and that at 5:30 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there will be two rollcall votes at 5:30 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MAY 5, 2014, AT 2 P.M.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:41 p.m., adjourned until Monday, May 5, 2014, at 2 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

PAMELA PEPPER, OF WISCONSIN, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN, VICE CHARLES N. CLEVERT, JR., RETIRED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL OF THE AIR FORCE AND FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE SERVING AS THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 8037:

To be lieutenant general

BRIG. GEN. CHRISTOPHER F. BURNE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. MARSHALL B. WEBB

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

LT. GEN. RAYMOND A. THOMAS III

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. STEPHEN G. FOGARTY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. MARGARET C. WILMOTH

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JOHN L. GRONSKI

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. THOMAS S. ROWDEN

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

REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN F. KIRBY

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. JON M. DAVIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. KENNETH F. MCKENZIE, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. ROBERT B. NELLER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. JOHN A. TOOLAN, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. PATRICK J. HERMESMANN
COL. HELEN G. PRATT

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

ROBERT J. TRAINER

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 1211:

To be major

PHILANDER PINCKNEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

ELIZABETH JOYCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be colonel

JASMINE T. DANIELS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

JAN S. SUNDE

To be major

SHRUTI P. MUTALIK
HIMANSHU PATHAK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JOSEPH L. CRAVER

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

CHARLES E. VARSOGEA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

LOUIS J. LAZZARA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

TARA M. MCARTHUR–MILTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

TODD W. BOEHM

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 1, 2014:

THE JUDICIARY

THEODORE DAVID CHUANG, OF MARYLAND, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND.

GEORGE JARROD HAZEL, OF MARYLAND, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

SUZAN G. LEVINE, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SWISS CONFEDERATION, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE PRINCIPALITY OF LIECHTENSTEIN.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

JANICE MARION SCHNEIDER, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN HONOR OF BETHEL MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 60th Anniversary of Bethel Missionary Baptist Church in Seaside, California. Over the course of the last half century, Bethel Missionary Baptist Church has become a community pillar of the Monterey Peninsula. Service and love are the hallmarks of its congregants and leadership. I can say with unshakeable confidence that the people of Bethel Missionary Baptist Church will continue to be a beacon of service, compassion, and faith in God for another sixty years and beyond.

In 1954, several leaders from Seaside and surrounding communities came together to found a new church. They included Mrs. William Irving, Amy Robinson, Lenora Bean, members of the Felix family, the late Reverend G.E. Ellis, the late Reverend W.F. Bailey, and the Reverend J.W. Harris. The late Reverend G.E. Ellis offered prayer and the group selected the name for the new church that had been suggested the late Sister Edna Felix.

In April 1954, Bethel Missionary Baptist Church services commenced under the leadership of its first Pastor, the Reverend J.W. Harris, at its first Seaside location at 1251 Broadway. The late Reverend J.W. Paige then assumed helm of the Church and helped it grow its congregation and acquire property for a permanent location. Two additional pastors followed in quick succession. The Reverend A.E. Johnson and the Reverend Elroy Day each brought their own particular gift to the Church community, including helping the Church move to 390 Elm Avenue, Seaside, the location that it still calls home today.

In 1961, the Reverend H.H. Lusk, Sr. assumed the pastoral duties of Bethel Missionary Baptist Church. The Church community was still small at that time, just 60 members. Under his spiritual and temporal leadership, the Bethel family found many new members. It quickly outgrew its facilities and in 1975, under Reverend Lusk's leadership, the old sanctuary was demolished and replaced with the current sanctuary and classrooms.

Mr. Speaker, the story of Bethel Missionary Baptist Church is a great American story of a family of faith growing from humble beginnings to become a pillar of the community. I know I speak for the whole House in congratulating Reverend H.H. Lusk, Sr. and the whole Bethel Missionary Baptist Church family on 60 years of success and I look forward to many more.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF SENIOR COMPANION

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, this year, we celebrate the 40th anniversary of the Senior Companion Program. This important program pairs senior volunteers with frail seniors or disabled adults who are homebound. By providing companionship, taking care of routine chores and providing transportation to medical appointments or the grocery store, Senior Companions are often the only reason that frail seniors or disabled citizens are able to remain in their homes. The program helps over 60,000 Americans continue living on their own, which not only benefits the individuals but saves the federal government millions of dollars. Other Senior Companions provide assistance and friendship to seniors who would otherwise be isolated.

I was responsible for bringing the first Senior Companion program to my home state of Oregon back in 1977. After being elected to Congress in 1986, I kept up my commitment to Senior Companion and other Senior Corps programs like RSVP and the Foster Grandparent Program. These programs have improved the quality of life for the citizens of my district and across the country. By mobilizing seniors to volunteer their skills and experience, vital community needs are met at a lower cost and senior volunteers reap the mental and physical benefits of remaining active in their communities.

After 40 years of success, we need to maintain our commitment to our nation's seniors. I have built a bipartisan coalition and led the fight against misguided proposals to defund Senior Corps and dismantle the current structure of the program in this year's budget debates. We must continue to utilize the talents of seniors and work to improve and protect vital Senior Corps programs like the Senior Companion Program.

HONORING THE STORY INN OF BROWN COUNTY, INDIANA

HON. TODD C. YOUNG

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, Hoosier innovation and small business entrepreneurship help drive the economic engine of the state. Indiana small businesses are a source of pride for towns and cities across the state for the distinctly local, high quality goods and services they provide. One such small business is the Story Inn of Brown County. Located at "one inconvenient location since 1851," the Story Inn is a snapshot of Indiana's frontier past and melds modern convenience with a rugged atmosphere.

The Story Inn is a staple in southern Indiana with a unique history. The village of Story, Indiana was established through a land grant from President Millard Fillmore to Dr. George Story in 1851. The village grew to support a sizeable population and embodied the small-town Hoosier experience. When the Great Depression crippled the nation, citizens of Story left in droves to search for economic opportunity elsewhere. The small Indiana town never fully regained its pre-depression population, but the lack of development and construction after the economic collapse was a benefit in disguise. Story remained a vintage tribute to Indiana's frontier past, relatively untouched by the modern era, complete with wooden cabins, cattle barns, and an old-fashioned general store.

The general store was converted to a bed and breakfast in the 1980s by aspiring entrepreneurs. In 1998 the town of Story was purchased by Richard R Hofstetter and Frank Mueller. It is still owned by Mr. Hofstetter and today, the bed and breakfast occupies the entire village. A peaceful getaway nestled in the rolling hills of Brown County Indiana, the Story Inn caters to those who wish to revel in breathtaking sights, enjoy culinary delights, or escape the bustle of city life. Guests can relax in a variety of cozy rooms that have elements of modernity but seamlessly blend into the luscious forests that surround the Inn. Even Indianapolis radio personality Greg Garrison purchased a cabin that overlooks the town and is available to guests. "The Garrison" cabin is the epitome of Brown County style: the walls are paneled in pine and the balcony provides an expansive view of the Brown County wilderness.

Guests can enjoy authentic Hoosier cuisine at the Inn's restaurant which features delicacies like locally-raised pork and beef, garden-grown herbs, spices, and fresh local produce, all complimented by a crisp glass or two of fine wine. The Story Inn's commitment to elegant simplicity drives visitors from across the state to this quaint bed and breakfast.

The Story Inn of Brown County continues to offer excellent service with a local taste to any and all desiring a serene getaway. Whether one is embarking on a nature trail, wishing to sample local cuisine, yearning to enjoy the scenery, or just passing through for a visit, the Story Inn is an amazing getaway and a remarkable part of Indiana's history. I would like to thank the Story Inn for its cultural impact on the state, and most importantly, for continuing to exemplify the Hoosier spirit. I wish all involved—including the Blue Lady—continued success for many years to come!

HONORING RESACA MIDDLE SCHOOL STUDENTS

HON. FILEMON VELA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the winners of the 2013–2014

Verizon Innovative App Challenge, team ''Hello Navi'' from Resaca Middle School in Los Fresnos, Texas. I commend the team for their hard work and dedication to the competition. These students exemplify the ingenuity and creativity found amongst South Texas students.

The Verizon Innovative App Challenge encourages middle school and high school students to use knowledge of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) subjects to develop an original mobile app concept to address a need in their school or community.

Los Fresnos students Cassandra Baquero, Grecia Cano, Caitlyn Gonzalez, Kayleen Gonzalez, Janessa Leija, Jacqueline Garcia Torres, along with their faculty advisor Maggie Bolado, pioneered an app to help the blind navigate any building, including Resaca Middle School.

Their exemplary leadership and creativity encourages other students to improve our world with technological developments. Projects such as this that increase student interest and knowledge in STEM subjects are extremely important to our region and our country given the high demand for STEM college graduates.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize these outstanding students for winning the 2013–2014 Verizon Innovative App Challenge and look forward to their future accomplishments.

HONORING GENERAL WILLIAM M. FRASER III

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and privilege to pay tribute to an exceptional Air Force leader, General William M. Fraser III, Commander, United States Transportation Command.

General Fraser is retiring after honorably serving this great nation with an incredibly distinguished 40-year career. General Fraser graduated from the Texas A&M University ROTC program in 1974. As a command pilot with more than 4,300 flying hours, General Fraser has held command and staff positions at the squadron, group, wing, major command, and Department of Defense levels and is considered one of the finest strategic logistics experts in the nation.

USTRANSCOM serves as the key logistics synchronizer for the Department of Defense. It provides global mobility for rapidly projecting national power and influence, anywhere, anytime. Whether sustaining our combat troops in remote parts of Afghanistan, ensuring critical cargo moves through ports in the South Pacific, or re-supplying our forces at the South Pole, General Fraser and his command have shown the world why we truly are an exceptional nation. No other nation can project power globally or sustain its forces in every far corner of the globe as we can, and we have achieved this ability largely through General Fraser's leadership and the efforts of his command.

Equally important, General Fraser cultivated trust with our allies and forged bonds that will endure for many years. These relationships are reaping diplomatic, economic, and geopolitical benefits that contributing directly to regional security and stability and enabling our military to remain effective and efficient as we downsize and rebalance our forces.

General Fraser will tell you that his accomplishments were due to the hard work from the men and women of USTRANSCOM, but we know they were highly inspired by his leadership. We, in Congress, will miss his ''Giddy Up'' and ''Aggie'' persona and his proactive approach to keep us informed and to help us understand the impact of our work. But most of all, we will be forever grateful for General Fraser's unwavering support to our men and women in the Armed Forces, their dependents, and our entire nation.

Mr. President, while we recognize General Fraser for his 40 years of service, I also wish to recognize his wife, Beverly, and wish her the very best for the future, as well as their son Mac who served in the U.S. Marine Corps, and their daughter, Ashlee, a military spouse of an Air Force officer. The Air Force will lose not one, but two, exceptional people upon General Fraser's retirement. Will and Bev, we wish you well in your future endeavors and pray that those who follow in your footsteps may continue the legacy of your unprecedented support for our great nation.

HONORING THE DEDICATED SERVICE OF PATRICK G. EMMANUEL OF NORTHWEST FLORIDA

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to recognize the dedicated service and contributions of Patrick G. Emmanuel on the occasion of his retirement from Emmanuel Sheppard and Condon, one of the oldest law firms in Pensacola, Florida. For 67 years, Mr. Emmanuel proudly served the law profession and Northwest Florida with passion and integrity.

Prior to his career in law, Mr. Emmanuel served our Nation with honor and distinction as an officer in the United States Armed Forces. As a U.S. Army major, he earned the Bronze Star for his service as part of a tank battalion unit during World War II.

Upon graduating from the University of Florida College of Law in 1946, Mr. Emmanuel began his long and decorated legal career. His countless accolades attest to his expertise as an attorney. Mr. Emmanuel has been listed in each prestigious volume of The Best Lawyers in America from 1983 until present, was rated by Martindale Hubbell as an A–V attorney, and was the recipient of the Florida Bar Foundation's ''2001 Medal of Honor Award.'' He also served as a Fellow in the American College of Trust and Estate Counsel, the American College of Trial Lawyers, and the American Bar Association. His vast list of memberships include: The Florida Bar, President, 1985–1986; Florida Bar Foundation, President, 1971–1973; Federal Judicial Nominating Commission of Florida, member and Chairman, 1974–1981; American Bar Association, Delegate, 1986–1989; Society of the Bar of the First Judicial Circuit, President, 1967; and the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals, Delegate, 1986–1990.

In addition to serving his profession, Mr. Emmanuel also maintained an honorable level of commitment to the Northwest Florida community. For 20 years, he was a pro bono attorney for the Northwest Florida Crippled Children's Home, as well as served on their Board of Directors. Mr. Emmanuel was Chairman of the Advisory Board of Sacred Heart Hospital in Pensacola for a decade, was appointed by the Governor to the Florida Children's Commission, chaired the Legal Division of the March of Dimes, and was a member of the James Baroco Foundation, Inc. His extensive pro bono work earned him the recognition of the Florida Bar and their President's Pro Bono Service Award.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the entire United States Congress, it is an honor to recognize the impressive career and achievements of one of Northwest Florida's most accomplished attorneys, Patrick G. Emmanuel. My wife Vicki and I congratulate Mr. Emmanuel, and we wish him and his family all the best for continued success.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

SPEECH OF

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 2014

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4486) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes:

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my friend Mr. ROTHFUS's commonsense amendment to H.R. 4486. I also want to thank Chairman CULBERSON for his hard work on this legislation on behalf of our nation's veterans.

This amendment would prohibit senior VA officials from collecting bonuses. According to several reports by the Inspector General at the Department of Veterans Affairs, there have been a series of tragic—and preventable—deaths at VA facilities across the country. The preventable deaths in the VA healthcare system have been attributed to mismanagement, improper oversight, and failure to schedule timely medical appointments, among other errors.

Yet, despite the fact that more than 20 deaths have been attributed to mismanagement and lack of oversight, tens of thousands of dollars in bonuses were awarded to top level executives at the VA.

This practice has been evident at the Atlanta VA Medical Center, where Inspector General reports highlighted widespread mismanagement, delays in care, and a lack of uniform and acceptable policies. At least three deaths—and possibly a fourth—have been attributed to this lack of oversight, including a suicidal patient who was supposed to be closely monitored by staff in the hospital's mental health ward but died of a drug overdose after staff members lost track of him for

hours. Despite the fact that as many as four unexpected deaths were attributed to mismanagement and lack of oversight, thousands of dollars in bonuses were awarded to top level executives at the facility.

At the Charlie Norwood VA Medical Center in Augusta, thousands of patients sat on a backlogged list for endoscopy consultations after management failed to act in a timely manner to schedule appointments for check-ups in the gastrointestinal clinic. These delays contributed to the deaths of three patients, who died waiting for care in what could otherwise have been a treatable illness. No one has been fired at this facility—to the contrary, VA refuses to say whether or not officials there are eligible for bonuses despite the deaths. Simply put, our veterans deserve better.

It is past time that we stop rewarding people for simply showing up to work—bonuses should be the exception, not the norm. It should never be easier to get a bonus than to get fired, but that is what we have seen at the VA.

Top officials at facilities from Atlanta to Pittsburgh have received ''performance awards,'' even while veterans died. Veterans deserve to know that in return for serving their country, they will not be endangered in the very place they go to seek care. They deserve the peace of mind that would come from knowing that those responsible for the tragic deaths received more than a slap on the wrist one day and a bonus the next. Our veterans deserve to know that deaths in the system are taken seriously and met with consequences. It is incomprehensible that management officials could simultaneously be complicit in mismanagement that led to a preventable death and also rewarded with a hefty bonus.

Furthermore, at a time when so many of our soldiers are returning from war, and in light of the deaths in Georgia and across the country, I believe the VA should prioritize veterans' health and well-being above all else.

Mr. Chair, I believe we should reward our veterans with quality care and services in exchange for their commitment to our country and our freedoms. Money spent on executive bonuses would be better spent on ensuring our nation's men and women in uniform receive the best possible care when they come home.

I urge my colleagues to join me in expressing support for our nation's veterans by supporting this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF SENATOR MARGARET CRAVEN

HON. MICHAEL H. MICHAUD

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the career of Maine State Senator Margaret Craven.

A native of Galway, Ireland, Senator Craven immigrated to Massachusetts at the age of 17 and later moved to Maine where she adopted Lewiston as her home city. Senator Craven was first elected to the Maine House of Representatives in 2002 and later to the Maine Senate in 2008.

Senator Craven currently serves as Chair of the Health and Human Services Committee and as a member of the Government Oversight Committee, and has previously served on the Appropriations Committee.

During her time in the Maine Legislature, Senator Craven has fought tirelessly on behalf of Maine's most vulnerable citizens, including veterans, the elderly, the disabled, women and children. Among her most significant accomplishments is her work on the Commission to Study Long-Term Care Facilities, which provided recommendations for addressing long-term care challenges in Maine.

In addition to her service in the Maine Legislature, Senator Craven has served her community through other means as a hospice volunteer and board member for several organizations, including Lewiston Public Library, Healthy Androscoggin, and Community Concepts.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in thanking Maine State Senator Margaret Craven for her service to the state of Maine and in wishing her the best of luck in future endeavors.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 2014

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4486) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes:

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I rise to speak on H.R. 4486, MILCON-VA Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2015.

The bill provides a total of $165 billion in FY 2015 to fund military construction projects and programs of the Veterans Affairs Department—$7 billion (4 percent) more than current funding.

This total includes $93.5 billion in mandatory spending (all for VA benefits) and $71.5 billion in discretionary funding.

Sequestration has caused significant problems for the VA in meeting the needs of our nation's veterans.

Unfortunately, H.R. 4486, does not provide the President's budget request for Department of Veteran Affairs (VA) medical care and includes unnecessary restrictions that could have negative consequences for benefits to our veterans.

I am disappointed with the funding level for VA Medical Care, which is $368 million below the President's request.

This funding level could delay the timely delivery of health care services to veterans and impede the Administration's efforts to end veterans' homelessness in 2015.

I hold our men and women of the armed services in the highest regard. I have fought for them to receive pay raises, affordable and safe housing, family support services, and the best possible medical care.

The Dr. Michael DeBakey VA Medical Center is in my District, and I am proud to say that Harris County is home to 187,717 veterans and Texas is called home by more than 1,618,413 veterans.

Our veterans never fail to respond to the call to serve their country. That is why we cannot and must not fail to serve them. And that begins by eliminating the back log. Veterans should not have to wait months to receive the care they need.

We must continue to fund programs to end veteran homelessness and increase benefits for veterans to assure they have access to healthcare, education and good paying jobs.

My support of veterans has been consistent and strong over the time I have served in the House of Representatives. I know firsthand how painful it is for Veterans to seek assistance for medical care—especially PTSD or Traumatic Brain injuries.

The VA has made important progress on the disability claims backlog which was at 900,000 last year, but the agency despite sequestration has made progress in reducing.

I will not be satisfied until the VA disability claims backlog has been eliminated.

VA funding should not be reduced from the amount requested by the Administration especially in light of the continuing backlog in disability claims.

Further, the bill provides $50 million below the request for Information Technology operations and maintenance programs, which may result in delayed technology infrastructure improvements that ensure continuity of operations for services that support all of VA's services and benefit delivery.

I appreciate the funding level provided for electronic health record interoperability and VistA Evolution, but I object to restriction on obligations for VistA modernization efforts.

Interoperability between the DOD and VA recordkeeping systems could significantly reduce the number of Veteran disability claims that are waiting processing.

Interoperability can also lead to significant cost savings by reducing inefficiencies that are created when the capacity for computing systems to automate benefits management and track claim submissions are not available.

Furthermore, interoperability among systems that are key to our men and women in uniform transitioning to civilian life makes sense for them and their families.

The Administration is committed to achieving seamless data integration and interoperability between the Department of Defense, VA, and also with private healthcare providers.

Meeting the challenge of interoperability must be addressed to make sure that Veterans receive the necessary and appropriate care in a timely manner.

The level of discretionary funding for FY 2015, which includes $55.6 billion in advance funding from prior-year appropriations, is $1.8 billion (2 percent) less than current comparable funding and $398 million less than requested.

I do thank the Appropriations Committee for its decision to provide $58.7 billion in advance FY 2016 funding for VA medical programs.

The measure boosts discretionary spending for the VA, providing $64.7 billion for FY 2015, $1.5 billion (2 percent) more than the comparable current level, while cutting military construction by $3.3 billion (33 percent) to $6.6 billion, equal to the administration's request.

The administration, given current budget caps on defense and nondefense spending,

elected to propose reductions in military construction in order to preserve funding for defense readiness accounts in the Defense appropriations bill.

With defense and non-defense spending caps in place for FY 2015, House and Senate appropriators expect to avoid the gridlock on spending bills that occurred last year.

Mr. Chair, it is my hope that my colleagues in the majority will place the best interest of the American people first during the deliberations on the budget to ensure that Federal government nor the American people have to endure another shutdown.

NATIONAL DAY OF PRAYER

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today, millions of Americans at home and around the world will gather together and pray for our nation in observance of the National Day of Prayer. More than 30,000 services will take place on the steps of county courthouses, in conference rooms of small businesses, and in church sanctuaries.

Since the first call to prayer by the Continental Congress in 1775, prayer has played a significant role in our history. Our forefathers founded this great nation on Christian principles. They believed that every American should be able to practice his or her faith freely and pray for wisdom and guidance for our country and its leaders.

Throughout our nation's challenges and achievements, the American people have united around prayer. Since President Harry Truman signed a Congressional resolution in 1952, we have come together on an annual basis to give thanks and ask God to bless our nation and the American people. I encourage every American to take time today and ask the Lord to guide our nation forward.

In conclusion, God Bless our Troops and we will never forget September 11th in the Global War on Terrorism.

HONORING THE LIFE AND DEDICATED SERVICE OF MILTON CITY COUNCILMAN RALPH ''CLAYTON'' WHITE

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and dedicated service of Northwest Florida's beloved Milton City Councilman Clayton White. Councilman White was a veteran, successful business owner, and committed public servant. The entire Northwest Florida community mourns the loss of a great man.

Councilman White was a native of Spencer County, Indiana, who first came to Milton, Florida, in 1951 during his service in the United States Navy. Like so many who come to Northwest Florida through military service, Councilman White was immediately struck by the Gulf Coast's natural beauty and the friendly nature of its residents and decided to remain in the area after completing his service. Councilman White and his wife Betty settled in Milton, where they opened a local appliance store, Tops TV and Appliance in 1957, which remains in business today and is run by their son, Barry. Tops quickly became known in the area for its quality selection, customer friendly service, and the store's wall of televisions, which Councilman White left on at night for the public to watch.

Councilman White also became involved in Northwest Florida's civic society and politics. He served on the Santa Rosa Elections Commission, as well as the Navarre Beach Board, before being appointed to a seat on the Milton City Council in 1979, which he held until 1994. In 2000, Councilman White decided to rejoin the council and was elected by the people of Milton to the council, where he continued to serve the community until his recent passing. Councilman White was known as an outstanding councilman with an assiduous work ethic and natural leadership abilities. Councilman White was also a long-time member of the local Kiwanis club, and he served on the Santa Rosa Tourist Development Council.

In addition to his business success and political service, Councilman White was also a loving and devoted husband, father, grandfather, and great-grandfather and a member of First United Methodist Church of Milton. Councilman White was preceded in death by his wife of 62 years, Betty, who passed away last December. To some Councilman White will be remembered as a dedicated public servant and to others as a successful businessman. To his family and friends, he will always be remembered as family man guided by his faith.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, it is an honor for me to recognize the life and dedicated service of Councilman Clayton White. My wife Vicki and I extend our prayers and sincere condolences his sons, Scott, Barry, and Brian; grandchildren, Randall, Emily, Clay, Bailey, Brennan, Brady and Raina; great-grandson Dylan; and the entire White Family.

HONORING ALYSSA KNOBEL ON RECEIVING THE DIRECTOR FOR LIFE AWARD AND RECOGNIZING THE OUTSTANDING WORK OF THE JEWISH COUNCIL FOR YOUTH SERVICES

HON. BRADLEY S. SCHNEIDER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a dedicated community servant and an outstanding community organization in the suburban Chicago district I represent. The Jewish Council for Youth Services (JCYS) will present Alyssa Knobel with the Director for Life Award at its 2014 Annual Gala.

Both Alyssa and JCYS embody a commitment to service and a dedication to enriching the lives of children that strengthens our community and lays a foundation for the future success of the next generation.

In the time I have known Alyssa, I have consistently been impressed with her energy, her enthusiasm and her passion for helping others. Her many activities are as diverse as they are inspirational, and her work with JCYS, in many roles, has helped boost the confidence and expand the imaginations of countless children.

JCYS is a tremendous organization that understands the fundamental principle that our generation's success will best be measured by the quality of opportunities we provide the next generation. Its steadfast commitment to educational, recreational and leadership development and activities offers many extraordinary opportunities for kids throughout our community.

I also would like to take this opportunity to welcome John Thomason as the new Executive Director of JCYS, and wish him only great success in his new role.

With people like Alyssa and John leading the way, I know JCYS will achieve great new heights and will continue its work inspiring and empowering generations of children for years to come.

STORM DAMAGE IN ARKANSAS, MISSISSIPPI, OKLAHOMA, KANSAS, TENNESSEE, AND ALABAMA

HON. ERIC A. "RICK" CRAWFORD

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I'm honored to be joined here by my colleagues from Arkansas, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Kansas, Tennessee, Alabama and the states that have been impacted by the devastating storms that occurred earlier this week. While we had hoped that the entire Mississippi and Arkansas delegations could join us, Representatives GREGG HARPER and ALAN NUNNELEE from Mississippi, and Representative TIM GRIFFIN from Arkansas, are back home today coordinating with the federal, state and local officials who are organizing disaster assistance efforts. Tomorrow Representative GRIFFIN will be touring the devastation in Arkansas' second district with Secretary Johnson from the Department of Homeland Security.

All these delegations have spent hours keeping close contact with one another and with officials in Arkansas, in particular regarding the tornado that ripped through Vilonia, Mayflower, El Paso and Perrin, leaving a path of destruction in central Arkansas and the same is true for the other affected states. The destruction we've witnessed is heartbreaking and our prayers go out to those affected by all these devastating storms, especially those who lost loved ones. All of us would like to thank the first responders, volunteers and neighboring communities for all their assistance, donations, prayers and tireless efforts during this difficult time. Their hard work and dedication has saved countless lives. We also urge those who can to continue to help in any way they can to assist in the recovery and rebuilding of neighborhoods and communities that were impacted by these storms.

We also honor and remember those we lost. Representative GRIFFIN asked that I share a story of one of his constituents, U.S. Air Force Master Sergeant Daniel Wassarn, who served as load master instructor with the 138th airlift wing at the Little Rock Air Force Base. The master sergeant lived in Vilonia, Arkansas with his wife, Suzanne, and his two young daughters. According to reports, Master Sergeant

Wassam sacrificed his own life to shield his 5-year-old daughter from falling debris. His example of selflessness and bravery during this disaster is one all Americans and Arkansans can admire.

I now ask for a moment of silent prayer to honor all the victims of those recent tragic events.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TIM MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 180, I was predisposed at this time. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

RECOGNIZING CHILDHOOD APRAXIA DAY

HON. MICHAEL F. DOYLE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, today marks the second annual Childhood Apraxia of Speech Day, during which we will raise national awareness about Childhood Apraxia of Speech, a particularly difficult, persistent, and severe speech and communication disorder in youngsters.

Today I want to recognize the Childhood Apraxia of Speech Association of North America (CASANA), whose mission is to strengthen the support systems in the lives of children with apraxia. CASANA offers information and support related to CAS on its website, www.apraxiakids.org.

Childhood Apraxia of Speech (CAS) causes children to have extreme difficulty planning and producing the precise, highly refined and specific series of movements of the tongue, lips, jaw, and palate that are necessary for the production of proper speech. It is among the most severe of speech and communication problems in children.

While the act of learning to speak comes effortlessly to most children, those with apraxia endure an incredible and lengthy struggle. Although not life threatening it is life altering as families are left to cope with the emotional, physical, and financial challenges of having a child diagnosed with CAS. Additionally, without appropriate intervention, children with CAS are at high risk for secondary impacts in literacy and other school-related skills.

We encourage states, insurance providers, and schools to recognize the critical need to provide adequate speech therapy and other services so that the impact of this disorder can be minimized and so that affected children can grow into productive, contributing adult citizens.

Every child should be afforded their best opportunity to develop speech. With early intervention and appropriate therapy, most children with CAS will learn to communicate with their very own voices. These children, as well as their families, deserve our highest respect for their effort, determination and resilience in the face of such obstacles.

Let's use Childhood Apraxia Day to raise awareness about CAS and support the goals of Better Hearing and Speech Month.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM MARINO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 180, I was not able to get to D.C. by the time votes were called due to a personal conflict. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

CONGRATULATING RONDOUT SCHOOL DISTRICT 72 ON ITS 150TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. BRADLEY S. SCHNEIDER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Rondout Elementary School in the suburban Chicago district I represent as it celebrates its sesquicentennial. For 150 years, Rondout School has educated children with a commitment to the Rondout Way: Respect, Responsibility, Honesty, Kindness.

Honoring these principles, Rondout School strives to focus its "collective professional expertise to deliver the highest quality instruction to our students and to measure their academic and social learning . . . one student at a time."

This is the Rondout School mission, and it is this mission that the talented, dedicated teachers, employees and administrators of District 72 carry out.

Good education is the foundation of all of our future success in the 21st Century, and all kids, regardless of zip code, deserve the opportunity to pursue an excellent education.

Outstanding schools like Rondout Elementary exemplify the character and vision that our educational system needs.

Whether it is in the classroom, during the summer, through social and emotional learning or at one of Rondout's extracurricular activities, students are engaged, stimulated and challenged in rewarding and enriching ways.

I am proud of Rondout Elementary School's commitment to excellence, and I am so pleased to congratulate Rondout School District 72 on 150 great years.

CELEBRATING DOROTHY "DOT" WIEKAMP'S 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. JACKIE WALORSKI

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize Mrs. Dorothy "Dot" Wiekamp, who reached the milestone of her 100th birthday on March 15, 2014. Mrs. Wiekamp is a truly remarkable woman who is known in our community as an outstanding volunteer, community leader, philanthropist, mother, and grandmother.

Dot met her late husband Darwin at Mishawaka High School and the two married in 1936, forming what many have called "the perfect team." Together the Wiekamps began a family, built a business, and created a legacy in our local community.

In 1945, the Wiekamps founded the Owners Discount Corporation in Elkhart, Indiana. The business serviced customers who were overlooked by other banks, specializing in small loans for cars and new businesses. After purchasing the West End State Bank of Mishawaka in 1966, Owners Discount continued to grow, changing its name several times, until finally becoming National City Bank.

The Wiekamp's business success gave way to their philanthropic efforts. The couple played an instrumental role in the building of Memorial Children's Hospital in South Bend and also generously gave their time and money to the construction of the Schwartz Wiekamp Medical Center in Mishawaka. These efforts continue to play a key role in ensuring that local children have access to quality healthcare.

In regards to higher education, the Wiekamps have contributed to numerous institutions and scholarships. The couple helped fund the main classroom building, Wiekamp Hall, at Indiana University—South Bend. They built the Wiekamp Athletic Facility at Bethel College and the Dorothy Wiekamp Demonstration Kitchen at Ivy Tech Community College. In addition, the couple provided funding for the Schwartz Tennis Center at Purdue University.

Mrs. Wiekamp was also instrumental in the construction of a new auditorium at the Northern Indiana Center for History, as well as the South Bend Center for the Homeless.

Throughout her life, Dot has been involved in numerous community organizations. She served on the board of trustees for the Northern Indiana Historical Society, as president of the Mishawaka Visiting Nurses Association, and is a founding member of the Mishawaka YMCA.

From philanthropic support to countless charities and educational institutions to leadership on the boards of our community's most important organizations, the Wiekamps have left a legacy in our local community. I am forever grateful for their service and dedication.

It is a privilege to recognize Dot Wiekamp, a woman whose admirable service and commitment to the local community is truly inspirational. On behalf of Indiana's Second District, I wish her a happy 100th birthday and many more to come.

WORKER'S MEMORIAL DAY

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, please join me in remembering the workers who have lost their lives on the job. It is an honor to join The Builders' Association and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) today in recognizing these men and women, alongside their colleagues and families.

At the turn of the 20th century, it is estimated that more than 100 American workers died on the job every day, with few laws in

place to protect them. Today, over 4,000 workers are killed on the job annually, and 3.3 million suffer a serious injury, leaving much work to be done to provide all workers a safe work environment.

In an effort to address this challenge, trade unions and workplace health and safety organizations world-wide have concentrated on the issue of workers' health and safety on April 28th of each year. Helping lead the charge is OSHA, who has worked to reduce workplace injuries and death for over forty years. In 2001, OSHA and The Builders' Association, through the Build Safe Partnership Program, developed cooperative partnerships designed to protect and promote the safety and health of construction workers in the Midwest. I would like to personally thank The Builders' Association/Kansas City Chapter, AGC and the Region 7 OSHA office for your continued efforts to keep worker safety a priority.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me in recognizing the local workers who lost their lives. We must never forget them, and we must respect their memory by continuing to work to improve standards for workplace health and safety.

RECOGNIZING THREE ILLINOISANS TRAGICALLY KILLED IN AFGHANISTAN

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my sorrow at the deaths of three Illinoisans, killed in an attack in Kabul, Afghanistan last week. The three—John Gabel, Gary Gabel, and Dr. Jerry Umanos—were shot at CURE International's Hospital, which provides critical medical care to the people of Afghanistan.

John Gabel, a visiting lecturer at Kabul University's information technology department, was shot along with his father, Gary Gabel. Both were from Palatine, Illinois and members of the Orchard Evangelical Church in Arlington Heights. Pastor Colin Smith of the church described John as a ''computer genius with a perfect mind'' who was living out his faith through his service in Afghanistan. Amy Dillman, who worked with John while he was at the National Center for Supercomputing Applications, said, ''I think John just had a calling and he could see where the work he was good at—the programming and the information technology—could be useful and of service to other areas and other parts of the world that really needed that infrastructure.''

Like his son, Gary Gabel was an active member of his church, working with youth groups and leadership teams. His wife, Teresa, was wounded in the attack but is recovering.

Dr. Jerry Umanos, a pediatrician who had practiced at the Lawndale Christian Health Center in Chicago, was serving at CURE's Hospital. Dr. Umanos was dedicated to providing essential medical care to Afghan children. According to his colleague Dr. Art Jones, ''. . . you can't count the number of children that Jerry's impacted, the lives he's saved on his own, and with the doctors he trained. That's who he was. He was driven by the kids.''

As we mourn the loss of John Gabel, Gary Gabel and Jerry Umanos, we also reflect on their dedication to working to improve the lives of others. I want to send my condolences to their families and friends.

RECOGNIZING THE WORK OF THE LATINO CHILDREN AND FAMILIES COUNCIL

HON. MARK POCAN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the tremendous work of the Latino Children and Families Council and their programs for the Latino community in Wisconsin's Second District.

The Latino Children and Families Council hosts El Día de los Niños, an annual event in Madison, Wisconsin for Latino children and their families. This event includes music, food and plenty of games and educational activities for youth to enjoy. Also featured are opportunities for parents to receive information about childcare, parenting and the resources available to them in our community. The day culminates with a parade of Latin American Nations which allows the children to showcase their talents and celebrate their heritage.

Through education and advocacy, the Council continually promotes the success and well-being of Latino children and families. The Council promotes strong partnerships between community organizations and works to ensure our schools provide quality education that is inclusive of all students and the unique backgrounds from which they come and the diverse languages that they speak. The Council also provides leadership, giving a strong voice to the concerns of the Latino community.

I am proud to celebrate Saturday, May 3, 2014 as ''El Día de los Niños.'' I thank the Latino Children and Families Council for their efforts to engage with and support the Latino community in Madison. This recognition is a most fitting honor of the important work that they do, not just today but throughout the year.

TO RECOGNIZE CENTRAL BUCKS SOUTH'S ICE HOCKEY TEAM

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 2013/2014 Central Bucks South High School ice hockey team who won the Pennsylvania double-A High School Ice Hockey Championship on March 22nd on the campus of Penn State University.

After wrapping up their regular season with a record of 14–3–1, the Titans entered the 2014 Flyers Cup tournament as the second seed. After emerging as the champions from the eastern side of the state, they'd go on to beat western Pennsylvania's Bishop Canevin High School by a score of 5–2 for the state title.

The players, coaches and managers involved with this year's team should be extremely proud—not only of their accomplishment on the ice, but also of the pride they've brought to their school and area.

Legendary Philadelphia Flyers coach Fred Shero once said, ''Success is not the result of spontaneous combustion. You must first set yourself on fire.''

Hockey, like life, requires hard work and dedication in order to succeed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 187 on Final Passage of H.R. 4486, the Fiscal Year 2015 Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act, I am not recorded because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for votes on Monday, April 28, 2014.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall vote 178, and ''yea'' on rollcall vote 179.

I was also absent for the following votes on Wednesday, April 30, 2014 and May 1, 2014 to participate in immigration events. Had I been present, I would have voted ''nay'' on rollcall vote 184, ''yea'' on rollcall vote 185, ''yea'' on rollcall vote 186, and ''yea'' on rollcall vote 187 in support of final passage of the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act.

On May 1, 2014, I would like the record to show that had I been present, I would have voted, ''nay'' on rollcall vote 188, ''nay'' on rollcall vote 189, ''nay'' on rollcall vote 190, ''nay'' on rollcall vote 191, and ''yea'' on rollcall vote 192. Finally, had I been present I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall vote 193 in support of final passage of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act.

HONORING BROOKE JACKSON

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Brooke Jackson. Brooke is a very special young woman who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Venturing Crew 2883, and earning a most prestigious recognition, the Venturing Silver Award.

Brooke has been very active with her troop, participating in many activities. Over the years Brooke has been involved with scouting, she

has not only earned numerous awards, but also the respect of her family, peers, and community. The Venturing Silver Award is the equivalent of obtaining an Eagle Scout and recognizes the high level of achievement Brooke has accomplished through the Venturing program.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Brooke Jackson for her accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for her efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of the Silver Award.

OLDER AMERICANS MONTH

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Older Americans Month. Each May, we celebrate the contributions and sacrifices that the older members of our communities have made to our nation.

The theme for this year's Older Americans Month is "Safe Today, Healthy Tomorrow." We must encourage older adults to protect themselves from injury and remain active. Unfortunately, unintended injuries to our population of older Americans result in 6 million medically treated injuries and more than 30,000 deaths each year.

We must emphasize safety in public and private settings. Falls are a leading cause of injury and subsequent hospitalization for older Americans. In order to keep the older population in our country contributing to society, we must ensure their health and safety.

Older Americans Month lets us celebrate the achievements of our parents, grandparents, friends, and neighbors. Seniors across the country deserve our recognition because they have built our strong foundation.

Please join me in celebrating Older Americans Month during May. Our seniors, a continuously growing number of Americans, deserve our recognition and our care.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TIM MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 181, I was predisposed at this time.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM MARINO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 182, I was unable to return in time for votes due to a personal conflict.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

HONORING THE SERVICE OF REPRESENTATIVE MICHAEL CAREY

HON. MICHAEL H. MICHAUD

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service of Representative Michael Carey.

A native of Leeds, Maine and graduate of Dartmouth College, Michael Carey has served the State of Maine through four terms in the Maine House of Representatives as well as through his membership on the board of several community organizations and local businesses.

Representative Carey currently serves on the Joint Standing Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs Committee and as Chair of the House Committee on Elections. He has also served on the Veterans and Legal Affairs Committee, Transportation Committee, as well as the special committees on Regulatory Fairness and Reform and Maine's Energy Future during his time in the Maine Legislature.

Representative Carey's long list of legislative achievements includes playing an instrumental role in the development and passage of the state's biennial and supplemental budgets. He has also sponsored successful legislation to strengthen penalties for violations of election laws, improve the Freedom of Access Act, preserve Code Enforcement Officer Training and Certification, improve lobbyist disclosure policies, help non-profit organizations take part in the legislative process and assist local towns in providing tax relief to residents.

In addition to his legislative accomplishments, Representative Carey has served Maine through his membership on the board of several local organizations and businesses, including Community Concepts, AVESTA Housing and Androscoggin County Habitat for Humanity.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in thanking Representative Michael Carey for his service to the state of Maine and in wishing him the best in his future endeavors.

HONORING ALEXANDER MEYER BLACKBURN

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Alexander Meyer Blackburn. Alexander is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 1393, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Alexander has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Alexander has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Alexander has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Alexander built a fire pit for Heartland Presbyterian Center, a conference and retreat facility in Parkville, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Alexander Meyer Blackburn for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

HONORING 16 PALM BEACH COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS WHO PLAN TO ENLIST INTO THE MILITARY AFTER GRADUATION

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of 16 high school seniors from Palm Beach County who plan to enlist into the military after graduation this spring. Their maturity and courage are a testament to their dedication to our country, and they rightfully deserve our recognition and admiration.

I am proud to represent a district that is home to such a large number of men and women in the military, veterans, and their families. I feel tremendous gratitude to those who fought in World War II, Korea, and Vietnam, and to a new generation of heroes from the Gulf War, Iraq, and Afghanistan. My father, Bernard Deutch, volunteered to fight in World War II as a teenager where he earned a Purple Heart at the Battle of the Bulge. It was his example of service to our nation that motivated me to serve in Congress.

Congratulations to Christopher Barnikel, Arturo Ipina Jr., Jose Pascual Tomas, Justin Grad, Adam Pendleton, Jason Marlin, Charles Green, Alexander Costello, Marc Velazquez, Sumer Boardman, Mauricio Alvarez, Trystan Anderson, Aprilday Lytal, Samuel Steinhouse, Elyzae Reina, and Shereek Powell for their service.

HONORING MICHAEL KAISER, PRESIDENT OF THE JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, for nearly 15 years, Michael Kaiser has served excellently as President of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in our nation's capital. Throughout his distinguished career, Michael's talents and devotion to the arts have helped establish the Kennedy Center as one of the nation's premiere performance venues, a destination for artistic talent and a bustling hub of creativity. This weekend, the Kennedy Center community will gather to pay tribute to Michael's outstanding leadership as he steps down from his post later this year.

Since he took the helm in 2001, Michael Kaiser has enthusiastically and passionately embraced the mission of the Kennedy Center, always maintaining, as President Kennedy once said, that "The life of the arts . . . is close to the center of a nation's purpose—and is a test to the quality of a nation's civilization."

Under Michael's leadership, the Kennedy Center has featured voices and visions across the disciplines of the performing arts. He has produced wonderful theatrical works that received national acclaim—some of which have garnered Tony Award nominations when they appeared on Broadway. He has presented multiple international festivals that showcased arts from around the world and established the Center as a model for cultural diplomacy. He has hosted every major national and international dance company. Most recently, he oversaw the Center's merger with the Washington National Opera, ensuring that our nation's capital will continue to experience the wonders of the opera.

Michael has embarked on an extensive effort to train arts managers across the country and throughout the world. Acknowledging that great art demands great managers, he conceived a program to bring the next generation of arts leaders together to learn best practices for directing cultural institutions, small and large. He launched a program called "Arts in Crisis" to provide free consultation to arts managers across the country. As part of this effort, he traveled to all 50 states, Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia to lead arts management symposia.

Michael has a unique vision that advances both artistic expression and cultural diplomacy—the power of the arts to connect peoples, communities, and nations. He has dedicated himself to enriching artistic expression and disseminating it in a way that builds bridges across borders and fosters international good will.

Michael's intellect, enthusiasm, and passion helped the Kennedy Center grow and thrive. We thank him for his years of leadership and wish him the best in the years to come.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 186, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

IN MEMORY OF HARRY HARMAN

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Midlands of South Carolina recognized a life of service to fellow citizens by Lexington County Coroner Harry O. Harman who was one of South Carolina's first Republican county public officials of the Twentieth Century.

The following obituary was published April 24, 2014, in the Lexington County Chronicle & The Dispatch News:

HARRY O. HARMAN, JR.

Funeral services for Harry O. Harman, Jr., 79, will be held at 1:30 p.m. on Tuesday, April 22, 2014, at St. Stephen's Evangelical Lutheran Church with Rev. Dr. Patrick W. Riddle and Rev. Dr. Dennis R. Bolton officiating. A reception will be held in the social hall immediately after the service. Private burial will follow in the church cemetery. The family will receive friends from 5:00 p.m. until 7:00 p.m. on Monday, April 21, at Caughman-Harman Funeral Home, Lexington Chapel. Honorary pallbearers are the staffs of Caughman-Harman Funeral Home, Lexington County Coroner's Office led by Chief Deputy Coroner Randy A. Martin, and Lexington Medical Center Pathology; the SC Funeral Directors' and SC Coroners' Associations; and Congressman Joe Wilson, Sheriff James R. Metts, Solicitor Donald V. Myers, Judge Knox McMahon, Jake Knotts, Mickey Lindler, and Lyman Whitehead.

Pallbearers are Josef E. Clark, Trevor P. Crocker, Alexander Harman, T. Brett Harman, George P.W. Harmon, Dr. R.B. Harmon II, Samuel H. Hendrix, Lester B. Hite, Joe Wayne Rauch, Walter "Sonny" Sanders, Franklin B. Waites, and Coroner Gary Watts.

Mr. Harman passed away on Friday, April 18, 2014. A native of Lexington, SC, Mr. Harman was born on March 30, 1935, and was the son of the late Sarah Clark Harman and Dr. H. Odelle Harman. He was predeceased by brother, Arthur C. Harman.

Mr. Harman graduated from Lexington High School, attended Newberry College, and was a graduate of Cincinnati College of Mortuary Science. In 1961 he started a successful business, Harman Funeral Home, which became Caughman-Harman Funeral Home in 1966 when he formed a partnership with the late Stephen Hampton Caughman. He spent more than 50 years counseling bereaved families.

Mr. Harman was first elected Coroner of Lexington County in 1976. He was instrumental in developing a countywide disaster plan and disaster-response team, 24-hour pathologist availability, and employing educated individuals to meet the demands of changing technology. He sought to establish strong working relationships with all law enforcement, EMS, fire services, physicians, pathologists, and nurses. He also helped obtain burial plots and grave markers to ensure dignified burials for indigent citizens of Lexington County.

Mr. Harman was a lifelong member of St. Stephen's Lutheran Church and longtime member of the Lexington County Chamber of Commerce, Lions' Club, Jaycees, and SC Coroners' and SC Law Enforcement Associations. He was a past member of the Lowman Home Board of Directors, as well as many other civic groups, and past president of the SC Funeral Directors' Association.

A man of many accomplishments, Mr. Harman was, most importantly, a servant. He took great pride and care in serving the people of his beloved Lexington County. With a strong sense of compassion and respect, he wanted to help families at times of crisis and sadness. This desire began with his work as a funeral director and continued with his service as Coroner. The people of Lexington County elected him as Coroner ten times, an honor he accepted with much gratitude and humility.

While Mr. Harman's service touched many lives, he was always, first of all, a dedicated son, brother, father, and grandfather who loved his family, especially his daughters and grandchildren, selflessly and unconditionally. His extraordinary sense of humor, unfailing empathy, understanding, and devotion will always be treasured and remembered by his family and friends. Mr. Harman is survived by his daughters, Sally H. Plowden (Russell) and Charlotte H. Stormer (Chris), both of Columbia; his sister, Elizabeth H. Caddell and brother Paul E. Harman (Gale) of Lexington; six grandchildren, Sarah Caroline Plowden, William Christian Stormer, Samuel Harman Stormer, Grace Zimmerman Plowden, Sarah McIver Stormer, and Anne Brailsford Plowden; many nieces and nephews; his loyal business partner and devoted mother of his two daughters and grandmother of his six grandchildren, Daisy Wilson Harman; and his special friend, Sandra Rauch White.

The Family wishes to extend a special thank you to the staffs of Lexington Medical Center, LMC Extended Care, and DayBreak; Doctors Michael Roberts, Christopher Marshall, and Richard Murray; and dear friends Bernice Gibson and Lettie Winston.

Memorials may be made to St. Stephen's Evangelical Lutheran Church, 119 N. Church St., Lexington, SC 29072; Heathwood Hall Episcopal School, 3000 S. Beltline Blvd., Columbia, SC 29201; or a Hospice group of one's choice.

HONORING BRAEDYN HAUSDORF

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Braedyn Hausdorf. Braedyn is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 174, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Braedyn has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Braedyn has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Braedyn has led his troop as the Senior Patrol Leader and become a member of the Order of the Arrow. Braedyn has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Braedyn coordinated and constructed a quarter-mile walking trail within a park in Canton, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Braedyn Hausdorf for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

IN RECOGNITION OF MARY FLORES, LUPE F. FLORES AND OUR LADY OF LORETO CHAPEL

HON. FILEMON VELA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mary Flores and Lupe F. Flores and their contribution to Our Lady of Loreto Chapel in Goliad, Texas.

The beautiful chapel has been in continuous use since the 1700s and is one of the oldest churches in Texas.

In 1946, Corpus Christi artist Antonio Garcia, who was known as the Michelangelo of South Texas, was commissioned to paint a fresco behind the chapel's altar. Mary Flores and Lupe F. Flores, both in high school at the time, posed for the artist during multiple sessions after school. Their likenesses were used to depict the annunciation scene from the Bible where the Angel Gabriel visits the Virgin Mary and explains that she will become the mother of Jesus.

The stunning fresco, which Mary Flores and Lupe Flores helped to create, is uniquely Texan and includes a cactus and rattlesnake in the background.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to honor Mary Flores, Lupe F. Flores and their contribution to Our Lady of Loreto Chapel. I appreciate you and the House of Representatives joining me in recognizing the beauty and history of Our Lady of Loreto Chapel and Goliad, Texas.

UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES ENLISTEES FROM FLORIDA'S 22ND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor seventy-five high school seniors in Florida's 22nd District who have decided to enlist in the United States Armed Forces.

Of these seventy-five, twenty-two have joined the Army; their names are Daryl Flowers, Stanly Ramirez, Jonathan Belman-Otero, Wilfredo Colon, Jeanette Cox, Dalenjie Jeanty, Cory Chobot, Kendall Gonsalves, Jamile Hill, Devon Petchner, Gage Morgan, Mario Valenzuela, Jr., Vanessa Sheika, Jackenson Toussaint, Jeffrey Edano, Krista Ramirez, Julianna Guerra, Caylah Murray, Kamyra Johnson, Daniel Castillo-Hernandez, Matthew Smith-Mullaly, Matthew Woods. Thirty-three have joined the Marines; their names are Kevin Cobty, Andres Cifuentes, Jimmy Octave, Frank Barker, Timothy Murray, Nicholas Nixon, Emilio Perez, Devonta Battles, Rock Joseph, Artem Solomakin, Arnulfo Vasquez, Gabriel Figueredo, Brian Sauls, Thales Rodrigues, Richard Lemus, Manuel Gonzalez, Bailey Ochoa, Collin Murphy, Julian Sosa, Leandra Sinclair, John Newkirk, Alexander Averhart, Bryant Mercely, Jace Bowes, Eric Morzella, Dylan Pierre Louis, Emmanuel Rivera, Argelis Hernandez, Jacob Quickel, Victor Stremel, Christian Pontier, Jonathan Vallejo, Devon McCarthy, Jr. Three have joined the National Guard; their names are Jimmy Lopez, Shalena Higgins, Kenneth Talvo. Fifteen have joined the Navy; their names are Jason Bagnall, Bobby Thomas, Raymond Brooks, Alec Johnston, Max Joseph, Xavier Owens, Christian Peraza, Ariah Pickering, Victoria Umpierrez, Christina Coder, Christopher Gibb, Jose Lopez, Charles Tookes, Maria Valdes, and Nehemie Jean-Charles. Two have joined the Air Force; their names are Gabrielle Etheradge and Aubrey Amorer.

It is in thanks to the dedication of patriots like these that we are able to meet here today, in the United States House of Representatives, and openly debate the best solutions to the diverse issues that confront our country. On behalf of myself and all of my constituents in Florida's Twenty-Second District, thank you for your service and best of luck as you pursue this challenging endeavor.

ON THE OCCASION OF COACH ALBERT FRACASSA'S RETIREMENT AS HEAD FOOTBALL COACH FROM BROTHER RICE HIGH SCHOOL IN BIRMINGHAM, MICHIGAN

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Al Fracassa as his family and the Greater Detroit community celebrate his retirement as Head Coach of the Brother Rice Warriors football team in Birmingham, Michigan. Capping off a 57 year career in football coaching, Coach Fracassa leaves the field as the winningest high school football coach in the State of Michigan's history having compiled 430 victories.

Long before his days as coach, Fracassa played football in high school and college—where he earned All State honors at Detroit's Northeastern High School and later joined the Michigan State University Spartans. At Michigan State, he was part of the school's dominance in colligate football during the early 1950s. While playing with the Spartans, Coach Fracassa was part of a team that won the National Championship in 1952 and played in the Rose Bowl in 1954. During his senior year, Coach Fracassa was honored with the highly coveted Fred Danziger Award. Praised by his teammates for his contributions both on and off the field, they describe Coach Fracassa as a dedicated athlete whose leadership inspired the best in his teammates—qualities that would continue to inspire while he worked the sidelines as a coach.

After his graduation from Michigan State, Coach Fracassa joined the coaching staff at Royal Oak's Shrine High School and became head coach several years later. In 1969, he went on to become head coach at Brother Rice High School in Birmingham, where he has served for 45 years and built a dynasty of dominance in Michigan high school football.

In football, so many important metrics of performance are measured by statistics, numbers which tell an incredible story of success for the Warriors under the direction of Coach Fracassa. With nine Michigan High School Athletic Association Championships—including three in the last three years, 16 Catholic League Championships, four teams that have been ranked national by USA Today and 430 victories over his career, Coach Fracassa has built an incredible program at Brother Rice. He is the recipient of many awards throughout his career, including the 2013 Coach of the Year Award by USA Today.

However, statistics do not tell the entire story of Coach Fracassa's success—the inspiration he instills in his players through his leadership and dedication to overall well-being. A constant throughout his career, Coach Fracassa is praised by his players for his inventiveness in play calling, his support of their development both on and off the field, and his genuine love for the sport of football. And as a testament to the long-term impact of his coaching, many of his players have gone on to excel in college and the National Football League.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize Coach Al Fracassa for the incredible impact he has made on the Greater Detroit community and the State of Michigan. For 57 years, he has demonstrated leadership and dedication that have truly inspired his players to reach for their maximum potential. Coach Fracassa leaves an incredible legacy at Brother Rice—45 years of success and hundreds of students who he has helped develop both in personal character and in skill on the football field. I know his leadership on the field will be greatly missed and I wish Coach Fracassa and his wife, Phyllis, the very best as they embark upon a new chapter in their lives.

CONGRATULATING WEYERHAEUSER COMPANY FOR BEING RECOGNIZED AS ONE OF THE 100 BEST CORPORATE CITIZENS

HON. G.K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Weyerhaeuser Company on being recognized as one of best corporate citizens in the nation. Weyerhaeuser ranked sixth on Corporate Responsibility Magazine's 100 Best Corporate Citizens 2014 list.

Since 1957, Weyerhaeuser has been an important part of communities throughout eastern North Carolina. Weyerhaeuser employs 1,051 North Carolinians and helps sustain families and businesses in rural communities across the state. More than 545,000 acres of land in North Carolina is owned or leased by Weyerhaeuser. The company's Softwood Lumber Mill in Plymouth and the Carolina Timberlands and GHW Operations Center in Washington are essential economic drivers for North Carolina's First Congressional District.

North Carolinians benefit from Weyerhaeuser's presence in our state. The company is an important economic contributor through job creation and business development, but importantly serves as an environmental steward and engages in philanthropy throughout the state. Over the last six years Weyerhaeuser has donated more than $2.5 million to philanthropic causes in North Carolina communities. Nationally, Weyerhaeuser and its employees have donated more than $215 million since 1903 to support education and youth development, affordable housing and shelter, human services, civic and cultural growth, and environmental stewardship.

Corporate Responsibility Magazine's 100 Best Corporate Citizens 2014 list evaluates companies based on climate change, employee relations, environment, finance, governance, human rights, and philanthropy. I am proud to represent Weyerhaeuser and am grateful for their extraordinary efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in applauding the outstanding efforts of Weyerhaeuser employees in North Carolina and across the country.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4486, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4487, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 2014

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on the Rule for H.R. 4486, the ''Military Construction and Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2015,'' which supports our military and their families and provides the benefits and medical care that our veterans have earned for their service.

H.R. 4486 provides the facilities and infrastructure needed to house, train, and equip our military personnel to defend this Nation, both in the United States and abroad, provides the housing and military community infrastructure that supports a good quality of life for them and their families, and allows the military to maintain an efficient and effective base structure.

The bill also funds programs to ensure that all veterans receive the benefits and medical care that they have earned as a result of their sacrifices in the service to our Nation.

Just as our military pledges to leave no one behind on the battlefield, Democrats in Congress have pledged to leave no veteran behind when they come home.

The bill provides a total of $165 billion in FY 2015 to fund military construction projects and programs of the Veterans Affairs Department, an increase of $7 billion (4%) over current funding levels. This total includes $93.5 billion in mandatory spending for VA benefits and $71.5 billion in discretionary funding.

The bill provides a total of $64.7 billion in discretionary funding for the VA in FY 2015, a 2% increase over current funding and I am pleased that it increases mandatory funding for veterans' compensation and benefits by almost 10 percent.

Mr. Speaker, although there is much in this bill that I support, I wish to note two major concerns.

First, I disagree with the funding level for VA Medical Care in the bill, which is $368 million below the President's request and the amount I support. This underfunding for VA Medical Care could delay the timely delivery of health care services to veterans and impede our efforts to end veterans' homelessness in 2015.

Second, the bill provides $50 million less than the President's request for Information Technology operations and maintenance programs. The result is likely to be a delay in making the necessary improvements to technology infrastructure that ensure continuity of operations for services that support all of VA's services and benefit delivery.

Third, I do not support section 411 of the bill, which would prohibit the use of funds to construct, renovate, or expand any facility in the United States to house individuals held in the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay. I do not support this rider because it unduly constrains the flexibility that the our Armed Forces and counterterrorism professionals need to best protect U.S. national security.

Mr. Speaker, the VA serves nearly 48.5 million people: 22 million veterans and 26.5 million family members of living veterans or survivors of deceased veterans, so in in my remaining time let me highlight some of the positive aspects of the bill:

$1.2 billion for family and military personnel housing—equal to the administration's request;

The bill contains an advance appropriation for FY 2016 of $58.7 billion, continuing the trend started in the Democratic-led 111th Congress of providing advance appropriations to the VA for the medical services, medical support and compliance, and medical facilities accounts.

This is a significant benefit to the veterans served by the VA at the 152 hospitals, 107 domiciliary residential rehabilitation treatment programs, 133 nursing homes, 300 Vet Centers, 70 mobile Vet Centers and 821 outpatient clinics, which include independent, satellite, community-based and rural outreach clinics.

$589 million is provided for for medical, rehabilitative, health services and prosthetic research—$3.3 million above current levels and recommends that a proportionate amount of funding for prosthetics should be focused on prosthetics for females, who outnumber male amputees by 3 percent.

In addition to veterans medical benefits, the bill provides $93.7 billion, an increase of $8.84 billion, in mandatory funding for other veterans benefits—primarily veterans compensation and pensions, and readjustment benefits.

$78.7 billion for veterans service-connected compensation benefits and pensions, an increase of $7.2 billion (10%) over current funding levels.

These funds are used for service-connected compensation payments to an estimated 4.6 million veterans, survivors and dependents and pension payments to 519,000 veterans and survivors.

$14.8 billion for veterans readjustment benefits, an increase of $1.6 billion (12%) over current funding levels. These funds include education and training assistance to veterans and service personnel; vocational rehabilitation; special housing and transportation grants to certain disabled veterans; and educational assistance to eligible dependents of deceased and seriously disabled veterans, as well as dependents of servicemembers who were captured or are missing in action.

This is not a perfect bill but this piece of legislations addresses the most critical needs of our service members, military families, and veterans.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE EDELSTEIN FAMILY

HON. FILEMON VELA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Edelstein family and their contributions to the Brownsville community.

In 1906, Lithuanian Immigrant Morris Edelstein opened Edelstein's Best Furniture store in Brownsville, Texas. By the 1930s, Mr. Edelstein had expanded his furniture business to include 12 stores throughout the Rio Grande Valley. In the 1940s, Morris Edelstein's sons, Ruben and Ben, took over the family furniture business. Together, they operated the chain of stores for more than 60 years and would grow the company to employ 260 people.

Morris Edelstein taught his children the importance of giving back to the Brownsville community. Ruben started the first United Way in Brownsville, served as mayor of Brownsville, and was the first director of the Brownsville Public Utilities Board. Additionally, he worked with Washington policymakers to secure funds to build the Brownsville Community Health Center.

In 2008, the Edelstein family sold its 12 Edelstein's stores but retained two Designer's Showroom stores, managed by Ruben Edelstein's daughter, Julie Edelstein-Best. This summer, Ms. Edelstein-Best will be closing the two remaining stores due to changing market conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to honor the Edelstein family and their commitment to Brownsville for more than 100 years.

CONGRATULATING THE HONOREES OF THE MAINE SPORTS HALL OF FAME'S 39TH ANNUAL INDUCTION BANQUET AND SCHOLAR-ATHLETE AWARDS CEREMONY

HON. MICHAEL H. MICHAUD

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the honorees of the Maine Sports Hall of Fame's Annual Induction Banquet and Scholar-Athlete Awards Ceremony.

This Sunday, the Maine Sports Hall of Fame will honor Maine athletes and sports figures who have exemplified a tireless commitment to their sport and to their community. Recognition awards and scholarships also will be presented to five of Maine's outstanding high school scholar-athletes. Each of the honorees have distinguished themselves on and off the field and are most deserving of this recognition.

This year's inductees to the Maine Sports Hall of Fame are: Julia Faith Dawson Clukey, Augusta; Jack W. Cosgrove, Bangor; Joseph L. Ferris, Brewer; Edward J. Flaherty, Portland; William (Bill) Green, Cumberland; Eleanor D. Logan, Boothbay Harbor; George J. Mitchell, New York City; Steven M. Pound, Greenville; and Abigail L. (Abby) Spector, Waterville.

This year's scholar-athlete honorees are: Carsyn Koch, Washburn District High School; Ian Lee, Madawaska High School; Alexandra Logan, Cheverus High School, Portland; Mikayla Turner, Messalonskee High School, Oakland; and Rayne Whitten, Massabesic High School, Waterboro.

The President's Award is presented to ''an individual who has bettered sports and athletics and has become a leader at state and national levels.'' This year's recipient is William E. Haggett of West Bath.

Each of these honorees is among the best that Maine has to offer. Through their leadership and their incredible commitment to their

sport, to their communities, and to our state, Maine is a better place in which to live.

Mr. Speaker, please join me again in congratulating each of the award recipients on their outstanding achievements and service.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TIM MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 183, I was predisposed at this time.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM MARINO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 184, I was unable to make votes due to a personal conflict.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

CELEBRATING THE CENTENNIAL OF THE BOROUGH OF WOODLAND PARK

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Borough of Woodland Park, located in Passaic County, New Jersey, as it celebrates its 100th Anniversary.

The Borough of Woodland Park was created on May 1, 1914. The area which now encompasses the Borough began as a section of the Township of Little Falls, called ''West Park.'' In 1905, the residents of West Park, concerned that they were not being fairly represented within the township initiated a fight to create their own Borough.

On January 7, 1913, the organization proposed the establishment of the ''Borough of West Paterson.'' The proposed name of the new town was chosen in recognition of its location next to the City of Paterson, America's first industrial center and the birthplace of the American silk industry.

Little more than a year later, on March 25, 1914, New Jersey State Senator Peter J. McGinnis' bill, ''An Act to Incorporate the Borough of West Paterson,'' received final approval by Governor James F. Fielder. On May 1, 1914, a referendum was held, and the voters overwhelmingly approved the creation of the new Borough, by a vote of 194 to 20. Twenty four days later, the town elected its first Mayor, Councilmen, Tax Collector, Constables, and two Justices of the Peace.

In its early years, West Paterson's major economic activity was agriculture. The rich, verdant farm lands produced an abundance of dairy products, fruits, and vegetables. The neighboring City of Paterson, which was home to numerous wealthy silk manufacturers, began to see many of its most prominent citizens move to West Paterson to take advantage of its bucolic, small town atmosphere.

The presence of the Passaic River, which is a major natural resource for the region, helped attract many hotels, ball fields, amusement parks, and a racetrack to its banks in West Paterson. At the time, one of the leading amusement parks of the town was Idlewood Park. Other amusement parks also located themselves on Garrett Mountain, on the east side of the Borough, where the Garret Mountain Reservation is today.

As the Borough grew, the population continuously rose. In 1920, the population was 1,858. By 1950, it had jumped to 3,931, and more than doubled over the following decade, to 7,602 by 1960. As of 2010, the Borough's population had grown to 11,819.

As the Borough grew, the township's necessary municipal services did as well. Many of these services were and are made possible due to residents volunteering to carry them out. Woodland Park has a long history of active volunteer commitment to the community, reflecting the value that its citizens place on their town and their desire to continue to make it a great place in which to live and work. Over the past several decades, many townhouse and condominium units were built to accommodate the influx of people wishing to make this desirable community their home.

In 2008, the Borough of West Paterson changed its name to the Borough of Woodland Park. Supporters had been attempting to change the town's name for 20 years, and were successful during the General Election of November 4, 2008. On December 17, 2008, the governing body approved Resolution R08-253, making the town's official name the Borough of Woodland Park, effective January 1, 2009.

Today, the Borough consists of a mixture of retail, office, residential, and industrial properties. A significant portion of the Borough consists of municipal parkland, county parks, and two reservoirs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Borough of Woodland Park as it celebrates its 100th Anniversary.

SANDY AND MARCIA COHEN

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Sandy and Marcia Cohen, who are being honored at the 2014 Susquehanna Tzedakah Society Dinner for their selfless dedication to the Harrisburg, Pennsylvania Jewish community.

Mr. and Mrs. Cohen, both Harrisburg natives, are well known throughout our community for their selfless devotion to Jewish philanthropies and activities. Mr. Cohen, CEO of Cohen Produce Marketing, and Mrs. Cohen, a pharmacist at Holy Spirit Hospital, each credit their parents for instilling a strong sense of devotion to helping the Jewish community in any way possible. In their many years of service, the Cohens have always accepted requests for their assistance and in doing so have set a high standard of excellence for others to emulate. Not unmindful of providing for future generations, the Cohens made sure to encourage a strong dedication to tzedakah in their four children, no doubt ensuring their legacy will inspire and benefit many members of the community for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, tonight as the Harrisburg community honors the Cohens at the 2014 Susquehanna Tzedakah Society Dinner, I join in commending them for their outstanding commitment to bettering the Jewish community and thank them and their family for their selfless dedication.

IN RECOGNITION OF KATHRYN STONER O'CONNOR

HON. FILEMON VELA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Kathryn Stoner O'Connor and her commitment to historical preservation.

Mrs. O'Connor was born on February 11, 1883, on her family's ranch in Victoria County, Texas. In 1905, she married Thomas O'Connor, a prominent rancher in South Texas.

In 1963, Mrs. O'Connor donated approximately $1 million to restore the Presidio La Bahía in Goliad, Texas. The Presidio, which lies along the San Antonio River, was constructed in 1749 by the Spanish army.

During the Texas Revolution, the fort came under siege by a group of Texans lead by Colonel James Fannin. Following the Battle of the Alamo, General Sam Houston ordered Colonel Fannin to abandon the fort. However, Fannin and the more than 300 soldiers under his control were met by the Mexican army and subsequently surrendered, believing they would not be harmed. Fannin and his men were imprisoned at La Bahía. On Palm Sunday, March 27, 1836, Colonel Fannin and more than 300 soldiers were executed in what has become known as the Goliad Massacre.

By the early 1900s, the fort had fallen into disrepair. Thanks to Mrs. O'Connor's generosity, the fort was rebuilt to its 1836 appearance based on archeological evidence. In 1967, Presidio La Bahía was designated a National Historic Landmark.

Today, thanks to Mrs. O'Connor's generous donation, Presidio La Bahía is one the best examples of a Spanish ecclesiastical building in North America and hosts an annual living history event, which includes battle reenactments.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to honor Mrs. O'Connor. I appreciate you joining me in recognizing Mrs. O'Connor's generosity, which preserved the Presidio La Bahía in Goliad, Texas for future generations.

IN HONOR OF VELVET ICE CREAM AND THE ENTIRE DAGER FAMILY

HON. PATRICK J. TIBERI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to congratulate Velvet Ice Cream in Utica, Ohio upon its 100th anniversary.

In a quintessential American story, 15-year-old Joseph Dager came to America from Lebanon in 1903 without knowing a word of English. Eleven years later he started his ice cream business in the basement of a local confectionary. His hand-cranked ice cream batches set his family and Central Ohio on a path that would make Velvet Ice Cream and Central Ohio famous.

Although they no longer hand-crank ice cream in a basement, the company strives to maintain its connection to those by-gone years. In homage to Velvet's adherence to old time values and tradition, Velvet is now housed in a refurbished grist mill from the 1800s. The "Ye Olde Mill" now manufactures ice cream, plays host to thousands of visitors and marks the center of activity during each annual Utica Sertoma Ice Cream Festival.

Thousands stream into Utica each year for the festival. Having attended many myself, I know the joy locals and outsiders alike find in a bowl of good, old-fashioned ice cream. In a way, the festival commemorates the simple beginnings of a business started by an immigrant named Joseph Dager. Like so many other enterprises, Velvet Ice Cream started humbly but grew into a Central Ohio institution. America is richer for Velvet's founder's contributions to our country and Central Ohioans are grateful he chose to settle here.

As the fourth generation of the Dager family carries Joseph Dager's legacy into its 2nd century, Central Ohio proudly celebrates one man's vision, hard work and sweet legacy.

HONORING DANIEL PUGH

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Daniel Pugh. Danny is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 177, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Danny has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Danny has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Danny has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Danny cleaned and cleared a city lot near the town square in Bowling Green, Missouri, that had been abandoned for a decade.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Daniel Pugh for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

IN RECOGNITION OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL MICHAEL FERRITER

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Lieutenant General Michael Ferriter, Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management and Commanding General, Installation Management Command, for his distinguished service to the United States of America. Lieutenant General Ferriter will be retiring from the United States Army after nearly 35 years of service. He will be honored at a retirement ceremony on Friday, May 2, 2014 at 10:00 a.m. at McGinnis-Wickham Hall at Fort Benning, Georgia.

LTG Ferriter graduated from The Citadel in Charleston, South Carolina in May 1979, and was commissioned in the Infantry as a Second Lieutenant. After the Infantry Officer Basic Course, his first troop assignment was Platoon Leader, 2nd Battalion, 16th Infantry, Fort Riley, Kansas. From there, he successfully completed numerous command and staff assignments at Fort Wainwright, Alaska; Fort Lewis, Washington; Fort Benning, Georgia; and Fort Bragg, North Carolina.

LTG Ferriter's first Joint Staff assignment was as Deputy Director for Operations and Plans before he became Executive Assistant to the Commander of the United States Joint Forces Command. In June 2004, he was called to duty as Assistant Division Commander of Operations of the 82d Airborne Division at Fort Bragg, North Carolina. He completed a combat tour in Operation Restore Hope in Somalia with the 3rd Battalion, 75th Ranger Regiment; two tours in Iraq as Deputy Commanding General (Operations), Multi-National Corps, Iraq; and one tour as Deputy Commanding General (Advising and Training), United States Forces—Iraq.

The Second Congressional District of Georgia gained a respected and compassionate leader when LTG Ferriter was appointed Commanding General of the United States Army Infantry Center and the Maneuver Center of Excellence at Fort Benning. He became a close friend and confidant as he served in my district and when he was appointed Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management and Commanding General, Installation Management Command, he demonstrated tremendous support for the Congressional Military Family Caucus, which I co-chair with Congresswoman Cathy McMorris Rodgers (R–WA). LTG Ferriter and Mrs. Ferriter graciously participated in the CMFC's annual Military Family Summit held at Fort Benning in 2012, demonstrating strong support for our nation's military families.

LTG Ferriter's service to his country is but a small testament of the high caliber of character that he embodies. As the head of a family heavily involved in the military, he recognizes the challenges that face service members, veterans and military families across the nation. Throughout his tenure, he has worked tirelessly to find and implement solutions to these challenges.

LTG Ferriter has certainly excelled in all areas of life, but none of this would be possible without the love and support of his wife, Margie Ferriter. LTG Ferriter's motivation also comes from being a role model to his four children Dr. Meghan Ferriter, MAJ Dan Ferriter, CPT Paddy Ferriter, and former CPT Mary Whitney Whittaker. Mary Whitney and her husband, Garret, are the proud parents of Parker, LTG Ferriter's and Margie's first grandchild.

Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join me, my wife, Vivian, the nearly 700,000 people in Georgia's 2nd Congressional District, and all Americans, in extending our sincerest appreciation and best wishes to Lieutenant General Michael Ferriter, a "Soldier's Soldier," and Mrs. Ferriter, upon the occasion of his retirement from a stellar career of 35 years in the United States Army.

RECOMMENDATION TO REJECT NORWEGIAN AIR INTERNATIONAL'S APPLICATION FOR A FOREIGN AIR OPERATORS CERTIFICATE

HON. RICHARD M. NOLAN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues concerned about our nation's aviation industry and the delicate balance in our international relations to the pending decision by U.S. Secretary of Transportation Anthony Foxx regarding the application of Norwegian Air International for a Foreign Air Operators Certificate.

This important issue was addressed with utmost clarity recently by my friend, former U.S. Congressman Jim Oberstar in the following letter to Secretary Foxx. Jim Oberstar served in the U.S. House from 1975 to 2011 and was for many years Chairman of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. He is known as the nation's leading expert on Domestic and International Transportation issues. Former Congressman Oberstar urges Secretary Foxx to reject the Norwegian Air International Application.

APRIL 28, 2014.

Hon. ANTHONY FOXX,
Secretary, U.S. Department of Transportation, New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have watched with great interest the public debate over the application of Norwegian Air International (NAI) for a foreign air operator's certificate from the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT). As a former chairman of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, it is my strongly held view that the approval of NAI's application would run contrary to the U.S.-EU Air Transport Agreement and the labor article embodied in the agreement, and contrary to the best interests of U. S. commercial aviation. I respectfully urge you to reject NAI's application.

During my 36 years of service in the U.S. House of Representatives on the committee of jurisdiction over international aviation trade issues, I witnessed dramatic changes in the U.S. and global airline industries. Beginning with deregulation in 1978 and continuing through the modern era of mergers, code sharing, anti-trust-immunized alliances, and expansive Open Skies agreements, much of the airline industry today is globally interconnected; U.S. airlines and their employees are directly impacted by the actions of foreign competitors more than ever before. During my tenure of watchfulness over the U.S. aviation industry, I sought to ensure that liberalization was pursued in bilateral agreements which assured a balance of benefits with our international trade partners, protecting the integrity, safety, and competitiveness of the U.S. aviation system.

In the early 1990s, the U.S. government began negotiating bilateral Air Transport, or Open Skies agreements that were intended to open aviation markets, promote competition and tourism, create jobs and increase consumer choice for international travel. These Open Skies agreements are qualitatively different from other trade agreements which deal with services in that they

are almost exclusively bilateral. As such, they reflect a balance of benefits for the U.S. and our trade partner, often with in-country and beyond operating rights, and they are overseen by the Departments of State, Transportation, and Justice, rather than the United States Trade Representative. Given the complexity and size of the U.S. aviation market—which accounts for over half of the world's aviation marketplace—retention of this model is necessary to ensure that the exchange in air traffic rights is done in a way that promotes strong safety, labor and working condition standards, while also ensuring an equitable competitive environment for U.S. airlines. Critical to achieving this goal has long been the continued enforcement of U.S. foreign ownership and control and cabotage laws, along with strong U.S. DOT and DOJ regulatory oversight.

The negotiation of the U.S.-EU Open Skies agreement, which began in the middle of the last decade, presented many unique challenges. While the European Union is an economic and political union of 28 member states, each of these states has retained its respective governmental aviation regulatory authority. Therefore, rather than dealing with a single aviation regulatory body and one set of labor and social laws as we had with previous agreements, we were dealing with multiple aviation regulatory authorities and sets of labor and social laws. While there are base standards for safety and labor laws, the individual nation-state laws still differ widely.

Given the unique nature of negotiating with the EU, many of my colleagues and I were concerned about proposed changes in regulatory structure that would allow any EU airline to operate from any point in the EU to any point in the U.S. and to establish subsidiaries in other EU states. Despite this ''European status'' for operating and corporate rights, there was no EU-wide law that governed key labor-management relations aspects of these airlines. Instead, these aspects—such as selection of bargaining representatives and contract negotiations—were, and continue to be, subject to the national labor laws of the respective European countries.

During the negotiations, EU representatives expressed concern that such an arrangement could lead to ''forum shopping'' where European airlines would seek to operate out of countries with less robust labor and social laws. This could allow airlines to seek the lowest common denominator in terms of labor and regulatory standards thereby lowering their own operating costs but driving down standards throughout the EU. In other words, the EU was concerned that new airlines could be launched using a NAI-like business model.

This concern led negotiators to include in the agreement Article 17 bis (''Social Dimension''), which states that ''the opportunities created by the Agreement are not intended to undermine labour standards or the labour-related rights and principles contained in the Parties' respective laws.'' It further states that ''the principles in paragraph 1 shall guide the Parties as they implement the Agreement.'' The fact that there was no equivalent to Article 17 bis in any of the previous Open Skies agreements with EU member states is a direct acknowledgement of the challenges posed by the regulatory and legal arrangement within the EU.

Article 17 bis was a critical factor in the ''Agreement''. I applauded its inclusion as an important and necessary step in protecting against the use of market-opening aviation trade agreements to lower labor standards throughout the transatlantic aviation market: the largest aviation trade market in the world.

Today, in light of NAI's application for a foreign air operator's certificate, as well as the plethora of public comments that the DOT has received on this application, I believe that the inclusion of Article 17 bis and the concerns that led to its inclusion were particularly prescient.

Mr. Secretary, you and the DOT International policy staff are familiar with the details of NAI's application and business model, but key facts are worth repeating: NAI is a subsidiary of Norwegian Air Shuttle (NAS), a low-cost European carrier based out of Norway. When Norway became a signatory of the U.S.-EU Open Skies Agreement in 2011, NAS was afforded the same access to air traffic rights under that agreement as other EU carriers. Rather than expand its operations with its existing corporate structure, its workforce and collective bargaining agreements, NAS created NAI and proceeded to register its long-haul aircraft in Ireland and obtain an Irish Air Operator's Certificate—effectively becoming an Irish airline despite the fact that it has no announced plans to operate in Ireland.

This move allowed NAS to expand its long-haul operations through NAI, but also to escape Norway's social laws and to evade existing collective bargaining agreements with its Norwegian pilots and flight attendants. For example, NAI's pilots are based in Thailand and employed under individual employment contracts that are covered by the laws of Singapore. These pilots are then contracted to NAI. The individual employment contracts prevent collective bargaining, and allow NAI to drastically reduce labor costs and gain an unfair competitive advantage over U.S. and European carriers who currently operate in the transatlantic market. The workforce arrangement for flight attendants is still evolving, but what I have learned is that NAI is hiring and basing its cabin crewmembers outside of its home country in what is clearly a plan to secure substandard wages and working conditions and to blatantly evade its collective bargaining obligations in Norway. NAI is pursuing, quite simply, what in maritime law is called a ''Flag of Convenience'' strategy.

NAI has not denied that it registered in Ireland to avoid the application of Norwegian labor laws to its crews. Other economic justifications presented for selecting Ireland over other possible places to incorporate, the validity of which also have been effectively rebutted by several opponents, appear to be intended to distract from this central and undisputed motivation. The company is thus taking advantage of the opportunities provided by the U.S.-EU Open Skies Agreement in order to lower its own labor costs and undercut the competition, the very scenario that EU negotiators feared when Article 17 bis was included in the U.S.-EU agreement.

I believe that the evidence and arguments submitted in the public docket provide the Department with ample justification to deny the application.

During my years of service on the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, conducting vigorous oversight of international aviation trade, I learned that liberalization and market expansion could provide numerous benefits to consumers, open business opportunities for U.S. carriers and create jobs. But I also observed that effective market expansion required the thoughtful and careful approach of balancing reduced trade barriers with the assurance of fair competition and the public interest. We understand the strategic and economic significance of the U.S. airline industry to our nation's well-being, and further understand the unique challenges inherent in implementing the expansive and complicated U.S.-EU Open Skies Agreement in a productive and responsible manner.

With this background, I believe that this is an important inflection point for how we as a nation project and secure America's role in the global aviation marketplace. The negotiators for both sides in the U.S.-EU Open Skies Agreement negotiations understood the risks and adverse consequences that irresponsible liberalization could pose to the airline industries and workforces on both sides of the Atlantic. They resisted deliberate efforts to dismantle the U.S. ownership and control and cabotage laws, and they included, for the first time ever, a labor article in the final agreement. In doing so, they made an unmistakable statement that the terms of competition must not be set by those who would seek to gain an unfair advantage at the expense of quality jobs and high labor standards.

The Department should implement the Agreement in the spirit of Article 17 bis and concern for both fair competition and balanced trade benefits. Were NAI to be allowed to operate as proposed, the dynamic of transatlantic aviation competition will be changed for the worse, creating a situation where Flags of Convenience become the norm, not the exception.

I urge you to reject the NAT application, and thereby uphold the spirit and intent of the U.S.-EU Open Skies Agreement and Article 17 bis. Thank you for your consideration of my views on this vital international aviation policy issue.

Sincerely,

JIM OBERSTAR, M.C.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 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 $17,447,321,527,551.15. We've added $6,820,444,478,638.07 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.

HONORING CARMEN VELASQUEZ OF CHICAGO FOR HER LIFETIME OF SERVICE TO THE UNDERSERVED LATINO COMMUNITY IN CHICAGO

HON. RAUL RUIZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize a dear friend of mine, Carmen Velasquez of Chicago as she retires from her position of executive director at Alivio Medical Center, for her incredible dedication to the medical community and the underserved Latino community of Chicago.

Carmen devoted her life to the care of others in her community, advocating for health, education, civil rights, and equitable heath access for all in Chicago. As founder of the

Alivio Medical Center, a bicultural nonprofit health center and extremely respected advocacy organization, she has dedicated over 25 years to expanding the reach of health care to low-income residents of Chicago. Because of Carmen's determination and perseverance, regardless of income, insurance, or ethnicity, over 20,000 individuals have received the best quality care in the greater Chicago community in over 6 clinics with plans for two new health clinic sites this year.

Coming from a family of hardworking Mexican immigrants, she became a social worker, community organizer, and bilingual education specialist after earning degrees from both Loyola University Chicago and the University of the Americas in Puebla, Mexico. As a member of Chicago's Board of Education, she saw firsthand the disparities in both education and health for Chicago's neglected Latino population. In 1988 Carmen found herself in a muffler shop parking lot, marking the beginning of her campaign to raise $2.1 million for the construction of her first of many health clinics. One year later, Carmen's passion manifested in the first Alivio Medical Center and she has been serving the otherwise unrepresented and overlooked community since.

Carmen has been recognized on numerous occasions for her renowned work, including recent recognitions at halftime by the Chicago Bears and the National Football League's Hispanic Heritage Leadership Award, the MALDEF Lifetime Achievement Award and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Community Health Leadership Award. Illinois Governor Pat Quinn has honored her as the Latino Heritage Month ''Trailblazer of the Day.''

It is an understatement to say that Carmen Velasquez is a true champion for Chicago's Latino community. Her undying fervor, commitment, and care for giving back to the low-income and at risk groups have had profound effects on the health and wellbeing of Chicago. On behalf of all who have benefited from her initiative and the entire medical community, I'd like to thank and congratulate Carmen for her lifelong dedication to others and wish her well in the years to come.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TIM GRIFFIN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, April 30, 2014, I missed four votes as I was returning home to Arkansas to continue my work in dealing with the aftermath of the devastating storm that hit my district over the weekend, including a scheduled tour of the affected areas in Mayflower and Vilonia with the United States Secretary of Homeland Security, who subsequently postponed his visit.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall vote No. 184, ''no'' on rollcall vote No. 185, ''no'' on rollcall vote No. 186, and ''yea'' on rollcall vote No. 187, for final passage of H.R. 4486, the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM MARINO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 181, I was unable to be in town for votes due to a personal matter. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

MORTON AND ALYCE SPECTOR

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Morton and Alyce Spector who are being honored at the 2014 Susquehanna Tzedakah Society Dinner for their devotion to bettering the Jewish community of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Mr. and Mrs. Spector have committed their lives to improving the community for their friends and neighbors. Mrs. Spector, a former teacher and executive director of the National Kidney Foundation of Central PA, and Mr. Spector, a founder of D&H Distributors and current co-owner of Design Kitchens and Appliances, have worked with dozens of boards and organizations across the Harrisburg region and are known by all for their ''can do'' attitude and willingness to lend a hand whenever it's needed. The Spectors credit their parents as their role models, instilling in them the importance of charitable efforts from an early age. Today, they themselves have become role models and are credited with raising hundreds of thousands of dollars for the Jewish community.

Mr. Speaker, tonight as the Harrisburg community honors the Spectors at the 2014 Susquehanna Tzedakah Society Dinner, I join in thanking them for their outstanding commitment to bettering the Jewish community, and I commend them and their families for their hard work and dedication.

HONORING RICHARD DAVID KANN MELANOMA FOUNDATION

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Richard David Kann Melanoma Foundation of Palm Beach County, Florida. The foundation will recognize Melanoma Awareness Day on May 5, an important opportunity to raise awareness of skin cancer prevention and treatment.

Malignant melanoma is the deadliest form of skin cancer. In fact, one American dies from Melanoma every fifty minutes. In Florida, residents are especially vulnerable to excessive exposure to the ultraviolet radiation of the sun. Unfortunately, our sunny state has the second highest incidence of the cancer in the country.

That is why it is critical that Floridians, and all Americans, take steps to reduce their likelihood of developing melanoma. These include avoiding peak sunlight hours when the sun's rays are most intense, seeking shade, applying sun block with an SPF of at least 30–50+ every two hours, and wearing protective clothing such as long-sleeved pants and sunglasses.

In honor of the Richard David Kann Melanoma Foundation, I am proud recognize Melanoma Awareness Day. I would also like to thank them for their tireless work in preventing and detecting skin cancer and wish them the best as they continue this daunting but important endeavor.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TIM MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 182, I was predisposed at the time.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM MARINO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 183, I was unable to make votes due to a personal conflict.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

LUPUS AWARENESS MONTH

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Lupus Awareness Month. Each May, we recognize lupus as the cruel, mysterious autoimmune disease from which an estimated 1.5 million Americans suffer.

Lupus comes in many shapes and sizes and does not discriminate against only one part of the body. The chronic disease can affect nearly any part of the body including the skin, lungs, heart, joints, kidneys, and brain. Lupus is often misdiagnosed several times over several months before an accurate diagnosis can be made. This is because lupus is known as the ''great imitator,'' mimicking many other illnesses and no single test can diagnose a patient.

Treatment for lupus can be very expensive because of its multi-faceted nature. Annually, lupus costs our nation about $31.4 billion. The annual cost for treatment for an individual with lupus is an estimated $20,000 and for an individual with lupus nephritis, kidney inflammation caused by lupus, could be as high as $62,000 per year.

Lupus is far more common in women and in men, particularly among African Americans, Hispanics, Asian Americans, and Native Americans. The cause for lupus' prevalence in minorities is unknown and extensive research is

necessary. Without additional research dollars, scientists searching for causes and treatments will inevitably be delayed.

This May, we must promote lupus awareness. Nearly three-fourths of Americans aged 18 to 34 have never heard of lupus and those who fall in that age bracket are at the highest risk. We must build awareness for this chronic condition and simultaneously work to increase funding for research to improve the diagnosis of this disease that disproportionally affects minorities and women in the prime of their lives. I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing Lupus Awareness Month.

CORRECTION

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

See Résumé of Congressional Activity.

The House passed H.R. 4487, Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2015.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2571–S2623

Measures Introduced: Twelve bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2275–2286, and S. Res. 432–433. **Pages S2613–14**

Measures Considered:

Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 2262, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry. **Pages S2571–73, S2591–S2603**

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, a vote on cloture will occur on Tuesday, May 6, 2014. **Page S2603**

Moritz Nomination: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Nancy L. Moritz, of Kansas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit. **Page S2581**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 60 yeas to 38 nays (Vote No. 126), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S2581**

Moritz and Selfridge Nominations—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, May 5, 2014, Senate vote on confirmation of the nominations of Nancy L. Moritz, of Kansas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit, and Peter A. Selfridge, of Minnesota, to be Chief of Protocol, and to have the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service, under the order of Wednesday, April 30, 2014. **Page S2622**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 53 yeas to 42 nays (Vote No. EX. 127), Theodore David Chuang, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland. **Pages S2579–80, S2590, S2623**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 54 yeas to 43 nays (Vote No. 124), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S2580**

By a unanimous vote of 95 yeas (Vote No. EX. 128), George Jarrod Hazel, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland. **Pages S2580–81, S2590, S2623**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 55 yeas to 42 nays (Vote No. 125), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S2581**

By 64 yeas to 32 nays (Vote No. EX. 129), Janice Marion Schneider, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior. **Pages S2590–91, S2623**

Suzan G. LeVine, of Washington, to be Ambassador to the Swiss Confederation, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Principality of Liechtenstein. **Pages S2591, S2623**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Pamela Pepper, of Wisconsin, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Wisconsin.

2 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

4 Army nominations in the rank of general.

6 Marine Corps nominations in the rank of general.

2 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, and Navy. **Pages S2622–23**

Messages from the House: Page S2608
Measures Referred: Pages S2608–09
Measures Read the First Time: Pages S2609, S2622
Executive Communications: Pages S2609–13
Executive Reports of Committees: Page S2613
Additional Cosponsors: Pages S2614–15
Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: Pages S2615–20
Additional Statements: Pages S2606–08
Authorities for Committees to Meet: Pages S2621–22
Privileges of the Floor: Page S2622

Record Votes: Six record votes were taken today. (Total—129) Pages S2580, S2581, S2590, S2590–91

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 6:41 p.m., until 2 p.m. on Monday, May 5, 2014. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S2622.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

RURAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Subcommittee on Jobs, Rural Economic Growth and Energy Innovation concluded a hearing to examine the importance of regional strategies in rural economic development, after receiving testimony from Doug O'Brien, Deputy Under Secretary of Agriculture for Rural Development; Dawn Keeley, Red River Regional Council, Grafton, North Dakota; Gary Person, City Manager, Sidney, Nebraska; Mark Tilsen, Native American Natural Foods, Kyle, South Dakota; and Chuck Fluharty, Rural Policy Research Institute, Columbia, Missouri.

APPROPRIATIONS: NASA

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2015 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, after receiving testimony from Charles F. Bolden, Jr., Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

UKRAINIAN CRISIS AND RUSSIA

Committee on Armed Services: Committee received a closed briefing on the Ukrainian crisis and Russia from General Philip M. Breedlove, USAF, Commander, U.S. European Command, and Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, Department of Defense.

SOCIAL IMPACT BONDS

Committee on the Budget: Committee with the Government Performance Task Force concluded a hearing to examine exploring social impact bonds, focusing on investing in what works, after receiving testimony from Maryland State Delegate Mark Fisher, Annapolis; Kyle McKay, Texas Legislative Budget Board, Austin; Mark Fisher, United Kingdom Department for Work and Pensions, London; and Jeffrey B. Liebman, Harvard Kennedy School Social Impact Bond Technical Assistance Lab, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

GAS AND PROPANE SHORTAGES

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine shortages on gas, focusing on a look into propane shortages this winter, after receiving testimony from Melanie Kenderdine, Director, Office of Energy Policy and Systems Analysis, and Energy Counselor to the Secretary, Department of Energy; Nils Nichols, Director, Division of Pipeline Regulation, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; Andrew J. Black, Association of Oil Pipe Lines, Washington, D.C.; Joe Cordill, Cordill Butane Propane Service, Winnsboro, Louisiana; John Zimmerman, Minnesota Turkey Growers Association, Northfield; and Gary France, France Propane Service, Schofield, Wisconsin.

PRESIDENT'S 2014 TRADE POLICY AGENDA

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the President's 2014 Trade Policy Agenda, after receiving testimony from Michael Froman, Ambassador, United States Trade Representative.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Deirdre M. Daly, to be United States Attorney for the District of Connecticut, and James Walter Frazer Green, to be United States Attorney for the Middle District of Louisiana, both of the Department of Justice, and Elisebeth Collins Cook, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board.

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: 24 public bills, H.R. 4539–4562; and 2 resolutions, and H. Res. 562–563 were introduced. **Pages H3407–08**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H3409**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2015: The House passed H.R. 4487, making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, by a yea-and-nay vote of 402 yeas to 14 nays, Roll No. 193. **Pages H3368–92**

Rejected the Ruiz motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 194 ayes to 222 noes, Roll No. 192. **Pages H3390–92**

Agreed to:

Speier amendment (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 113–426) that appropriates $500,000 to provide for sexual harassment training for all House offices which will be carried out by the Congressional Office of Compliance. These funds are offset from the AOC General Administration fund; **Pages H3381–82**

Hall amendment (No. 6 printed in H. Rept. 113–426) that prohibits funds from being used to deliver a printed copy of the CAO's Statement of Disbursements of the House to any Member of the House of Representatives; **Page H3385**

Wenstrup amendment (No. 7 printed in H. Rept. 113–426) that prohibits funding for the delivery of printed copies of the Daily Calendar of the United States House of Representatives to Member offices, as this document is accessible online; and **Pages H3385–86**

Gosar amendment (No. 3 printed in H. Rept. 113–426) that reduces the amount provided for the Botanic Garden to the fiscal year 2014 level and transfers the funds to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 219 ayes to 198 noes, Roll No. 189). **Pages H3382–83, H3388–89**

Rejected:

Duffy amendment (No. 5 printed in H. Rept. 113–426) that sought to defund the Open World Leadership Center Trust Fund; **Pages H3384–85**

Nugent amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 113–426) that sought to prohibit the CAO of the House of Representatives from making any payments from any Members' representational allowance for the leasing of a vehicle, excluding mobile district offices and short-term vehicle rentals (by a recorded vote of 196 ayes to 221 noes, Roll No. 188); **Pages H3380–81, H3387–88**

Broun (GA) amendment (No. 4 printed in H. Rept. 113–426) that sought to reduce the funding for the Capitol Visitor Center by $243,000, returning it to FY14 levels (by a recorded vote of 207 ayes to 212 noes, Roll No. 190); and **Pages H3383–84, H3389**

Holt amendment (No. 8 printed in H. Rept. 113–426) that sought to appropriate $2.5 million to re-institute the Office of Technology Assessment (OTA), offset from funds in the House Historic Buildings Revitalization Trust Fund (by a recorded vote of 164 ayes to 248 noes, Roll No. 191). **Pages H3386–87, H3389–90**

H. Res. 557, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 4486) and (H.R. 4487), was agreed to yesterday, April 30th.

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 noon tomorrow, May 2nd; and when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Tuesday, May 6th when it shall convene at 12 noon for Morning Hour Debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business. **Page H3395**

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote and five recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H3388, H3388–89, H3389, H3389–90, H3391–92, H3392. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 2:46 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a markup on H.R. 4435, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015". The bill was forwarded to the Full Committee without amendment.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness held a markup on H.R. 4435, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015". The bill was forwarded, as amended, to the Full Committee.

TELEHEALTH TO DIGITAL MEDICINE: HOW 21ST CENTURY TECHNOLOGY CAN BENEFIT PATIENTS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled ''Telehealth to Digital Medicine: How 21st Century Technology Can Benefit Patients''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS TO ENHANCE CAPITAL FORMATION FOR SMALL AND EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES, PART II

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises held a hearing entitled ''Legislative Proposals to Enhance Capital Formation for Small and Emerging Growth Companies, Part II''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC: FROM ''PRE-GENOCIDE'' TO GENOCIDE

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations held a hearing entitled ''The Central African Republic: from ''Pre-genocide'' to Genocide?'' Testimony was heard from Robert P. Jackson, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of African Affairs, Department of State; Anne Richard, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration, Department of State; and public witnesses.

BENGHAZI, INSTABILITY AND A NEW GOVERNMENT: SUCCESS AND FAILURES OF U.S. INTERVENTION IN LIBYA

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Benghazi, Instability and a New Government: Success and Failures of U.S. Intervention in Libya''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ONGOING INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Ongoing Intelligence Activities''. This was a closed hearing.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, MAY 2, 2014

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Résumé of Congressional Activity

SECOND SESSION OF THE ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS

The first table gives a comprehensive résumé of all legislative business transacted by the Senate and House. The second table accounts for all nominations submitted to the Senate by the President for Senate confirmation.

DATA ON LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY

January 3 through April 30, 2014

	Senate	*House*	*Total*
Days in session	56	54	..
Time in session	342 hrs., 11′	261 hrs., 48′	..
Congressional Record:			
Pages of proceedings	2,569	3,365	..
Extensions of Remarks	..	649	..
Public bills enacted into law	13	15	28
Private bills enacted into law	..	..	..
Bills in conference	2	2	..
Measures passed, total	119	147	266
Senate bills	22	10	..
House bills	13	89	..
Senate joint resolutions	3	3	..
House joint resolutions	1	1	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	3	1	..
House concurrent resolutions	8	9	..
Simple resolutions	69	34	..
Measures reported, total	44	102	146
Senate bills	27	..	..
House bills	7	80	..
Senate joint resolutions	..	..	..
House joint resolutions	..	..	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	..	..	..
House concurrent resolutions	..	3	..
Simple resolutions	10	19	..
Special reports	2	3	..
Conference reports	1	1	..
Measures pending on calendar	256	35	..
Measures introduced, total	495	880	1,375
Bills	380	732	..
Joint resolutions	6	10	..
Concurrent resolutions	5	25	..
Simple resolutions	104	113	..
Quorum calls	1	1	..
Yea-and-nay votes	123	87	..
Recorded votes	..	99	..
Bills vetoed	..	..	..
Vetoes overridden	..	..	..

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

January 3 through April 30, 2014

Civilian nominations, totaling 443 (including 2 nominations carried over from the First Session), disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	182
Unconfirmed	258
Withdrawn	3
Other Civilian nominations, totaling 2,344, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	1,862
Unconfirmed	482
Air Force nominations, totaling 1,231, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	1,196
Unconfirmed	35
Army nominations, totaling 2,432, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	635
Unconfirmed	1,797
Navy nominations, totaling 143, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	81
Unconfirmed	62
Marine Corps nominations, totaling 866, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	546
Unconfirmed	320

Summary

Total nominations carried over from the First Session	2
Total nominations received this Session	7,457
Total confirmed	4,502
Total unconfirmed	2,954
Total withdrawn	3
Total returned to the White House	0

Next Meeting of the SENATE

2 p.m., Monday, May 5

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 5:30 p.m.), Senate will vote on confirmation of the nominations of Nancy L. Moritz, of Kansas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit, and Peter A. Selfridge, of Minnesota, to be Chief of Protocol, and to have the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12 p.m., Friday, May 2

House Chamber

Program for Friday: The House will meet in pro forma session at 12 noon.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Barletta, Lou, Pa., E661, E664
Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E662
Butterfield, G.K., N.C.,E659
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E663
Crawford, Eric A. ''Rick'', Ark., E654
DeFazio, Peter A., Ore., E651
Deutch, Theodore E., Fla., E657
Doyle, Michael F., Pa., E655
Farr, Sam, Calif., E651
Fitzpatrick, Michael G., Pa., E656
Frankel, Lois, Fla., E659, E664
Frelinghuysen, Rodney P., N.J., E661
Gingrey, Phil, Ga., E652, E656
Graves, Sam, Mo., E655, E656, E657, E658, E662
Green, Gene, Tex., E658
Griffin, Tim, Ark., E664
Gutiérrez, Luis V., Ill., E656
Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E653, E660
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E657, E664
Marino, Tom, Pa., E655, E657, E661, E664, E664
Michaud, Michael H., Me., E653, E657, E660
Miller, Jeff, Fla., E652, E654
Murphy, Tim, Pa., E655, E657, E661, E664
Nolan, Richard M., Minn., E662
Pelosi, Nancy, Calif., E657
Peters, Gary C., Mich., E659
Pocan, Mark, Wisc., E656
Ruiz, Raul, Calif., E663
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E656
Schneider, Bradley S., Ill., E654, E655
Shimkus, John, Ill., E652
Tiberi, Patrick J., Ohio, E661
Vela, Filemon, Tex., E651, E658, E660, E661
Walorski, Jackie, Ind., E655
Wilson, Joe, S.C., E654, E658
Young, Todd C., Ind., E651

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.